Canadian Social Studies
Canada's National Social Studies Journal

Volume 48(2), *The Retrospective Issue*

2016

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Retrospective Issue

Cathryn van Kessel
Assistant Professor, Department of Secondary Education
University of Alberta
vankesse@ualberta.ca

David Scott
Director, Student Experiences Community-Based Pathway
Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary
scottd@ucalgary.ca

This fall, *Canadian Social Studies* is capping off its twentieth year, with fifteen of those years as an open source online journal. In celebration, the Associate Editors have put together a selection of articles from the archives. It was difficult to choose from the outstanding contributions over the last two decades, but we have picked a selection to offer insights into the concerns of the past that still live with us today. Drawing inspiration from Gert Biesta (2010), the criteria we chose to pick these articles was guided by the following question: *What might be educational about social studies education?* In bringing forth articles that lend insight into this question, we were interested in exploring the aims and purposes of social studies.

Biesta (2010) noted that schools have three distinct but interrelated aims: "qualification," "socialization," and "subjectification." Qualification takes the form of training for particular skills, such as political literacy or supposedly "practical" skills that serve as a sort of job training. Socialization initiates students into existing, dominant orders—how they ought to speak, behave, and think. Both qualification and socialization are useful to a degree, but they do not allow for new thinking or new ways of being in the world. Thus, the more educational aim of schooling is subjectification, the process by which we *become a subject* who can take critical distance from the current status quo. Subjectification, thus, entails more consciously examining what we as educators are doing on a daily basis in and out of the classroom, and then provides an opportunity to generate new, more creative and ethical ways we might live together. Ongoing issues such as sexism, ethnocentrism, racism, and terrorism highlight our need for the educational aim of subjectification—the need for classrooms where independent, interconnected thought is not only tolerated, but also nourished and cultivated. The following articles provide a variety of ways for researchers and teachers to do just that.

In *Unmentionable Things in Social Studies: Women's Issues?* (1997), J-C Couture invited his readers to consider how we, as educators, cannot escape the political aspects of teaching. This article resonates today as much as it did back then. Through an engagement with a diverse group of writers from Judith Butler to bell hooks to Donna Haraway, Couture, a white male in Alberta during a deeply conservative political time, takes the reader through a journey of subjectification that allowed him to interrogate the patriarchal coding of social studies. Couture learned that he was "as much a subject" as what he taught (p. 82), and thus his sensibilities as a social studies educator morphed to reflect the politics of gender and respectful engagements with feminist perspectives. Couture came to see the ways in which we do not use language as much as "language uses us" (p. 81). As a doctoral candidate then, and an associate coordinator of research

for the Alberta Teachers' Association now, Couture continues to lead and support research that calls for *education,* rather than a much-diminished form of *schooling* that only seeks to replicate the current way of things.

In *Two Terms You Can (and Should) Use in the Classroom: Cultural Homogenization and Eurocentrism* (2000), George Richardson discussed how the media portrays globalization, and suggested ways to encourage students to analyze and critique these portrayals. Richardson, then a new professor at the University of Alberta with more than twenty years of classroom experience, provoked both researchers and teachers to think about why globalization might be difficult to teach, and suggested ways we might deal with this situation: "In an age of globalization when consumerism and cultural conformity appear to leave less and less room for independent thought and action (para. 20)," Richardson argued that media literacy programs are one way to encourage active, responsible citizens. Like Couture (1997), Richardson (2000) attended to the importance of considering language as interconnected to our (potential) thinking processes as we become subjects to our own educational formation.

Where were you when you heard about the attacks on the World Trade Center, and what was your reaction? In his article, *Teaching After 9/11* (2003), Robert Gardner related his experiences as a social studies teacher in a large and diverse urban high school, whose students expressed a multitude of reactions to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Gardner thoughtfully recounted his students' comments and concerns, and described the upheaval that has occurred in North America in the two years since the attacks. Now, more than a decade later, similar concerns abound in Canadian social studies classrooms—polarizing discourses, contending loyalties, and identity politics. Despite his extensive experience, Gardner (2003) realized that he needed to "re-learn the content of [his] trade, almost as a beginning teacher" in terms of both what he taught and how he approached the subject he thought he knew so well (para. 12). Teaching social studies thus called for new ways of being in the classroom. For Gardner, who continues to teach high school social studies in Edmonton, 9/11 has ruptured the binaries of us/them and here/there, and is an event that can be taught in ways that emphasize our connections to a larger world. Gardner's article, paired with that of Richardson, provides a space to think about issues of terrorism in ways that open up thinking, rather than foreclosing the possibilities for generative thought about how we might live together more ethically.

In *We Interrupt This Moment: Education and the Teaching of History* (2005), Jennifer Tupper explored the interplay between what we consider to be the past and present, as well as how we imagine the future. Through the technique of interruption, Tupper highlighted often forgotten content about women in social studies while recounting her experiences as an Assistant Professor teaching undergraduate students. Tupper illuminated how dominant narratives silence women in history and shapes our minds regardless of our gender. When we examine the stories we tell—whose they are, how they are being told, and whose are neglected—there is an opportunity to re-read and re-think: "Such questions, when used in the classroom, create the necessary pre-conditions for students and teachers to pause in their readings of the past so that they may critically re-read it" (para. 15). Although it may be easy to slip into frustration or anger when students assume a narrow view of the past and present, Tupper illustrated a way educators might work with students to interrupt and subvert the narratives that shape such troubling views. Tupper provides a way for us all to take critical distance from the status quo and work toward

better ethical relations with each other. Tupper is currently continuing such endeavours (and others) as Dean of Education at the University of Regina.

The final article we chose for this retrospective issue was: *Unsettling Our Narrative Encounters Within and Outside of Canadian Social Studies* (2014), by Nicholas Ng-A-Fook and Robin Milne, a professor and a graduate student at the University of Ottawa respectively. In this very recent article, the authors engaged with the work of Roger Simon to thoughtfully address social studies during the early stages of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission: "Part of decolonizing the explicit, implicit, and null school curriculum involves learning how to remember the narratives that inform our understandings of Canadian history" (p. 93). Through the writing of "shadow texts" (i.e., secondary responses to unresolved questions from a primary narrative; See Simon & Eppert, 1997, p. 184), the authors show how we can document historical traumas such as Indian Residential Schools in ways that are respectful—acting as a witnesses while we teach and learn. As those residing in the land now called "Canada" are struggling with what reconciliation can mean, this article posits one way that we all, as treaty people, can work pedagogically toward more peaceful and respectful ways of being together on this land.

What are the educational purposes of a social studies education? One (of many possible) responses to that question is that social studies provides an opportunity for teachers and students to un/re/learn how we have, and are, living with each other. As educators, it is vital that we interrogate our core assumptions, and how they frame our research, classroom practice, and daily lives. J-C Couture, George Richardson, and Robert Gardner reflect on how we talk about historical and contemporary events, thus setting the stage for more thoughtful narratives that open up possibilities for interconnected relationships. Tupper as well as Ng-A-Fook and Milne provide two different, but generative ways, of opening up our conceptualizations of the past that will ultimately cause us to re-think our present and future as well. We wish to thank these authors, as well as all the other contributors to *Canadian Social Studies* over the last two decades, for their contributions to not only this journal, but also for their commitments to the greater field of educational theory and practice.

References

Biesta, G. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Couture, J-C. (1997). Unmentionable things in social studies: Women's issues? *Canadian Social Studies, 31*(2), 80-82.

Gardner, R. (2003). Teaching after 9/11. *Canadian Social Studies, 38*(1), n.p.

Ng-A-Fook, N., & Milne, R. (2014). Unsettling our narrative encounters within and outside of Canadian social studies. *Canadian Social Studies, 47*(2), 88-109.

Richardson, G. (2000). Two terms you can (and should) use in the classroom: Cultural homogenization and eurocentrism. *Canadian Social Studies, 35*(1), n.p.

Simon, R., & Eppert, C. (1997). Remembering obligation: Pedagogy and the witnessing of testimony of historical trauma. *Canadian Journal of Education, 22*(2), 175-191.

Tupper, J. (2005). We interrupt this moment: Education and the teaching of history. *Canadian Social Studies, 39*(2), n.p.

Unmentionable Things in Social Studies: Women's Issues?

Jean-Claude Couture

Abstract

The author is a middle-aged male teacher in Alberta, living under the Klein revolution and the corporatist pressures for so-called accountability. Feminism has reminded him that teachers are as much subjects as is the prescribed program of studies that they teach. Exploring women's issues helps teachers mediate what counts as a question in social studies. The author encourages social studies educators to revisit how patriarchal language sometimes limits our understanding of terms such as "security" and "politics."

Only as subjects can we speak
bell hooks

Gloria Steinhem wrote in the introduction to *Revolution from Within* that she realized late in the completion of her manuscript that she was attracted to the subject of women's self-esteem "not because other people needed it, but because I did" (1992, p. 6). At this point she understood what "deep shit" she was in—she had spent much of her life knowing better what other people were thinking and feeling than she did herself. Steinhem characterizes this "deep shit" as a psychological malaise she calls "empathy sickness." For me, graduate work in women's studies over the last few years has pulled back the mask of pure reason and objectivity that I used to confidently wear as a middle-aged male, privileged with access to the material resources of society. Speaking through this mask of pure reason, I taught *government*, *power*, and *security*, as if I knew what these words were about for everyone, in all places, and at all times. In what follows I will explore the growing concerns I have about my complicity in teaching political and economic concepts defined in ways that are at best incomplete and, at worst, debilitating and marginalizing for female students.

While it would be dangerous to characterize feminism as a single impulse or method of social inquiry, I believe exploration of what has been loosely characterized as "women's issues" does offer teachers some escape from a curriculum that enjoys (within its patriarchical sensibility) its own definitions of what it means to be a "citizen" who experiences *power*, *security*, and *government*. Permit me to explain with a few examples from my own personal experiences as a classroom teacher, and from concerns I have with the way the Alberta social studies curriculum deploys political and economic concepts in ways that limit the possibility of what feminist writers such as Haraway (1988) call an *embodied* curriculum.

The Alberta Program of Studies, like many provincial social studies curricula, depoliticizes certain spaces (homes, schools) and politicizes others (provincial and federal governments) in ways that privilege certain ways of *seeing* and *talking about* political and economic systems. After the threat of a province-wide labour walkout subsided in Alberta in mid-November, 1995, I was discussing with a class of Grade 12 students a statement made by Premier Ralph Klein that since there were so few student protests to his fiscal restraint program, there was probably not a lot of opposition to the cuts he was imposing on post-secondary institutions. I asked my class what they thought about the implications of Klein's remarks: *Are mass rallies and public displays of protest important barometers that a government should use to shape its policies?* Several students agreed with Klein's assertion: "These are tough times and despite the vocal opposition of interest groups (a.k.a. nurses, doctors, teachers), Klein should stick to his original plan." Others disagreed, claiming that public protest in the province never got off the ground because few people have been immediately or directly affected. Then one student asked me about the teachers: "Why have they not been more vocal? What about the kindergarten cuts?" I can recall sort of mumbling something about our provincial association's public awareness campaign, and how important it was for teachers to appear as supporters of public education and not to get *too* political. But I had no idea what I was trying to say. "What does it mean not to be *too* political." "What crap!" I thought as I felt the words spill out of my mouth. Then another student remarked:

> My cousin Alison worked at a laundry place in a Calgary hospital and was taking home around $1,000 a month after she took a 25% pay cut. And she has a kid at home. My mother's a nurse and she said 5,000 nurses lost their jobs in Alberta—and they are the ones that do a lot of the 'shit jobs' in a hospital. You hear about the doctors threatening to go on strike and look at what they make—what a joke! And teachers—they do pretty well compared to the laundry workers and nurses—plus that they don't have to clean up other people's vomit.

After the nervous laughter subsided, I realized how sanitized our conversation in class had been that day. Our conversation had been about abstract ideas like "democracy" and "participation." Yet the student's remark brought us back to a place where women's issues are often located—the less visible "shit jobs" like cleaning up other people's vomit. These are jobs I recall my wife doing with our young children in the early years of our marriage as they passed through the inevitable bouts of flu and colds. Gradually, I learned to do them too, but never to the full satisfaction of my children. Visiting an ailing relative in an extended care facility recently, I was struck by the intense and publicly invisible labour involved in caring for those who are not well. It was *all* women doing this work.

The low status and money accrued to daycare workers in this country is probably more of a meaningful comment about

"power" and "politics" in Canada than anything you could read in a standard social studies text on government. Politics finds many women where they labour at the less visible jobs—jobs that society demeans through structurally discriminatory pay scales and employment practices. Feminist writers like Haraway remind us that when social studies moves down from the "view above" into the embodied world of women, we soon discover that women do not need to look for politics—politics finds them. Later in the same discussion that day, one of my students wrote about difficulties she was having with her employer who was sexually harassing her: "I don't need to study power in dictatorships in the textbook—*it* studies me at work."

Feminism reminds us that language does not merely say something, it performs something. Language circulates differences that come to matter over time. Judith Butler argues that the *body* is a "style" constructed over time as the *flesh* becomes *materialized* through the "effects of power" circulated through the relations of labour and capital (1993). Haraway would say the ideas become *embodied* here (1988). For women, as with any marginalized subject, their particularity or difference lies within the stylings of the unequal access to economic and social resources (Butler, 1993). Women's issues are about the language of power and the power of language.

In Alberta, the current Program of Studies for Social Studies represents a series of hypertrophied compromises that largely sidestep the particular embodied concerns and issues that students face in their daily lives. The stated goal of the course is to evaluate critically the political and economic ideologies of modern nations as well as identify and evaluate the sources of conflict and co-operation among nations in the 20th century. Not bad for one course! One of my students commented of the course's ambitious scope, "There's more stuff in this course than at *Walmart* where I work." As pressure for accountability mounts, the language that constructs "citizenship education" in high school social studies across Canada attempts to be comprehensive in its coverage, robust in its descriptions and detail, and rigorous in its demands on students' critical thinking abilities. In patriarchy, it is not uncommon for academic rigour to be achieved through the god-trick of distance: the view from far away calls on one to equate quality with the breadth and number of historical examples instead of with the depth of a few localized cases. Few teachers would disagree that most high school curricula are overloaded with content specifications and prescriptions. Substituting breadth for depth is a common problem that feminist curriculum criticism sees in public education's rush to be seen to be accountable. As Haraway reminds us again, the patriarchical "view from nowhere in particular" is much more comfortable than the view from within the complex difficulties of an individual's everyday living. In Alberta, where I teach, students write a three-hour examination that represents 50 percent of their final mark and consists of 70 multiple-choice questions and a so-called "position paper" prepared without any reference material. Standardized external examinations limit the posing of interesting questions like what is politics? what is security? and who counts as a citizen? Let us examine how we might begin to expand the limits of what counts as knowledge in social studies.

Feminism encourages us to think about the way we use language and the way language uses us. Consider the term "security." In what context should the questions who has security? and who does not have security? be asked? In answering these questions, subject position is everything. As Butler would argue, concepts such as "security," "politics," or "economics," need to be examined within the lived experience of the flesh becoming a body. In a society such as Canada where 54 percent of women are afraid to walk outside at night (*Edmonton Journal*, November 29, 1992, p. A3), the definition of "citizenship rights" and "security" becomes devoid of any generalizable meaning (unless of course you are a male). Consider the case of a 20-year-old Calgary woman who was sexually assaulted and knifed and then charged $181 by the city's ambulance service for the trip to the hospital (*Edmonton Journal*, June 16, 1993, A6). The woman complains that, since she already finds it difficult to keep up financially working as a waitress "This is going to make it tough, I'm already behind on my rent." Her predicament raises the question within Butler's sense of the *materialized body*: for young women in our classrooms, what meaning can be given to the concept of "security" where every 17 minutes in Canada a female is sexually assaulted? This is what I would call an embodied social studies question (Fulford, 1994).

Some say we plan a curriculum much as we build a house. I prefer to think of "planting" a curriculum, where concepts such as security are allowed to grow within the middle spaces between community, students, and teacher. Feminism reminds educators that the word "concept" is derived from the Latin, *concipere*, "to gather the male seed." For feminist curriculum theorists such as Madeline Grumet, curriculum ought to become the bonding of thought (seed) to the relationships within the world: "The child and the idea are generated in the dialectic of male and female, of the one and the many, of love" (Grumet, 1988, p. 8). A female student once told me about walking down the hallway at lunch time while a group of male students sat on the floor staring at her as she went by. A couple of them snickered, one remarked "she's a 4." Knowing, as she did, that the number referred to a score out of 10, she walked away and cried. As Wendy Brown suggests, "Even when women acquire civil rights, they acquire something that is, at best, partially relevant to their daily rights and the main domain of her unfreedom" (1992, p. 17).

When is the fact that girls in many high schools feel intimidated walking down a hallway ever addressed as a social studies issue? Or that access to contraceptives in a small rural town in this province is virtually non-existent compared to that of a larger centre? Why is not the study of labour unions and employee-employer relations a fundamental part of social studies curricula across Canada? How many social studies courses make an effort to examine the labour practices of trendy clothing stores that so many of our female students work in? Feminist writer and activist, Naomi Klein, has thoroughly documented the exploitative labour practices of many chains, such as *Club Monaco* and *le Chateau* (1995). Should learning how to speak up for one's rights and organize collectively be part of an "essential learning outcome" (to use current accountability buzz-words) in social studies? Or should we keep our students occupied studying the failure of the Treaty of Versailles to maintain European stability in the inter-war period?

The splitting off of the public sphere from the private sphere is an obvious example of

how a patriarchal coding of social studies concepts acts to diminish and erase feminine agency in our society. Consider the efforts by women's advocacy groups to have housework included in the calculation of Gross Domestic Product. In 1992 StatsCan reported that the replacement value of 44 household activities necessary for maintaining a family would be $285 billion (*Globe and Mail*, April 11, 1994). There is an acrimonious debate going on in this country about what should count as GDP, yet how many teachers discuss this question with their students? Questioning the meaning of a concept as seemingly innocuous as GDP is only one example of how feminism reminds us that subject position is everything. How one's work is "viewed from above" by the dominant patriarchal capitalist discourse as it hovers above women's embodied and often invisible experience is a central issue for women that social studies needs to address.

Recall that *women do not have to find politics, it will find them*. I believe this is a crucial message that surfaces from the conversation broadly framed by discussion of women's issues. In 1991 Canadian women with college degrees made $1,000 a year less than men with primary school education. Women with university degrees earned 63 percent of what men did (Ministry, 1992). It is up to individual women how they will respond to their material conditions. Some activists see a chance for women to find a political voice in current institutions of state-centred political organization; others see this discursive democracy as insufficient. These activists call for an embodied material democracy, one that seeks locally to build equal access to social and economic resources by reconstituting fundamental relationships and institutions in society. Either way, the road ahead for women will be a difficult one. If women, as co-breadwinners in the home, quit working today, half of the families in Canada would drop below the poverty line (Ebert, 1995, p. 212).

With questions about what counts as a question, I begin to sense the "deep shit" I am in as a middle-aged male social studies teacher. I suffer with many of my students the same unmentionable "empathy sickness" that Steinhem wrote about: the failure to live the connection between private life and public life, and to explore my own preoccupation with hypertrophied terms such as "human rights," "security" and "democracy." With increasing pressures to be accountable to the normalized state-centred language of politics and economics, the Diploma Examinations in Alberta have increased the symptoms of "empathy sickness." I hyperactively struggle through the obstacle course that has become "teaching the curriculum"—now more and more a preparation for a final comprehensive examination envisioned by others who live outside our classroom. In the language of accountability our students are made normal according to the number of tests they pass.

The Diploma Examinations do the limiting job they are designed for, which is to define and circulate among the teachers which language it is worthwhile speaking. Students can now purchase commercially produced test booklets appropriately entitled *The Edge*, which denotes for me two significations: one implying the winning edge of the high performance athlete who is running an obstacle course, as a downhill skier would, the second being the delineation of what is *in* and *out*. I recall a discussion I had in a Grade 12 class about the May 1993 fire in the Kader toy factory in Thailand that killed 188 workers (mostly women and girls as young as 13). When I mentioned that Chinese workers make $1.00 per day in toy-factories that sell to transnationals like Kenner, Gund, and Mattel, a few students raised the issue of moral responsibility in their toy buying habits. And then I heard the question from the back of the room: "Is this on the test tomorrow?" I could not say anything, choosing to hide my disgust behind the mask of a dispassionate listener. I leaned back, pressing my anger into the back of the chair.

As I read more about feminism, I guess I learn that I am as much a subject as what I teach. Maybe writing this paper is a way to stuggle through "empathy sickness." I do not claim to be getting much better though. Paying attention to women's issues reminds us that we are all subjects of the language we speak. Writing about the erasure of women's experience in what has been traditionally accepted as political science, Struening recently wrote that given the ecological and social problems facing the world, the academic disciplines can no longer afford to separate the languages of experience of men and women. For Struening, the imperative for students of the humanities and social sciences is to broadly define politics as "the activity of speech that has the potential to bring strangers together" (1992, p. 207).

Women's studies reminds social studies educators that we need to be mindful of the political effects of our educational practices. More than bringing women's issues into the curriculum, perhaps we can hope for a reconstitution of the language used in our teaching—a language of embodiment that recognizes that, like ourselves, our students live politics and economics every day as subject-bodies within patriarchal regimes of language relations. I have argued that power, security, and GDP are words spoken behind the mask of pure reason, what Haraway called the "view from above." What I hoped to demonstrate is that this place behind the mask is a distant and empty one where the bodies and flesh of our students do not live. Neither can ours as teachers.

References

Brown, W. "Finding the Man in the State." *Feminist Studies* 18 (Spring 1992): 7-34.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Ebert, T.L. "Subalterity and Feminism." In K. Myrsiades and J. McGuire, *Order and Partialities: Theory, Pedagogy, and the Postcolonial*. New York: SUNY Press, 1995.

Fulford, Robert. "Putting the Spotlight on 'date rape'." *Globe and Mail*. December 21, 1994. A14.

Grumet, Madeline. *Bitter Milk*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

Haraway, Donna. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism as a Site of Discourse on the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14 (Sept. 1988): 575-99.

hooks, bell. *Teaching to Transgress*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Klein, Naomi. "Salesgirl Solidarity." *This Magazine* 28 (Feb. 1995): 12-20.

MacKinnon, C. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourse on Life and Law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Nicholson, L. *Gender and History: The Limits of Social Theory in the Age of the Family*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

continued on page 89

about violence as a form of entertainment? I know girls can separate reality from media fantasy, but how many murders and violent scenes or lyrics are they exposed to before they reach this understanding? Is violence simply a part of life—always has been, and always will be? Having listened deeply to conversations Amy and I shared, I wonder how and where she made sense of watching and reading about violence, in particular, about film that connects sex with violence. Where could she talk about what she watched in educative ways? Where could Amy write about her movie-watching experiences? In diaries? At home? At school? With whom?

Each time my conversations with Amy began with the opening of her blue social studies binder and the stories she constructed of failing, of not making the grade. This leaves me to wonder why writing journal entries of experiences of viewing, seeing, and hearing about violence in popular culture was problematic—why are these stories ignored? Can there be spaces for these experiences in social studies classrooms?

Note
This work was supported by an Alberta Advisory Council on Educational Studies grant to K. Cairns and D.J. Clandinin.

References

Bach, Hedy. *Listening to the Voices of Girls: Narratives of Experience.* Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Alberta, 1993.

Brown, Mikel and Carol Gilligan. *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girls' Development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Clandinin, D. Jean and F. Michael Connelly. *Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1995.

Jaggar, Allison and Susan Bordo. *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstruction of Being and Knowing.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1989.

Rubins, Nancy. *Ask Me If I Care: Voices from an American High School.* Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press, 1994.

Hedy Bach is currently a Killam Fellow at the University of Alberta.

---

continued from page 82

Steinhem, G. *Revolution from Within.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1992.

Struening, K. *Gender and the Division Between Public and Private in the Political Writings of Aristotle and Rousseau.* Ph.D. diss., Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1992.

Jean-Claude Couture is a teacher and a doctoral candidate in the Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta.

---

continued from page 86

Cherryholmes, C. "Knowledge, Power, and Discourse in Social Studies Education." *Journal of Education* 165, no. 4 (1983): 341-58.

Code, L. *What Can She Know?* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Davis, F., and G. Nemiroff. *Gender Fairness in the Classroom: Theory and Praxis.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges, Montreal, May 1992.

Hannam, J. "Women, History and Protest." In *Thinking Feminist* edited by D. Richardson and V. Robinson, 303-23. New York: The Guilford Press, 1993.

Light, B., P. Staton, and P. Bourne. "Sex Equity Content in History Textbooks." *The History and Social Science Teacher* 25 (Fall 1989): 18-20.

McKenna, K. "An Examination of Sex Equity in the 1986 Ontario Curriculum Guide for History and Contemporary Studies." *The History and Social Science Teacher* 25 (Fall 1989): 21-24.

Noddings, N. "Social Studies and Feminism." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 20 (Summer 1992): 230-41.

Stobart, G., J. Elwood, and M. Quinlan. "Gender Bias in Examinations: How Equal are the Opportunities?" *British Educational Research Journal* 18, no. 3 (1992): 261-76.

Walter, C. *Gender Bias in Social Studies 30 Diploma Examinations 1991-1993.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1995.

Wilder, G., and K. Powell. *Sex Differences in Test Performance: A Survey of the Literature.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1989.

Connie Walter is a teacher at Victoria School in Edmonton and Beth Young is Associate Professor, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta.

http://www.educ.ualberta.ca/css/CSS_35_1/index35_1.htm

Two Terms You Can (and Should) Use in the Classroom: Cultural Homogenization and Eurocentrism

George Richardson
Department of Secondary Education
University of Alberta

Abstract

This article focuses on media literacy and globalization. Specifically, it discusses the issue of how and why classroom teachers should develop strategies for questioning the media's tendency to portray globalization in neutral, unproblematic terms. Through an examination of the way the media present two underlying tenets of globalization (cultural homogenization and Eurocentrism) in advertisements and in news broadcasts, I suggest classroom activities that encourage students to view globalization and its effects analytically and critically.

Introduction: Disturbing the Peace

In 1978, comedian George Carlin's classic routine, "Seven Words You Can't Say on Radio," challenged existing media censorship regulations in two critical ways. First, by mentioning the seven "forbidden" terms repeatedly in the routine, he succeeded simultaneously in de-mystifying them while at the same time mocking the US Federal Communications Commission's preoccupation with "filthy words".[1] Second, and perhaps most importantly, Carlin raised the question of agency (individual or collective resistance to some kind of external control) and the media. Given the immense power that the media has over what we see and hear, how can we question and resist its tendency toward the promotion of global consumerism, Eurocentrism and cultural homogenization? As social studies teachers, how do we formulate an effective response to the images that are presented to us as "normal" while at the same time seeking to uncover the "other" that has been left out?

Unfortunately, such questions are not easily resolved by satire, however savage or pertinent it might be. They are real dilemmas classroom teachers face when dealing with how the media represent (and privilege) a particular worldview. In the face of this representation, it is vital that teachers equip their students with the tools to question the messages that the media diffuse about globalization.

[1] www.eff.org/pub/Legal/Cases/FCC_v_Pacifica/fcc_v_pacifica.decision

Why it is Difficult to Teach About Globalization

If, unlike George Carlin, classroom teachers do not face official sanctions each time they mention the unmentionable, they are nevertheless constrained in what they say about the "unofficial story" of globalization. Ironically, these constraints are sometimes self-imposed. In many cases they are an internalized self-censorship in response to what curriculum scholar Michael Apple refers to as the "intensification" (Apple 1993) of teaching. By intensification, Apple means that teachers are increasingly preoccupied with externally imposed expectations (preparing students for standardized examinations, implementing district initiatives, fund-raising activities, etc.). Given the pressures these external demands create, teachers retreat from dealing with "difficult" classroom issues and focus, instead, on performing safe, uncontroversial activities.

Another serious constraint is the effect of the prevailing political and economic climate on schools and on teachers. In the past decade, government cutbacks to education in the service of supply-side debt-reduction policies have driven many schools to the brink of bankruptcy (Kachur and Harrison 1998). In order to survive, schools and school districts have increasingly turned to the private sector for financial or technological aid. Thus, we see the proliferation of educational "branding": there are Coca-Cola schools, Pepsi schools, Apple schools and IBM schools (Barlow and Robertson 1994). But with private sector funding and technological support comes a price, as insidious as it is inevitable. Students, often from a very young age, are schooled in directed consumerism and the school itself becomes a kind of "sphere of influence" of the sponsor. This colonial metaphor is particularly and tragically appropriate. The existing neo-liberal economic milieu that is one of the defining traits of globalization has served to create a virtual "Open Door" policy for companies wishing to exploit the opportunities that an impoverished public education system presents.1 In this colonial environment, teachers find themselves and their freedom compromised by the obligation to support (or at least refrain from directly criticizing) those companies that have provided assistance to schools. In such a climate of obligation, opportunities to develop media literacy based on critical thinking that is characteristic of responsible citizenship and that can challenge globalization are seriously diminished.

Fighting Back: Talking Back

Yet despite both internal and external constraints on teaching about globalization, it is important that students and teachers develop facility in viewing media critically. Without this critical sense, students, in particular, have no context for evaluating the "truth" of the worldview that the media present them with. As media illiterates, they become unknowingly complicit in the further development of globalization and ultimately in their own commodification (Dahl 1998).

However, in the face of this danger, there are locations for resistance, and it is clear that popular opposition to globalization can have an effect. The decision of the World

Trade Organization in January, 1998 not to proceed with its proposed Multilateral Agreement on Investment was at least partly a reaction to organized campaigns against the initiative, and the massive campaigns of protest and civil disobedience at the November, 1999 Seattle Congress of the WTO certainly placed growing concerns over globalization at the forefront of the public agenda.

Perhaps more importantly for social studies teachers, it is quite clear that there are enough spaces to develop media literacy programs in the classroom. Even a cursory examination of some provincial curricula suggests that media literacy is given a fairly high priority in Canada. In Alberta, for example, the Language Arts Program of Studies introduces the concept that "The viewer must evaluate the apparent reality created in media products" and goes even further to note that, by the end of their final year of studies: "Students should be able to analyze and evaluate the extent to which manipulative devices are used in the material they encounter in their daily lives" (Alberta Learning, English Language Arts Program of Study 1981, 16).

In Ontario, the Ministry of Education specifies a separate Media Studies component in its English curriculum and notes that students need to develop critical thinking skills in order to: "Understand at first hand how media works are designed to influence audiences or reflect the perspectives of their creator" (Ontario Ministry of Education, English Curriculum 1999, 5).

In the Atlantic Region, the essential learnings document for the four Maritime Provinces identifies the need for students to "critically reflect on and interpret ideas presented through a variety of media" (New Brunswick Department of Education 1999). Although provincial governments clearly expect that media literacy will figure prominently in the English curriculum, it is interesting to note that media literacy has a much lower profile in the history and social studies curricula. Ironically, these disciplines are exactly those that are in a position to deal most directly with the social, cultural and economic consequences of the medias' promotion of globalization.

Given the need to equip students with media literacy skills as they are faced with the medias' unproblematized representation of globalization, the exercises that follow are designed to help address the problem. Like George Carlin's routine, they focus on the forbidden-or at least the controversial. Through an examination of "two terms you can (and should) use in the classroom," the exercises below suggest how students and teachers might develop a sense of agency as they deal with the effects of globalization.

Teaching the World to Sing: Consuming Cola and Cultures in the Same Breath

First Term: Cultural homogenization

Coca-Cola's famous 1970s ad that had children representing cultures from around the world singing together (and, of course, drinking Coke) symbolizes the tendency of

globalization to discount or caricature cultural difference while reducing individuals to the status of potential consumers. But despite its attempts to set global harmony to song, the move towards cultural homogenization that is implicit in the ad and in globalization has significant consequences. Cultural homogenization substitutes a kind of decontextualized consumerism for a more grounded and authentic sense of identity. Dahl describes the impact of cultural homogenization as a "mirror effect" in which the behavior of media role models is "mirrored, digested and internalized" thus: "The norms and values, the morals of the culture industry they represent are taken over. If they drink Coke, their followers do" (1998, 8). Furthermore, cultural homogenization reduces existing cultures to superficial parodies of themselves and in suggesting that these pale imitations are the essences of local cultures, it minimizes significant differences that can and do exist between cultural groups. Ultimately, cultural homogenization is a form of cultural repression rather than an open expression of cultural difference.

Particularly in television advertisements, cultural homogenization has become so pervasive that many students have ceased to remark on its underlying message of consumerism and cultural conformity. As a way of revealing and analyzing the subtext of cultural homogenization, students should be encouraged to "talk back" to television ads through the creation of "anti-ads." The structure of such a project might have the following form:

Talking Back to Your Television: Creating an "Anti-Ad"

We have all seen television ads that use exotic images of different nations and cultures to endorse particular products. Despite the visible differences between these other cultures and our own, the ads tend to promote the underlying message that we are all basically part of the same global culture and that we all believe in the same values. But is this true? Critics of these ads point to the idea that they promote global consumerism and cultural homogenization. Cultural homogenization threatens to diminish or to eliminate local cultures by creating a global culture based mainly on consumerism. In the following exercise, you will be looking at the idea of cultural homogenization as you create your own "anti-ad."

Instructions

Part I: Gathering Information

* Over two or three evenings watch television for ads using images of different nations and cultures to sell their products.
* Describe how the ads represented those nations and cultures by briefly answering the following questions:

1. Were other nations and cultures shown as fundamentally similar to or different from you?
2. Were stereotypes used to represent these nations and cultures?
3. What stereotypes were used, and would you describe them as positive or negative?
4. How did the ad represent Western or North American nations and culture?
5. Do you think the nations and cultures used in the ads were accurately and fairly

represented?

Part II: Talking It Over
* In a 20 to 30 minute general discussion, share your answers to these questions with those of your classmates.

Part III: Creating an Anti-Ad
* Working in groups of 2 or 3, pick a single television ad produced by a company that uses images of different nations and cultures to sell its products.
* In 2 or 3 class periods, create your own anti-ad video with slogans, pictures and images that you think more fairly and accurately represents both the nations and cultures shown in the original ad and the effects the particular product or products have had on these nations and cultures.

Part IV: Taking a Stand
* Show your anti-ad in the classroom, and along with the other groups, make a brief (no more than 3 minute) oral presentation about the images and slogans you used.
* Using all the information gathered in this project, write 1-2 page essay on the following topic: In a world that is increasingly global, how does globalization affect local or national cultures?

Peter, Lloyd and Me: Watching the News Through Different Eyes

Second Word: Eurocentrism

In its attempt to encourage the development of a single global market, globalization has actively substituted the values of European-based cultures for those of other cultures. While cultural diffusion and cultural hybridity are the expected consequences of interaction among states, the Eurocentrism that is associated with globalization is much more than just another example of cultural diffusion. Eurocentrism implies a field of values specific to the historical experience of Western society. Chief among those values are individualism, a belief in progress as defined by technological sophistication and material well-being, and a worldview predicated on the twin notions of prediction and control (Habermas1984; Borgmann 1993). This field of values represents a cultural template that fits well into market-driven economics and globalization.

But the aggressive political and economic expansion that was typical of Western culture during the 19th Century and that has continued today under the guise of its less overt, but no less powerful surrogates, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, has paved the way for the substitution of Western cultural forms as universal touchstones for all nations under the guise of transcendence. As David Morley notes:

For all that it has projected itself as transhistorical and

> transnational, as the transcendent and universalizing force of modernization and modernity, global capitalism has in reality been about Westernization-the export of western commodities, values, priorities, ways of life. (Morley 1995, 108)

To resist being caught in a perspective that judges the merit of other cultures through such an ethnocentric lens, students need to become aware of the cultural values that underpin Eurocentrism and see them as representative of one culture, not as representative of all cultures. One way to counteract Eurocentrism is to examine and analyze how other cultures are represented in news broadcasts. The exercise below suggests openings for cultural analysis that resists the Eurocentrism that globalization promotes.

Watching the News Through Different Eyes

We all watch the news. It gives us a sense of the local, national and global events that affect our lives; as citizens it helps keep us informed, as individuals it connects us with our community and with the world as a whole. But is the news totally objective in what it shows us about our world, or is it presented from a particular perspective? Those who suggest that news is broadcast from a particularly Western cultural perspective sometimes use the term Eurocentrism to describe how news is presented in most industrialized nations. A Eurocentric point of view presents events mainly in terms of the values that are basic to Western industrialized societies: individualism, support for capitalism and a belief in technical and material progress. The exercise that follows encourages you to examine and compare news broadcasts for evidence of Eurocentrism and cultural bias.

Instructions

Part I: Keeping a News Log of Western Media

* As a class, pick an emerging story that deals with an important issue or event in the developing world.
* Assign 3 or 4 students to tape three newscasts that deal with the issue or event you have selected:

-One newscast should be Canadian, one should be American, and one should be British (BBC World News is available from most cable networks).

* In class, view the 3 tapes and prepare a written news log (this could be in the form of a chart) comparing how the issue or event you selected was represented in the different broadcasts. As you do this it will help to keep the following questions in mind:

1. What pictures or images did each newscast use to illustrate the story?

2. In your opinion, were the images or pictures stereotyped (provide examples)?
3. How did the news reader describe the event (what tone of voice was used, was the news item mainly factual or did it express an opinion or a conclusion)?
4. What kind of background information was given?
5. What kind of coverage did the story get (was it a short item or a longer piece)?
6. Were local people interviewed in the piece?

Part II: Keeping a News Log of Eastern Media

* Access the web pages of either Asahi Shimbun <www.asahi.com>, or the India Times <www.indiatimes.com> and prepare a written news log (again, this could be in the form of a chart) examining how the issue or event you selected was represented in these online journals. As you do this, keep the following questions in mind:

1. What images or pictures (if any) were used to illustrate the story?
2. In your opinion, were the images or pictures stereotyped (provide examples)
3. How did the article describe the event (what was the tone of the writing, was it primarily factual or did it present an opinion or conclusion)?
4. What kind of background information was given?
5. What kind of coverage did the story get (was it a short item or a longer piece)?
6. Were local people interviewed in the piece?

Part III: Comparing the Coverage

* Take part in a class discussion about the similarities and differences in how the event or issue was covered in the Western TV broadcasts and the coverage it received in non-Western online journals.

Part IV: West and non-West: A Role Playing Activity

* In a role-playing activity, (this can be videotaped or acted out in the classroom) re-broadcast the original news item with a Western and a non-Western newsreader sitting together.

* As the western newsreader presents the story, the non-Western newsreader should respond or interrupt to present the story the way he/she views it.

Part V: Becoming Critical: New Ways to Approach the News

* Based on your experience in this exercise, prepare a 1-page handbook on how to view the news critically.
* Your handbook should offer viewers tips and suggestions for detecting cultural bias in newscasts

Conclusion

Traditionally, social studies has attempted to develop the kind of critical thinking that helps students become active, responsible citizens. However, in an age of globalization when consumerism and cultural conformity appear to leave less and less room for independent thought and action, this task is increasingly difficult. One way to approach this difficulty is to develop media literacy programs that encourage students to critically engage the ideas that the media diffuse about culture and society. The exercises included in this article suggest how you can (and should) use such concepts as cultural homogenization and Eurocentrism to involve students in an investigation of the impact of globalization on culture and, ultimately, on democratic institutions themselves.

Notes

1. At the November, 1999 meeting of the WTO in Seattle, it was proposed that education be included in the trade category of "Services". This inclusion carries with it the implication that national and provincial or state educational systems of all WTO nations could be in competition with transnational educational corporations offering a variety of educational (packaged learning, distance education etc.) products.

References

Alberta Learning 1981. *English Language Arts Program of Studies*. Edmonton AB: Alberta Learning.

Apple, M. 1993. *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age*. New York: Routledge.

Borgmann, A. 1993. *Crossing the Postmodern Divide*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Barlow, M. and Robertson, H. 1994. *Class Warfare: The Assault on Canada's Schools*.Toronto: Key Porter Books.

Dahl, S. *Communications and Culture Transformation: Cultural Diversity, Globalization and Cultural Convergence*. Paper presented to the European University, Barcelona. June, 1998.

Habermas, J. 1970. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Kachur, J. and Harrison, T. W. 1999. *Contested Classrooms: Education, Globalization and Democracy in Alberta*. Edmonton, AB: University of Alberta Press

Morley, D. 1995. *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. London: Routledge.

New Brunswick Department of Education 1999. *1999 Atlantic Canada Education Foundation for Essential Learnings*. Fredericton, NB: New Brunswick Department of Education.

Ontario Ministry of Education 1999. *1999 English Curriculum*. Toronto, ON: Ontario Ministry of Education.

http://www.educ.ualberta.ca/css/Css_38_1/index38_1.htm

Teaching after 9/11

Robert Gardner
Harry Ainlay Composite High School

Abstract

Robert Gardner is a Social Studies teacher at a large urban high school in Edmonton with a widely diverse ethnic population. He observes that after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 his students became much more engaged in discussion of international issues and more willing to share their personal experiences of life outside of Canada. Mr. Gardner soon found that he needed to learn far more about Middle Eastern history, culture and religion to better understand and to better teach current events from a range of perspectives.

It was, of course, one of those "where-were-you-when..?" moments that we will all remember forever. Like many people everywhere on September 11, 2001 I awoke to the stunning news of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center. As information came out and the enormity of the event became clearer I instinctively concluded that something had changed that morning, the world had somehow lurched onto a new path in a direction as yet unknown. And just as the world was changed so too was my classroom experience. In the hours and days immediately following the attacks I would be pulled out of what had been a relatively comfortable and familiar teaching practice into a much more demanding and complicated circumstance. I found that I had to significantly expand my knowledge and understanding of the intricacies of world history, cultures and religions. I also found that my students became more animated in classroom discussions, more aware of world events and more willing to share personal perceptions, however harsh. I became a citizen of the world because the world came to me.

I teach at a large urban high school of 2200 students. It has a widely diverse ethnic population represented by students from dozens of countries, which speak over a hundred languages and embrace numerous religions, beliefs and political perspectives. The students are the sons and daughters of immigrants, of multi-millionaire businessmen, of refugees, or are themselves refugees. Only half the students are white whose parents come from Alberta. Some boys wear turbans; some girls wear the hijab. Indian girls practice traditional dancing after school. There are various morning and lunchtime prayer groups consisting of Muslims, Christians, and others. In this environment multiculturalism is celebrated, most students mix easily and are eager to learn about each other's customs, faiths, cultures and ancestry. This is reflected in the annual "culture-fest," a festival of exotic food, music and dance, a weeklong kaleidoscope of colour, scent and sound. The school is a microcosm of humanity, a concrete expression of the new Canadian pluralism and of globalization, a preview of what all of Canada is becoming. I

sometimes tell visitors, "This is the future. Get used to it." It is against this backdrop that the implications of Sept 11 developed.

I rushed to the school library that Tuesday to watch the news live on TV. Witnessing the collapse of the first WTC tower made me feel ill. The televised images of 110 stories of crumbling steel and concrete were terrifying, yet beside me three students of apparent Middle Eastern decent were beaming. With near giddiness and a clenched fist one of them whispered, "Yessss!" Another, practically shaking with excitement added, "It's the Palestinians. They're fighting back." I was well aware of a certain anti-American sentiment flowing through our student population, due mostly to perceived arrogance of US power and wealth. However this expression of near joy in the face of unimaginable destruction startled me. I continued the nervous morning in my classroom where many students expressed shock and worry at the breaking news. Both towers had collapsed; the Pentagon was under attack, all North American aircraft traffic grounded. Uncertainty and fear ruled the hours, and students' questions were the obvious ones. Who could do this? How could such a thing happen? In response, several of my Arab and African students offered their take on events. "It's about time." "Surprised it didn't happen earlier." "The Americans deserve it." My sheltered Alberta-bred students and I were treated to a shopping list of US foreign policies characterized by hypocrisy, betrayal, lies and violence around the world. I have long understood the hypocrisy of US foreign policy, but what was interesting here was the personal anger and frustration of many students. "Hundreds of Palestinians get killed, and their homes destroyed by Israeli police, but it's not news. A couple of buildings fall down and suddenly the whole world cares." and "Now the Americans know how it feels."

Many students admire the United States, its economic and military might, its sports heroes and its popular culture, yet many others have come, through personal experience or inherited opinions, to despise America. The September 11 wound inflicted on the United States seemed to be a catalyst for expressions of anger rather than shock or empathy. I observed that it was the students of foreign ancestry who were most vocal and critical. Even if they were actually born in Canada they seemed to have a larger perspective since they generally knew more about geopolitics and international events than the homegrown group. It became clearer that these students had relatives scattered around the globe, or had adopted their parents' views, or got their news from illegal satellite receptions of Arab TV networks. 9/11 was an event of such significance that everyone had an opinion or a question. This exposed the wide range of worldviews that students now felt free - perhaps compelled - to share. What began to transpire was a real dialogue among students of varied backgrounds about how they saw the larger world. Who were the "good guys" and the "bad guys?" What did justice mean in a world of militarism, terrorism and oppression? What things in life were worth fighting for? Acts of terror were no longer senseless after learning the back story of US presence in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, and the policies toward Palestine and Afghanistan. A deeper knowledge from a multitude of perspectives emerged.

The shock of September 11 has dissipated, but global upheaval continues. Indeed, the past two years have brought remarkable changes to the international scene. A global economic downturn has reduced travel and trade, there is an increased preoccupation with security, and we've seen war in Afghanistan and in Iraq, neither of which has yet been resolved. The US has embarked

on an aggressive foreign policy that would make Teddy Roosevelt blush. The path of international relations seems to have turned backward to what Gwynne Dyer refers to as "the old world order," the use of coercion and brute force as instruments of policy. This has presented challenges for me. Young people are often cynical about the world so I have often tried to argue that things have been getting better in recent years: the Cold War over, peace breaking out everywhere, greater international cooperation has resulted in progress. That's a tough sell these days. Militarism is on the rise, terror is potentially everywhere, and anyone could be a victim - or a suspect. My young citizens are coming of age, becoming globally aware at an uncomfortable time.

This spills over into students' opinions about geo-politics and about the United States. Nearly all non-white students either distrust or are openly hostile to the US as a political entity, particularly the President. These tensions were exacerbated by the war in Iraq. Classroom debates over the merits of invading that country tended to divide over trust in the US, not over the villainy of the Hussein regime. "Iraq is a threat to peace," some students would say. "The US is a bigger threat," came the reply. "Hussein has weapons of mass destruction." "Bush has more of them." "Saddam is a dictator." "How do you think Bush become president?" Contrasting perspectives became sharper and opinions more polarized as areas of gray gave way to black and white. The UN, the president, or the Prime Minister were right or wrong, calculating or naive, reasonable or useless.

With such division I sometimes wondered about contending loyalties. If forced to choose, would my students support their country of ethnic origin or their new home of Canada? Might there be shouting or fights in the hallways over foreign policy? Fortunately, I was able to maintain the safe distance of a detached observer of world affairs. Say what you will about Mr. Chretien; the Prime Minister did me a favour by not committing troops to Iraq. I would not wish to be in a school where half the students were "proud of our boys and girls fighting for freedom" and half angered over "an unjustified invasion by American imperialists wanting cheap oil." If anything, the majority of students became united in anti-American sentiment.

I felt a need to modify my teaching practice to accommodate a more complex dynamic of views. It is true that Social Studies teachers are expected to articulate or explain multiple perspectives on a range of issues, and need to discuss controversial topics in a balanced way, give fair consideration to conflicting viewpoints. However, sometimes I found this approach limiting. While not advocating a particular position I wanted my students to at least understand the motives for certain actions, and his put me in the curious position of attempting to defend extreme points of view. In an effort to find clarity I sometimes reach for blatant imbalance. "If Israeli soldiers evict you from your own home, bulldoze your house and arrest your brother, how would you feel? How would respond?" Or, "How do you fight back against an enemy of vastly superior strength? What tools are open to you?" Against calls of "war-monger" or "Bush is a moron" I find myself defending the President. "Is it not his responsibility to protect his citizens as best he can? If Bush has to invade every dictator-run nation on earth to root out those who are pledged to killing his countrymen, shouldn't he do it? Would you not demand the same of your Prime Minister?" It is an interesting exercise, trying to rationalize extremism.
When not bashing US policy, students freely express their thoughts on other world issues and sometimes reveal new perspectives on conventional wisdom. "Pakistan's President Musharraf is

a military dictator and the state is corrupt, but it's a big improvement over the previous democratic regime." "In the United Arab Emirates the Royal Family looks after all the citizens. There is no poverty, no crime; much better than Canada." I was surprised to learn that quite a few of my students were unimpressed by the ideals of democracy, yet one of the goals of the curriculum is to teach democratic citizenship. Should they fail a particular element of the program because they see things differently than I? Just as I was trying to explain certain perspective to them, they were trying to teach me how they saw the world. For all the reading I've done and listening to students there are limits to my understanding. Sometimes I encounter a moment when a student's angry experience holds more meaning than my attempt at "balanced explanation." One day I offered that Islam is a peaceful, enlightened religion. A grade 12 girl indignantly replied, "No it's not. My family is Sikh. My grandfather had property in Pakistan, but the family had to escape when Muslims tried to convert him. Jihad is hatred of anyone non-Muslim." At a significant level she knows better than I, I am a unilingual white male infidel from Alberta. What do I know?

At school the politics of identity have changed because of 9/11. Ethnicity and culture used to be curiosities. Now, while diversity is still celebrated, there is a new recognition that ethnicity can be an undesirable element of one's identity. I have students in my classes that could be detained at the US border, photographed and fingerprinted because of where they or their parents were born. Some of them would love to travel America to see Washington or the Florida coast or perhaps Disneyland, but now their parents have precluded it. They don't wish to be hassled because of their colour, their last names or their birth certificates. This in itself creates an interesting divide among students: those who are welcome to enjoy America in all its grandeur and excess, and those who would be treated as suspects. This probably develops a deeper resentment of the US. Not only do many students have friends or family who have been directly or indirectly victimized by American policy, but now these young people themselves must feel some discomfort in the land of the free.

World events and students' reactions to them have underscored the inadequacy of the current curriculum. The woeful shortcomings of textbooks and support materials have become pronounced. There is scant treatment of Middle Eastern history or politics outside of the contexts of World War or Cold War. Because publishers and ministries of education try to avoid controversial topics there is no mention of the intricacies of religious thought. Even the conventional model of the political spectrum shows cracks as the right calls for greater security and limits to freedoms while the left decries loss of individual rights and privacy.

I need to re-learn the content of my trade, almost as a beginning teacher. I've had to explore the difference between Sunnis and Shi'ias and why these Muslims would do violence to each other; how the Taliban took over Afghanistan, what passages in the Koran could be interpreted as license for killing. My VISA bill at Indigo-Chapters is becoming a burden. The shamefully inadequate war coverage by CNN forced me to seek out alternative media resources for information on the war. These days my news "diet" consists of helpings of BBC and the Al Jazeera web site just for variety.

I do find the teaching of Social Studies more difficult now. I need to learn much more about the world so that I can respond intelligently to students' questions and comments, and sometimes

simply to referee debate. However challenging, it is also an extraordinary opportunity. Since I can't know everything I've developed a partnership with some of my students who watch late night Arab TV. We discuss the news from the different angles. And this gives students a chance to share details and stories of their personal faiths in the context of world events. Notably, these discussions were never heated however energized. When voices were raised they were invariably in order to clarify points or to add details to some concept. It was an exploration more than a debate, the beginnings of what Dr. David Geoffrey Smith calls "intercivilizational dialogue."

The events of 9/11 exploded the myth of "us" and "them" or "here" and "there." Foreign war and political upheaval are not far-away things because they have a direct link to a young person sitting in my classroom. Globalization has brought us together in a strange place: a small classroom in Western Canada. Yet we are all connected to the larger world and what happens in the world affects us all individually and collectively.

http://www.educ.ualberta.ca/css/Css_39_2/index39_2.htm

We Interrupt This Moment: Education and the Teaching of History

Jennifer Tupper
University of Regina

Abstract

The history that students learn in schools supports a view of the past that casts men as dominant and universal subjects. As such, the way that students understand the past will inevitably influence the way they think about the present and consider the future. Rather than perpetuating dominant narratives, this paper argues that history and social studies teachers much engage in a re(hi)storation through the pedagogical process of interruption as a means of bringing into view that which has always been there but has been neglected, abandoned and forgotten.

> *There were still women surgeons at the end of the seventeenth century, but women healers were increasingly associated with witchcraft and the practice of the black arts. As medicine became a science the terms of entry into training excluded women, protecting the profession for the sons of families who could afford education. Women were forced to the bottom. Midwifery, an exclusively female branch of medicine, was taken over by the male doctor when rich women gave birth. The female midwife attended only the poor. (Rowbotham 1973, p. 3).*

Not so long ago, as I was teaching a group of third and fourth year university students with minors in social studies education, I encountered a distressing but not necessarily surprising comment from one of my students. As a class, we had been discussing the importance of including multiple perspectives in the content of social studies and the students in the class had seemed supportive of this approach from the moment we first began discussing it. Half way through the semester, I dedicated a three hour block of time to exploring the representation of women in social studies curriculum as well as issues of gender inherent in the structure and content of the discipline. While this was an obvious extension of our multiple perspectives discussion, it did not receive the same widespread support, and was indeed met with open resistance from certain members of the class. One student in particular asserted that women had not been widely included in social studies curriculum for good reason. When I asked him to elaborate he suggested that had women been engaging in important historical activities, then surely they would have been included in the curriculum.

The implication here is palpable. This student believed that women played only a minor role in history and were thus not deserving of any in-depth study in social studies classrooms. Rather than being angry with this student for what I perceived as a troubling perception of the past, I reminded myself that he was a product of his own schooling. It is possible, even probable, that he had little if any encounter with the lives and experiences of women in his own history lessons, hence his views on what had historical value. Thus, another implication that emerges from this encounter is the role that social studies and history classrooms have played in perpetuating historical narratives that privilege men as dominant historical actors with little critical reflection on the exclusions and omissions inherent in such a study of history. To imagine that women were not doing anything of importance and are therefore not worthy of study in schools is distressing, but sadly not surprising.

> *Many people claimed that medicine was an unsuitable field for women, arguing that the study of the human body and the dissecting course would cause them to lose their 'maidenly modesty.' They also claimed women had weak nerves, unstable health, poor powers of endurance and could not withstand the stresses of medical life. In short, the home was the place for women; the world was the place for men. In response, those in favour of women doctors pointed to the many women healers of the past. They also pointed out that the many women who toiled long, exhausting hours in factory sweatshops were proof enough of women's ability to endure hard physical labour. The question of female endurance, they suggested, was merely a smoke screen to keep women out of the well-paying professions. (Merritt, 1995, p. 90).*

Joan Wallach Scott (1999, p. 17) in her book Gender and the Politics of History, maintains that history as a discipline has failed to reflect upon knowledge of the past, choosing instead to reproduce it. From her perspective, studies of history have perpetuated a view of the past whereby men are well established as dominant and universal subjects, central historical actors who have come to represent moments of historical significance. Because of this, Scott believes that historians face a particular challenge,

> to make women a focus of inquiry, a subject of the story, an agent of the narrative - whether that narrative is a chronicle of political events (the French Revolution, the Swing riots, World War I and II) and political moments (Chartism, utopian socialism, feminism, women's suffrage), or a more analytically cast account of the workings or unfoldings of large scale processes of social change (industrialization, capitalism, modernization, urbanization, the building of nation-states).

I would argue that not only are historians faced with a particular challenge in relation to the inclusion of women in historical narratives as Scott asserts, but so too are educators invested

with the challenge of teaching history to students, and connecting students with history. It is no secret that history and social studies curricula have tended to reflect a canon of accepted truths and acted as vehicles for cultural hegemony and ideological reproduction (Dolby, 2000; Osborne, 2000). In her examination of the teaching of history, Nadine Dolby (2000, p. 158) writes about a student, Susan, who believed that historically "there weren't a lot of leading ladies" and even though she wanted to know more about women, she seemed to accept the universality of male history, she seemed to accept that "women's history is of minor value and only of interest to girls and women." What this suggests is that the universality of male history is so normalized in historical discourse that even young women accept that the (in)activities and (in)actions of their foremothers are not worthy of significant study. In my own research with five high school social studies teachers, there was an awareness that the history taught in schools was narrowly constructed and failed to reflect multiple experiences and perspectives. However, each participant struggled with ways of approaching history in more inclusive ways beyond the confines of the curriculum and in relation to the realities of high stakes testing and educational accountability. The challenge is what we, as educators do with this knowledge. How might we approach the teaching of history knowing full well that what we are mandated to teach is not reflective of the multiplicity of historical narratives and experiences?

> *No woman, then, has any occasion for feeling that hers is an humble or insignificant lot. The value of what an individual accomplishes, is to be estimated by the importance of the enterprise achieved, and not by the particular position of the labourer. The drops of heaven which freshen the earth, are each of equal value, whether they fall in the lowland meadow, or the princely parterre. The builders of a temple are of equal importance, whether they labour on the foundations, or toil upon the dome (Cott, N.F., Boydston, J., Braude, A., Ginzberg, L., Ladd-Taylor, M., 1996, p. 135).*

Canadian educator Ken Osborne (2000) maintains that we need to ask ourselves how the study of history might contribute to what our students should know about the world in order to live fully as citizens and human beings. This question, coupled with Scott's call for reflection on historical knowledge, has implications for the way in which we approach the teaching of history in schools regardless of the existence of canonized knowledge in curriculum documents. In the discussion that follows, I attempt to elaborate on this point and argue not only for a new approach to teaching history, but for a re-discovery or re(hi)storation of the past in the hopes that it will at the very least influence and at the very most transform classroom practice so that comments, such as the one made by my student, no longer emerge from historical consciousness.

> We wanted to petition the men, we said, to let us own our land as they owned theirs…The town had waited on a factory company in the north part of the place for their taxes for years, till the company failed, and they lost several thousand dollars by it. We had our share of this money to pay; a larger share, as it appeared

> by his books, than any other of the inhabitants, and there was no risk in waiting for us to pay. But they were men, and we are women. (Kerber, 1998, p. 90).

The italicized text that I have interspersed throughout this writing is my attempt at re(hi)storation through the process of interruption. The notion of interruption is not new in education and has been discussed as a vehicle through which thinking and learning might be transformed. Michael Apple (2002) refers to a "politics of interruption" in the context of critically exploring the events of 9/11 and attempting to understand the complexities of the terrorist attacks beyond the superficial and simplistic rhetoric espoused by the American government. For Apple, it is crucial to interrupt dominant discourses which often present only a very narrow view of events if we are to engage in transformative teaching. Similarly, Roger Simon, Claudia Eppert, Mark Clamen and Laura Beres (2001, pp. 286-287) speak about the need to re-appraise "current presumptions about the past and its inheritance." For these authors, the process of remembrance, of bringing into view that which has been lost so "that one might 'know' what happened" is a call to examine the pedagogical terms on which the teaching of history is founded. Dwayne Donald (2004, p. 25) suggests that we must contest the official versions of history and society "through a process of active and critical re-reading as a way to re-present what has been left out." I believe, however, that there is an important precursor missing from these conversations. Before we can engage in remembrance, before we can memorialize "that which has been known but now must be told again" (Simon et al. 2001, p. 287), before we are able to critically re-read the past, we must first engage in the process of interruption. Interrupting dominant historical discourse creates the spaces through which a re(hi)storation of the past can occur.

> *Despite her important contributions and influence in certain areas, the Indian woman in fur-trade society was at the mercy of a social structure devised primarily to meet the needs of European males…By the turn of the century some of the bourgeois had stooped to the nefarious but profitable scheme of selling women to their engagés. At Fort Chipewyan in 1800, when the estranged wife of the voyageur Morin tried to run away, she was brought back by her Indian relations, only to face the prospect of being sold by the bourgeois to another engagé. (Van Kirk, 1980, p. 88-89).*

It is no secret that we are socialized to believe that interrupting the speech of another is poor etiquette and that we must always let the other person finish speaking before we begin. But what if their speech is seemingly without end? What if we believe that the words of an individual are incomplete, representative of only one perspective in the midst of many? Must we remain silent for the sake of politeness all the while anxious to be heard ourselves? What is lost in this moment? Why is it that we accept the interruptions that occur on television, in the form of commercials, or even, in more extreme cases, when programming is interrupted for the sake of 'breaking news'? *WE INTERRUPT THIS PROGRAM…* The term 'breaking news' is an interesting one for it implies only just happening, on the verge of historical significance, and as

such offers a justification for interrupting television programming. Yet breaking also implies being shattered, no longer whole, damaged in some way. When something breaks, it is often discarded, thrown away. That is the legacy of women's lives and experiences in relation to the historical narratives that students encounter in schools and textbooks. For women, there have been no interruptions, no moments of historical significance worthy of memorialization, or at least that's the implicit message embedded in the history taught in schools. Thus, I believe, as in 'breaking news', that interruptions are necessary - pedagogically imperative particularly in the context of historical narratives.

Re(hi)storation is about restoring something that already existed in the first place but that has been neglected, abandoned, and forgotten. The official versions of history that students encounter in schools must be interrupted as a means of restoring that which has been lost, so that all students, male and female, white and non-white have an opportunity to see their lives and experiences reflected in historical narratives. Here it is useful to return to Donald's (2004, p. 49) work and remember that "the responsibility to tell a story is given to all of us because stories are all that we are." But how might teachers, mandated to teach a required curriculum, engage in such historical interruptions? Pedagogically speaking, it requires teachers to interrupt their own historical knowledge, to bring to mind that which they think they know and that which they might need to know if they are to approach the teaching of history differently. I am not suggesting that teachers need to re-read or read anew vast tomes of historical narratives. Rather, what I am suggesting is that teachers, in teaching the history prescribed in the curriculum, allow spaces for 'breaking news' that might otherwise be overlooked, that they allow for what Simon et al (2001, p. 296) describe as a "shattering of the hermeneutic horizon on which past and present meet and within which historical interpretation becomes possible." It can be as simple as asking students to consider their own understandings of the past, to consider what they know and what they do not know, to consider what is missing and why it might be missing, and how all of these things might inform our present understandings and influence the way we think about the future. It can be as complex as working with students to step outside their own historical consciousness long enough so that this consciousness might be disrupted, interrupted. It might entail using gender as a category of analysis in all historical discussions, or it might require specific moments of interruption in which students and teachers take a step back from the topic at hand, allowing historical spaces to open up, allowing for flexibility and fluidity.

I recently took a group of third-year teacher education students to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Museum in Regina as part of a three-day off campus experience. Many of my students had visited the museum previously and were familiar with the displays and artefacts it housed. On this visit I asked each student to consider three questions as they moved through the museum: Whose story is being told? How is it being told? Whose story is not being told? The questions were my attempt to "interrupt" my students' interactions with the past. Many of them commented to me during and after our experience at the museum that it was as if they had visited the museum for the first time. Such questions, when used in the classroom, create the necessary pre-conditions for students and teachers to pause in their reading of the past so that they may critically re-read it. For my students, the questions created a need for each of them to "interrupt" his or her own historical understanding and engage in the process of re(hi)storation in very real and meaningful ways.

Returning to the comments of my student which began this discussion, it was necessary for me, in that moment, to interrupt the narrative in-process. Rather than disagreeing with, or becoming angry with this student for what was so apparently a narrow view of the past, I needed to take that moment to push him outside of his own historical location as a white man, to interrupt if you will, his sense of himself, and his sense of the past regardless of any perceived risks to my own position as teacher. For it is in those moments of interruption that remembrance, memorialization, and re(hi)storation are made possible. And it is in these moments that we can engage in new pedagogical practices of historical understandings.

References

Apple, M.W. 2002. Pedagogy, patriotism, and democracy: On the educational meanings of 11 September 2001. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 23 (3): 299-308.

Cott, N.F., Boydston, J., Braude, A., Ginzberg, L., and Ladd-Taylor, M. 1996. *Root of bitterness: Documents of the social history of American women, Second edition*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Dolby, N. 2000. New stories: Rethinking history and lives. In *Multicultural Curriculum: New Directions for Social Inquiry*, edited by R. Mahalingham & C. McCarthy, 155-167. New York: Routledge.

Donald, D.T. 2004. Edmonton pentimento: Re-reading history in the case of the Papaschase Cree. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies* 2 (1): 21-54.

Kerber, L. 1998. *No constitutional right to be ladies: Women and the obligations of citizenship*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Merritt, S.E. 1995. *Her story II: Women from Canada's past*. St. Catherine's, ON: Vanwell Publishing Ltd.

Osborne, K. 2000. 'Our history syllabus has us gasping:' History in Canadian schools - past, present, and future. *Canadian Historical Review* 81 (3): 404-436.

Rowbotham, S. 1973. *Hidden from history: 300 years of women's oppression and the fight against it*. London: Pluto Press.

Scott, J.W. 1999. *Gender and the politics of history, revised edition*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Simon, R. I., Eppert, C., Clamen, M., and Beres, L. 2001. Witness as study: The difficult inheritance of testimony. *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies* 22 (4): 285-322.

Van Kirk, S. 1980. *"Many tender ties:" Women in fur-trade society, 1670-1870*. Winnipeg: Watson & Dwyer Publishing.

Unsettling our Narrative Encounters within and outside of Canadian Social Studies

Nicholas Ng-A-Fook
Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa
nngafook@uottawa.ca

Robin Milne
Faculty of Education
University of Ottawa
rob@itutorls.com

Abstract

In 2007, Indian Residential School System (IRS) survivors won a class action settlement worth an estimated 2 billion dollars from the Canadian Government. The settlement also included the establishment a Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Despite the public acknowledgement, we posit that there is still a lack of opportunity and the necessary historical knowledge to address the intergenerational impacts of the IRS system in Ontario's social studies classrooms. In this essay we therefore ask: How might we learn to reread and rewrite the individual and collective narratives that constitute Canadian history? In response to such curriculum inquiries, we lean upon the work of Roger Simon to reread and rewrite historical narratives as shadow texts. For us, life writing as shadow texts, as *currere*, enables us to revisit the past as a practice of unsettling the present, toward reimagining more hopeful future relations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities across the territories we now call Canada. As Simon's life-long scholarly commitments make clear in this essay, the onus lies with those present to teach against the grain so that we might encounter each other's unsettling historical traumas with compassion, knowledge, and justice.

> Our project requires that we subvert a view which constitutes existing forms of social life and social consciousness as obvious, natural, and taken for granted. We need to comprehend how the limits we all live within are historical limits. (Simon & Dippo, 1986, p. 198)

> I am estranged from a past to which I always arrive too late (thus as I come close, I find myself moving away). Yet this boundary is not simply the limit of my social imagination condemning me to indifference, voyeurism, or an epistemological violence that renders the experience of others in terms I recognize or imagine as

> my own. This boundary rather initiates the terms for the reconstructions of my historical memory. (Simon, 2000, p. 21)
>
> Yet at times, unsettling questions need to be asked. (Simon, 2013, p. 133)

Nicholas and Robin: What is Truth and Reconciliation for Canadians? Why and how should it matter for teachers and students across Canada? What are our pedagogical obligations toward collectively witnessing, acknowledging, and remembering the historical experiences, impacts, and consequences of establishing the Indian Residential Schooling (IRS) system to ensure the future security of a settler nation-state? Studying such ethical, historical, and social questions provokes us to subvert, as Simon and Dippo (1986) suggest, the historical limits of what constitutes our contemporary and future normative understandings of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples' treaty relations.

In *Settler Colonialism*, Lorenzo Veracini (2010) situates some important discursive, material, political, and psychical distinctions among the descendants of European settlers, immigrant exogenous Others, and Indigenous peoples. Although, "immigrant exogenous Others often benefit from the dispossession of indigenous people, even as their incorporation into the settler body politics remains pending, …it is, the settler that establishes himself as the normative" (p. 18). The settler often hides behind historical narratives whose storylines describe "the metropolitan colonizer," "labour and hardship," and "the peacemaker" (p. 14). Though we grew up in different places, our public school history courses taught us, as diasporic settler Canadians, that our descendants did not have the right to make economic, political, or military decisions reserved for kings, queens, lords, dictators, and elected governments who by manifest destiny pioneered colonial nation-states like Canada. Outside of formal schooling, we learned from our parents and grandparents about the hardships and sacrifices they had to make to leave their homelands and immigrate to Canada. Their arrival perpetuated the chain of settler colonialism, and they profited from the appropriation of newly allotted, Indigenous dispossessed land.

For the most part, in school we learned that colonial settlement here in Canada, compared to the United States, was a relatively non-violent military activity. Indeed, a Judeo-Christian commonwealth curriculum, and its mythical portrayals of a settler colonial democratic peacekeeping regime influenced the ways in which we socially imagined and narrated Canadian history (Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernandez, 2013). During our lived experiences with the Ontario social studies curriculum, we were taught that French and British settlers sought to establish colonial settlements that mimicked their respective metropolitan (judicial, military, political, religious, schooling) institutions. What was absent from this historical account of our common countenance (Tomkins, 1986/2008), was that several different cosmopolitan settlers, such as English, Chinese, French, German, Irish, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Ukrainian, and so on, alongside First Nations communities, helped to found what is now constitutionally known as Canada (Battiste, 2013; Stanley, 2006). Such imagined inclusions and exclusions often manifest themselves as a certain kind

of historical narrative of disavowal within our social studies curriculum here in Ontario. This is what Paulette Regan (2010) calls elsewhere a curriculum of settler denial.

After demanding acknowledgement of longstanding historical settler denial and a violent colonial past, several Indian residential school survivors won a class action settlement agreement worth an estimated 2 billion dollars from the Canadian Government in 2007. The Canadian government officially responded a year later with a public state apology for the violent intergenerational impacts of residential schooling. Soon after, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission travelled across Canada, listening to the stories of survivors, and facilitating various public commemorative events for both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities.[1] Often forgotten within this recent sequence of events, however, is that First Nation, Métis and Inuit communities and their leaders had been petitioning the Canadian government and its people to acknowledge their constitutional treaty obligations for several decades prior to the 2008 apology. Such obligations included land settlements, educational funding, and judicial and political recognition of First Nations sovereignty as part of Canada's Constitutional Act – what Henderson Youngblood (2013) has termed constitutional reconciliation. Despite this momentum, opportunities to study the complexities of truth and reconciliation in terms of our historical and ongoing treaty obligations are for the most part absent from our school curriculum in Ontario and from the public memory of a settler nation-state.

Given the disparity between public apology and personal knowledge, how might we work as curriculum theorists, social studies educators, teachers, and students toward rereading and rewriting our individual and collective memories within and beyond the boundaries of the existing narratives that constitute what Canadian history? To respond to this pedagogical and personal question, we lean upon the work of Roger Simon and life writing as a form of curriculum theorizing, as *currere*,[2] to deconstruct and reconstruct our estrangements from the historical narratives that were, and in many ways still are, absent from our lived experiences with Canadian social studies and history curricula.

Our initial conversation for this essay began as part of Robin's final life-writing project for a graduate course entitled: *Curriculum, culture, and language*. There, we focused on the different ways in which life writing "requires researchers to craft pieces of autobiographical writing in which they research and teach themselves" (Hasebe-Ludt, Chambers, and Leggo, 2009, p. 9). We examined different methodological strategies for engaging life writing research such as autobiography (as *currere*, literary métissage), auto/ethnography (as bricolage), A/r/tography, and oral history. Each assignment worked toward creating openings for graduate students to further develop their understandings of life writing as a research methodology that in turn informs educational research and the aesthetics of their academic writing as life writers, while also studying, theorizing, thinking through, and improvising playfully with the intellectual compositions put forth by past and present Canadian curriculum scholars.

Situating our Narrative Encounters

Nicholas and Robin: During the winter term of 2012, we travelled with six Bachelor of Education students to conduct oral history interviews with Bertha Commanda, a residential school survivor, who live on the Kitigan Zibi reserve near Maniwaki Québec. The oral history interview was part of a larger Social Science and Humanities Research Council Insight Development (SSHRC) Grant titled *Making digital histories: Virtual historians, digital literacies, and education*.[3] The larger project was designed to explore the existing digital practices and respective literacies teacher candidates draw upon to both access and produce historical knowledge. During their coursework, teacher candidates were introduced to the concepts of historical thinking (Lévesque, 2008; Seixas, 2006; Seixas & Morton, 2013), followed by a workshop that introduced students to the Virtual Historian website (http://www.virtualhistorian.ca). This is a website through which history teachers can share lessons and historical content that not only facilitates the process of 'doing history' but also the pedagogical demands of 21st century digital classrooms.

As a supplement to their course, we offered teacher candidates opportunities to volunteer for the oral history component of the project. Prior to interviewing elders, teacher candidates attended several different workshops that examined the theoretical and methodological processes for doing oral history research as part of their future curriculum designs for teaching the Ontario social studies and history curriculum (see Perks & Thomson, 1998; Ritchie, 2003). For the final component of the SSHRC research project, eight senior history teacher candidates conducted oral history interviews with two Kitigan Zibi Algonquin elders. Through this, the teacher candidates had the chance to partake in the pedagogical processes of "rereading" and "rewriting" their existing historical narratives on the psychosocial, cultural, and material impacts of settler colonialism with First Nations elders.

In this project, we sought to create an epistemological space for us to identify and discuss the different tensions we experienced when confronted with alternative narratives that depart from the grand narratives of Canadian settler history. Engaging these narrative tensions is crucial for complicating our ongoing identifications with, and constructions of history. What is at stake in such epistemological commitments "is our imaginative and emotional abilities to learn from 'multiple perspectives' so as to potentially expand the range of responses to pressing issues of social concern by extending our circle of attention and care" (den Heyer & Abbott, 2011, p. 612). Such extensions involve becoming historical subjects capable of rereading historical narratives through the rewriting of alternatives.

Juxtaposing different alternative, or counternarrative historical texts such as historiographies, oral histories, and autobiographies alongside rewriting our individual and collective life histories promotes "a capacity to tolerate – and narrate – the disillusionment of encountering the otherness that history both references and provokes on the inside" (Farley, 2009, p. 538). In contrast to a "readerly" approach that anchors one to meaning explicitly found within a text, a "writerly" approach calls upon readers to create meanings with reference to the historical con/texts that inform their imagined past, present and future lives (den Heyer & Abbott, 2011).

In the ensuing sections, we take up Simon and Eppert's (1997) concept of writing shadow texts, which recognize the juxtaposition of presences (governmental, judicial,

curricular), and absences (cultural, place, psychic), in order to unsettle our "readerly" and "writerly" narrative encounters with the life histories of others. Part of this critical and ethical praxis of relational reflexive rewriting of history requires one to reread "as much for a text's 'absences' or 'silences' as for what it more directly 'says'" (Simon, 1982, p. 6). Such readings and rewritings are part of a "commemorative" praxis of ethics, of learning to bear witness to historical traumas, where one "becomes aware of, self-present to, and responsive toward something/someone beyond oneself" (Simon and Eppert, 1997, p. 183). We, as historical subjects, are learning to work through the juxtaposition of alternative "readerly" and "writerly" shadow texts that in turn attempt to bear witness to the historical traumas of residential school survivors.

Here we draw upon William F. Pinar's (2006) concept of "juxtaposition" to clarify a conceptual framework for the kinds of rereadings and rewritings of historical narratives we put forth in this essay. In *The synoptic text today*, Pinar calls for teachers and curriculum scholars to both paraphrase and juxtapose historical texts that have never been in narrative relations with each other before this moment in time. Such juxtapositions should include students' questions, comments, and pedagogical engagements. He further explains that, "in addition to connecting the 'text' to students' and her or his own subjective intellectual experience, the teacher enables students to connect 'text' to 'social text,' to society," a concept he understands is situated in time, and thus historically (p. 9). As part of his experimentations with life writing and for his final course assignment, Robin juxtaposed the life histories of residential school survivors with the works of scholars like Roger Simon, which have never before been in narrative relation with one another, or with narratives that implicate us as historical subjects. Such kinds of historical rereadings and rewritings we suggest, are part of the pedagogical processes for recursively questioning the ways in which our research, theorizing, and conceptions of the Ontario social studies curriculum do or do not represent our individual and collective subjective relations with the past, present, and future.

Life Writing as Shadow Texts

> Communities of memory designate structured sets of relationships through which people engage representations of past events and put forth shared, complementary, or competing versions of what should be remembered and how. (Simon & Eppert, 1997, p. 186)

> If the Commission can create a space that allows people to feel that their stories are accepted without fear of repercussions, perhaps it can help to neutralize some of the negativity that has poisoned our relationships with each other. Hopefully, in some ways, our relationships with Canada can be improved. (Angeconeb, 2012, p. 30)

Nicholas: Part of decolonizing the explicit, implicit, and null school curriculum involves learning how to remember the narratives that inform our understandings of Canadian history. It requires coming into contact with alternative historical narratives that we can juxtapose as complementary and competing versions of what and how our differing individual and collective histories are remembered. In *Pedagogy and witnessing testimony of historical trauma*, Simon and Eppert (1997) explain that writing shadow texts provides a potential personal and communal space for us to witness, teach, and learn from historical trauma. Yet, we have to remember that documenting historical trauma is difficult work. After all, "testimonies of historical trauma always enact a betrayal" due to the discursive limits of our interpretive translations that fail to fully render "the realities of human cruelty and suffering" (p. 183). Consequently, this "translational betrayal of the testimonial act means that narrative and images of historical trauma are commonly shot through with absences that, in their silence, solicit" and provoke us to ask interminable questions (ibid.). At this juncture in Canadian history, and living in a society which champions a neoliberal politic and ethos, it seems fair to ask how anyone could take away another parent's child. We might ask the following questions: Why didn't more First Nations parents take more action to protect their children? Why did a supposedly "peacekeeping" settler nation-state let such violent events happen?

Simon and Eppert (1997) invite us to write shadow texts as a potential response to answering such interminable historical questions. For them, shadow texts are "secondary narratives a reader or listener 'writes' (but does not necessarily write down) in response to the unresolved questions a primary narrative elicits" (p. 184), and where "attempts to write shadow texts are an 'asking after' something that has not been satisfied" (ibid.). Our attempts at constructing explanations which address these questions are not typically attached to something in historical texts but instead to something missing from such textual representations. Moreover, "shadow texts are neither juvenile nor narcissistic; they are cultivated precisely because they fuel an unrest—a movement without definitive end—which is the only possible way to sustain the pursuit of justice" (ibid.). However, shadow texts may also become, as Simon and Eppert warn, "simplistic (or worse yet, racist or sexist) rationalizations that short-circuit one's capacity to witness testimony" (ibid.). More troubling, testimonies like those of residential school survivors become an object of a lesson taught in schools, where the complexity and feelings evoked within their narratives are reduced and mobilized to illustrate the concept of "historical significance" as a means of addressing a specific category of knowledge and skills within the Ontario achievement chart (see Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 33). Despite significant benefits, developing shadow texts through life writing poses several pedagogical risks.

In *The paradoxical practice of Zakhor: Memories of "what has never been my fault or my deed*," Simon (2000) outlines some of these risks. First, elders' stories are in danger of becoming old news to which students claim to fully understand and respond. Second, the stories can become appropriated objects to be consumed, remembered and then forgotten. Similar to the 2008 government apology, a student can "accept the predefined importance of such stories and one's responsibility to reiterate that significance when asked, but only

when asked" (p. 18). Finally, as Simon makes clear, the stories can become transferential objects reduced and shaped by one's obsessions, concerns, and own self-understanding. My sense is in this article we perform such risks. How do we learn then to reread, rewrite, view, or listen to others' pain when it is not recognizable as our own? This is an interminable curricular question. It is even perhaps unanswerable.

While mindful of the aforementioned risks, such learning involves opening ourselves up to the vulnerable processes of being wounded by the wounds of others while reading, listening, and reviewing "the shadows of history" and acting "against the grain of an objectifying and oppressive historical grammar" (Eppert, 2000, p. 216). During our courses together, I invite students to write their life narratives alongside and against the historical narratives of others—to risk being wounded. To do so, we watch films, read novels, and listen to the testimonies of Algonquin elders and each other. This pedagogical process demands reading and rewriting different historical accounts of what constitutes the places and people that make up the mythologies of Canada. As a praxis of decolonization, life writing as shadow texts, enables us in many ways, to honour survivors' "names and to hold a place for their absent presence" as Canadians (Simon, 2000, p. 4). My hope is that through such practices of life writing, such as *currere*, we can envision narratives of the past, present, and for the future, that work to remember the names and lives of those who were lost and survived the violent colonial government curriculum of the Indian Residential Schooling (IRS) system.

Engendering Absences: A Curriculum of Apathy, Ignorance and Negligence

> An education that creates silence is not an education. (Simon, 1987, p. 375)

Robin: Who is a Canadian? What does it mean to be a responsible citizen here in Canada or abroad? What do the geopolitical and historical landscapes of Canadian cultures look, sound, taste, smell, and feel like? Are we just a collection of disconnected micro-cultures borrowed from faraway places? What makes us Canadian apart from being born here? Are Canadian social studies curricula and classrooms accountable for connecting different Canadians to the territories and histories that now make up what we, as intergenerational settlers, call Canada? These are for me the kinds of Canadian social studies questions we need to pose as teachers and students.

My lived experiences with such curricular inquiries at school were intertwined with the Ontario social studies curriculum where students were invited to "understand basic concepts," "develop the skills, strategies and habits of mind required for effective inquiry and communication," and then apply such "basic concepts of social studies, history, and geography to a variety of learning tasks" (see Ontario Ministry of Education, 2004, p. 3). Unfortunately, these goals engender little other than the ability for students to "continue to learn effectively in secondary school" (p. 3). Thinking back to my lived experiences within this social studies curriculum, I wonder at what point are we empowered to pose the following proverbial educational question: What knowledge is of most worth? We were not

developing the skills in classrooms to become active members of society capable of critically identifying historical and contemporary injustices like the Indian Residential Schooling (IRS) system.

While some connections are made between self, local, national and global concerns, I experienced what Freire (1970/1990) terms a banking model of education. By simply fostering knowledge, skills and attitudes that afford certain students access to future university studies, teachers push students into higher studies where they continue to be comforted by settler narratives of the status quo, and only "know" history from one vantage point. Not surprisingly, students remain apathetic, ignorant and absent toward a greater social responsibility to discover the narrative complexity of what it means to be Canadian because they have not been taught that other narratives exist, much less how to investigate them. Questions like the ones I pose above often go unanswered, largely because they are never asked. My experience with the social studies curriculum certainly did not provoke any kind of critical thinking, witnessing and/or forms of historical remembering that Simon and Eppert (1997) call for.

Simon (1987) reminds us in *Empowerment as a pedagogy of possibility*, that "education is fundamentally about our hopes for the future given an understanding of current realities, that particular forms of educational practice offer both a particular version and vision of a future civic prospect and morality" (p. 370). Simon additionally calls for educators to create spaces for their students to romanticize with a particular "not yet" of how we might live our lives together. But we cannot do this with misguided narrative conceptions of the present. A limited historical understanding of the present clouds our potential visions toward the future while simultaneously perpetuating hegemonic constructions of the past. If our teaching of social studies continues to deny our collective remembering of the narrative ruins of a Canadian colonial past, our present and future conceptions of an uncommon common curricular countenance will continue to push narratives of survivors to the margins of Canadian social studies curriculum (Chambers, 2012).

At issue here is what we might call a curriculum of present absence (Aoki, 2000/2005). In my lived experiences within Ontario's public schools, the social studies curriculum fostered unawareness and general apathy. The alternative voices, experiences and perspectives of many marginalized Canadians were pushed to the periphery of our national "knowing." These voices, like those of the victims and survivors of the IRS system, are in many ways still waiting at the periphery to be heard and remembered (Donald, 2009; Weenie, 2008). Eurocentric conceptions of curricula allow teachers to "protect" their pupils from potentially discomforting and destabilizing notions that accompany the witnessing of difficult knowledge and traumatic Canadian histories (den Heyer & Abbott, 2011; Eppert, 2002).

The revised Ontario Social Studies curriculum seems to address the previous document's shortcomings at least in part. It advocates for presenting students with opportunities to "learn about what it means to be a responsible, active citizen in the community of the classroom and the diverse communities to which they belong within and outside the school" (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 9). Specifically, this curriculum

asks Canadian teachers and students to: 1) Work for the common good in local, national, and global communities; 2) Foster a sense of personal identity as a member of various communities; 3) Understand power and systems within societies; and, 4) Develop character traits, values, and habits of mind (see Ontario Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 10). While this more engaged discourse sounds quite promising, there are still very powerful political forces and hegemonic agendas at play that must challenge the explicit, implicit, and null narrative dimensions of this policy document (Ng-A-Fook, 2013). In the sections that follow, I attempt to bring meaning to my recent connections to a Canadian history and narrative previously absent from my "knowing." My goal is to critique current realities, deconstruct a curriculum of absence, and create in its place an imagination of alternative possible futures. To accomplish this, I see my task as a curriculum theorist not only to share testimony of what I have witnessed as an act of "learning from the past," but also, to speak back *to* such testimony. Speaking *to* testimony requires us to "attend to the limits displayed" as we attend to experiences that are absolutely foreign to us, calling into question the predispositions we bring with us – an attending to our attending (Simon & Eppert, 1997).

Teaching Against the Grain: Toward a Vulnerable Education

> The cultural politics from which I begin is one centrally committed to the task of creating specific social forms (such as schooling) that encourage and make possible the realization of a variety of differentiated human capacities; rather than denying, diluting or distorting those capacities. (Simon, 1987, p. 372)

> Since the late 1800s, over 150,000 Aboriginal children were forcibly taken away from their families and shipped off to one of 130-plus schools scattered across seven provinces and two territories. There, they were robbed of their language, their beliefs, their self-respect, their cultural, and, in some cases, their very existence in a vain attempt to make them more Canadian. (Taylor, 2012, p. 142)

Nicholas: How do we begin to decolonize our relations with our selves, others, and the past? What are the local, national, and international implications of such cultural, historical, material and political relations in terms of Truth and Reconciliation? What is "truth?' What is "reconciliation?" These are provocative curricular questions. Perhaps for some, they are dangerous ones. They are in-deed complex ones (see Henderson & Wakeham, 2013).[4] Nonetheless, these are the kinds of pedagogical questions Roger Simon (2013) asked "as a form of worrying-in-public" (p. 129). In many ways, his research continues to invite us to critically question our relations with each other by revisiting, listening, and remembering

our individual and collective narrative conceptions of the past and our potential future relations to national programs of cultural redress and/or reconciliation.

Therefore, decolonizing our relations with the past also involves, as Simon (1992) suggests, a commitment toward *teaching against the grain*. Within such teachings, Marie Battiste (2013) calls our attention to the existing historical narratives that inform the public memory of settler colonialism and its ongoing denial of a colonizing past.

> Consider for more than a century, Indigenous students have been part of a forced assimilation plan—their heritage and knowledge rejected and suppressed, and ignored by the education system. Imagine the consequence of a powerful ideology that positions one group as superior an gives away First Nations peoples' lands and resources and invites churches and other administrative agents to inhabit their homeland, while negating their very existence and finally removing them from the Canadian landscape to lands no one wants. (p. 23)

Here, a commemorative ethics of "remembrance attempts to meet the challenge of what it might mean to live, not in the past but *in relation with* the past, acknowledging the claim the past has on the present" (Simon, 2000, p. 4). Acknowledging such kinds of ethical engagements with the past must be part of the politics of redress implicated in Truth and Reconciliation.

In our course together, Robin and I attended to such relations with our pasts by rereading and rewriting our memories and our narrative representations of them through life writing. We leaned on the different methodological dimensions of *currere*—regression, progression, analysis, and synthesis—to create a space "that risks our becoming wounded in the attendance to the wounds of another" (Simon, 2000, p. 5). The historical traumas of the victims and survivors of the IRS system call for such pedagogical risks as part of our responsibilities toward Truth and Reconciliation. But how do we create the necessary pedagogical spaces of vulnerability to encounter unsettling historical narratives as a project of possibility? Like Robin, I continue to struggle to learn the difficult knowledge associated with historical trauma. Such learning, as Britzman (1998) suggests, is belated, often coming to us when it is too late. Moreover, how do elementary, secondary, and/or university educators introduce difficult knowledge in productive ways that do not console our egos?

In *Radical hope: Or, the problem of uncertainty in History Education*, Lisa Farley (2009) puts forth the psychoanalytic concepts of "illusion," "disillusionment," and "re-illusions" to complicate the "readerly" and "writerly" processes of unsettling our relationships with the traumatic pasts of others.[5] Farley draws upon these concepts to explore the uncertainty and tensions that exist in the psychic dynamics of teaching and learning from difficult knowledge. And within the contexts of history education such knowledge is, she writes,

> … difficult not only because of its inclusion of traumatic content in and otherwise-sanitized curriculum, but also because it poses a challenge to

> teachers and students, who, in efforts to understand such knowledge, may be confronted with affective traces of an *internal* history made from primal helplessness, disillusionment and crises of authority and (not) knowing. At stake here is a view of historical knowledge that is touched by the very anxieties it hopes to settle in answering "matter-of-factly" a child's burning question. (p. 539)

To reread and rewrite alternative historical narratives, or open ourselves up to an ethical engagement with others, means having to tolerate the loss of epistemological certainty in our very pedagogical efforts "to know" or "to interpret" others' individual and collective traumatic pasts that are excluded from the school history curriculum.

In response to such discursive reproductions of an explicit, implicit, and null curriculum as well as our encounters with epistemologies of uncertainty, I suggest that we might learn the critical politics of remembering and forgetting certain historical narratives through life writing.[6] "One concrete version of what this might entail would be a process," as Simon (2013) proposes, "of reflecting on the experiences of listening to the stories told to the TRC and retelling these stories, not to co-opt them in the service of the self, but interweaving them with one's own life stories" (p. 136). Such "a critical politics of remembrance," as Ranck (2000) stresses, "necessarily implies a decolonization of imagination that scrutinizes the discourses of neo-colonialism for its contamination of the politics of the present" (p. 209). In turn, "the insight won in the struggle to learn from history," as Simon (2013) maintains, "can offer a new foundation for rethinking the significance of a history of violation and violence beyond the idealizations of empathy, identification, and facile notions of solidarity that simply promote settler state citizenship" (p. 136). This is especially true when a curriculum of neo/colonial dominance—history textbooks, curriculum policies, popular films, and so on—continues to work here in Ontario to create myths about the Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal creation stories we tell (or don't tell) each other.

Such mediated stories, as Dwayne Donald (2009, 2012) has illustrated in his thought-provoking research on forts, curriculum, and Indigenous métissage, work to represent the beliefs Canadian citizens hold regarding the narrative genesis of our nation-state. The stories we (don't) tell each other through the public school curriculum about the birth of our country have a significant impact on the institutional, political, and cultural character of the country, as well as the narrative preoccupations of its future citizens. In this groundbreaking work, Donald (2009) makes clear that Canadian institutions perpetuate the colonial establishment of the fort. Where "universities and schools are predicated on colonial frontier logics and have both served to enforce epistemological and social conformity to Euro-western standards" (p. 4). Educational institutions as such, then symbolize academic forts that work to perpetuate certain inherent institutional discursive regimes that in turn obstruct our potential engagement of Indigenous perspectives and contribute to the violent pedagogical and epistemic curricular reproductions of exclusion and displacement of what does and does not constitute historical knowledge within the contexts of what we call "Canadian" history.

If we think about the school, or the policy document as a public site implicated in the formation of our collective historical imagination, we can see how it institutionally operates in a similar fashion to that of the colonial fort. Curriculum policy documents, and the ways in which we might translate them form the political walls of the provincial (or state) curricula. History textbooks and teacher perceptions of history effectively erect certain discursive walls, establishing the territorial and disciplinary demarcations of a neoliberal, neoconservative, indeed neocolonial Eurocentric (white supremacist) narrative fort (Stanley, 2006).

The curriculum itself then becomes a discursive instructional and instrumental fortification where the teachings of history might seem, at first glance, self-evident. However, as we all know, history is not an inert political or psychic text that students receive or create in a classroom. Rather history, or the current educational movement called historical thinking, *is* always about interpretative, discursive, and ethical relations with our narrative constructions of the past, its implication for present, and future visions of what constitutes Canadian history. Theorizing and doing such kinds of historical thinking or historical inquiry then need to foster ethical relational spaces for teachers and students to access the diverse alternative primary and secondary sources that inform our interpretations of the historical significance of creating settler state sponsored institutions like the IRS system.

Although the last residential schools closed in the mid-1990s, narratives about the institutions or by their survivors did not exist within my school-aged memories or as an undergraduate student. Not until graduate school in a course with Celia Haig-Brown (2009) on decolonizing research methodologies, did I begin to question whose traditional lands I now occupied while learning to become a "good" diasporic Canadian. My prior educational experiences inside and outside the explicit, implicit, and null Catholic school curriculum did not create specific social forms that encouraged my capacity to imagine the diverse historical narratives of the differing Aboriginal communities who continue to live on what some call Turtle Island.

Unsettling Narrative Understandings of the Past: Experiencing Inexperience

> On such terms, remembrance becomes a practice that supports a learning from "the past" that is a fresh cognizance or discovery that unsettles the very terms on which our understandings of ourselves and our world are based. In its most powerful form, such remembrance initiates forms of learning that shift and disrupt the present, opening one to new ways of perceiving, thinking and acting. (Simon, 2000, p.13)

Robin: In our teaching and learning together, Dr. Ng-A-Fook continually challenged my preconceptions and pushed me to accommodate new capacities for imagining the lives of others. This was possible because he complicated my understanding of curriculum, in how I was encouraged to attend to the testimonies of others – whether through artistic

representations or the living accounts he invited into the classroom. He provoked me to expand upon my newly developed capacities by inviting me to identify, interrogate, situate, and present curriculum artifacts. Unlike any of my prior schooling, this experience at graduate school challenged the very epistemological foundations for comprehending my sense of self. My personal apathy led to my reductive notions of history; institutional and social structures became exposed through what I now understand was a process of re-remembering.

Coming to the realization that certain political ideologies had deeply structured how I received, remembered, and responded to knowledge and other representations completely dismantled my historical grounding as a Canadian teacher and student. I was rendered both vulnerable and fragile. Nonetheless, it afforded me pedagogical opportunities to encounter the "experience of my inexperience" – that is, to hear, and learn differently (Simon, 2000, p.19). I encountered my complicity in remembering and forgetting certain historical narratives. No longer naïve, I could not hide behind a veil of indifference. Instead, I now understand my responsibilities as a Canadian to re-remember the various historical narratives that constitute my Canadian identity. To do so, "one must bear (support and endure)," as Simon and Eppert (1997) make clear, "the psychic burden of a traumatic history, and acknowledge that memories of violence and injustice press down on one's sense of humanity and moral equilibrium" (p. 178). It is within such vulnerability, fragility and unsettling curriculum that a pedagogical space becomes available for learning difficult knowledge. Provoked by the unsettling experience of my inexperience, I desired alternative understandings of the past, opportunities to read, interpret, and re/write my ways of perceiving, thinking and acting as a Canadian. After discussing this with Nicholas, he invited me to join him on a trip to Kitigan Zibi, an Algonquin reserve in Quebec.

When we arrived, the Kitigan Zibi School was lively with activity. Students from grades one to twelve filled the halls. Eagles, trees, a flock of Canadian geese and the lone wolf made up some of the Canadian topography painted on the walls. While wondering and witnessing, I could feel the soft gaze of students attempting to process my presence as the proverbial "Other." My eyes drifted to theirs. They were met with an intrigued, yet bashful smile that turned into a series of timid little waves, welcoming me to the school. Others were slightly bolder, greeting me with the type of hug I would only be comfortable instigating with a dear friend. In the library, the principal readied her presentation of the Algonquin Anishinàbeg culture, language and curriculum. I listened intently to her describe the cultural, historical, and linguistic relevance of their locally developed education system and its seven grandfather teachings of honesty, truth, love, respect, humility, bravery and wisdom. I was also experiencing it all around me.

Then Bertha Commanda, an Algonquin elder and residential school survivor stood up in front of us. She expressed her gratitude for our presence and desire to learn about Algonquin history and culture. And, Bertha proceeded to share the following story:

> *A couple of years ago, I was in with the Assembly of First Nations. We went for a meeting [on] parliament hill and so the national Chief says, "this is Mrs. Commanda…this is her territory. Let's thank her for being*

> *on her territory." A lot of parliamentarians were confused there. After the meeting was over, I was getting ready to get up and a couple of women came to see me. White women! And you know what they said? "I'm so glad you people are here." I said thank you. They then said, "You know what? If it wasn't for you people, my ancestors would have never survived." I told them we must have welcomed them because "Quebec" for me sounds like my language. If you come to my house in a boat or in a car all alone, I would say "kaba." When there are many of you, I would say "kabak." "Kabak kinebay" means in our language "get off and come on in." That should be in our history! So that day, I told the Chiefs across Canada, "it's about time we changed our history, I want a better history." We got a lot of our own young people. They should be able to write and learn our history.*

This alternative account emerged from the silent confines of the colonial narratives that previously prejudiced my understandings of Canadian history. In this moment, history and its respective narratives came alive differently for me, and not because I had witnessed survivor testimony, but more disturbingly because I became further aware of my complicity in the perpetration of what Malewski and Jaramillo (2011) call an epistemology of "ignorance." Such unsettling narrative encounters were not just about unearthing facts that rendered history more accurate. Instead, I was awakened toward attending to Canadian history differently (Simon, 2000). Kanu and Glor (2006) explain, "by uncovering biographies, there can be an empowerment and a movement away from cultural authority and cultural reproduction" (p. 106). Engaging oral history projects with Algonquin elders as one example, forces us to interrogate our worldviews. In turn, it connects us to the multiplicity of historical accounts, many of which remain characterized by inequality, discrimination, stereotypes, paternalism, isolation, distrust and misunderstanding (Donald, 2004). Such acts of historical deconstruction and reconstruction within and outside the contexts of Canadian social studies may potentially lead to more hopeful relations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities. And, within such encounters of remembrance, we may become unsettled in our rethinking, reassessing and re-understanding of Canadian history.

Encountering Truth and Reconciliation: An Unfinished Story

> This unfinished story is the story pedagogy must learn to tolerate. (Britzman, 2000, p. 50)

> My understanding of what *reconciliation* means has evolved since that time. To me, it's all about relationships and communication. (Angeconeb, 2012, p. 27)

> The worthy pedagogical idea inherent in such a form of public history is that the authority and moral weight of the commission will lead Canadians not only to become more aware of past policies and events excluded from the dominant narratives of Canadian history, but also to undertake an active, ethical engagement with this past, one that might forge new covenantal relations of solidarity with Indigenous communities in a collective struggle for a more hopeful future for all. (Simon, 2013, p. 130)

Nicholas: We seem to think we know Aboriginal people by name. And "we" as settlers continue to profit from renaming their ontological, epistemological, material, and political realities with the mythologies we call Canadian history (Donald, 2012). Such colonizing and nationalizing hubris should be an epistemological, curricular, and pedagogical worrying problem for Canadian citizens. For those of us who support and profit from a settler "neoliberal" colonial nation-state we remain intoxicated by the convenient myths of what King (2012) calls elsewhere the *Inconvenient Indian*. In our Ontario social studies curriculum, we often toast to celebrations of economic, moral, and technological progress of our citizenship. Our national congratulatory cheers are so loud that we cannot see or hear the voices of the missing and murdered Aboriginal women, men, and children who have experienced the systemic intergenerational traumas of cultural genocide. Who are experiencing it! Discursively and politically, the narratives occupying our newsstands, our classrooms, our individual and collective historical consciousness, are perhaps slowly changing. Ontario teachers and students can now find the term "residential schools" within the social studies curriculum policy document. But how do we take up the complexities of their historical representations as future strategic essential questions?

Over the course of our oral history work together, Bertha Commanda refused to let her lived experiences, her life narratives, or Algonquin histories be symbolized by the colonial discursive and material regimes of privatization, criminalization, and victimization. Despite her traumatic experiences at St. Joseph's, the girls Indian Residential School in Spanish Ontario, she shared testimonies of her traumas with resilience and a generous pedagogical spirit. On several occasions, Bertha shared her teachings with pre-service history teachers and graduate students. She taught us how to reread, relearn, rewrite, and teach what we call "Canadian" history differently. Hers and other elders' stories, like Garnet Angeconeb in *Speaking My Truth: Reflections on Reconciliation and Residential School*, have provoked me to question the ways in which I am (or not) addressing the commemorative ethics required for *Truth and Reconciliation*. And yet addressing such ethics as a critical pedagogy for questioning and remembering history will not be found within the disciplinary thinking skills of the Ontario social studies curriculum. And, like Robin, I am still learning how to attend to such kinds of commemorative ethics, of unsettling my encounters with others in the past, present, and future within my research and teaching as a pedagogy of worrying-in-public, as a shadow text, where my relationships with *Truth and Reconciliation* remain an unfinished story. Remembering

Bertha's parting words, I am learning to reread, rewrite, and relearn her Algonquin Kitigan Zibi history: "*Kabak kinebay*!"

Toward the Pedagogical Art of the Possibility of futurities

> There is no future without uncanny memorial connections, responsibilities to memories other than one's own, to memories you have no responsibility for but claim you to a memorial kinship. (Simon, 2000, p. 19)

> Writers and intellectuals can name, we can describe, we can depict, we can witness—with—out sacrificing craft, nuance, or beauty. Above all, and at our best, we may sometimes help question the questions. (Rich, 2001, p. 167)

Nicholas and Robin: Throughout his work as a writer and public intellectual, Roger Simon challenged educators to question the questions that inform our understandings of history. His work continues to provoke us to think, listen, speak, and write differently. While the discourse in Ontario's new social studies curriculum seems to enable educators to learn the shadow texts of Canadian history, the onus is still on curriculum theorists, teachers, and students of history to craft pedagogical spaces to encounter the unsettling historical traumas of others with compassion, knowledge, and justice (Eppert, 2002). These encounters, as Eppert reminds us, must also challenge our anxieties and egocentric investments that seek to forget as we remember the violent inheritance of a colonial history. Moreover, as she and Roger Simon stressed, we must continue to commit ourselves toward deconstructing and reconstructing current Western narratives in their "heroic" conventions for understanding the past. Such conventional historical plots fail to provide the necessary historical reading lenses to construct the shadow texts and affective excesses of residential school survivors' testimonies. For us, life writing as shadow texts, as *currere*, enables us to revisit the past as "a practice of unsettling the present," toward reimagining more hopeful future relations between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities across the territories we now call Canada (Simon, 2000, p. 20). Roger Simon and the works of former students like Aparna Mishra Tarc (2011), Claudia Eppert (2000, 2002), and Lisa Farley (2008, 2009, 2010) have provided an intellectual and pedagogical starting point for us to further develop alternative lenses to encounter unsettling histories inside and outside of Canadian social studies.

To this unfinished ending, we might heed Simon's (1987) words, that "what we do in classrooms can matter; we can begin to enable students to enter the openness of the future as the place of human hope and worth" (p. 381). Such pedagogical openness might begin by taking account, listening, reading, and viewing the stories of elders like Bertha Commanda, Garnet Angeconeb, and the many nameless others who did and did not survive as part of our commemorative ethical commitment, as treaty people, to truth and reconciliation.

Endnotes

[1] To see a timeline on the establishment of the Indian Residential Schooling system and ensuing Truth and Reconciliation Commission consult the following website: http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/a-timeline-of-residential-schools-the-truth-and-reconciliation-commission-1.724434.

[2] *Currere* is the Latin infinitive etymological root for the term "curriculum" and can be translated as: "to run the course." For Pinar (2012), the method of *currere* consists of the four following intertwining parts: regressive, progressive, analytical, and synthetical. In the regressive phase, one conducts free association with memories in order to collect autobiographical data. The purpose is to try and re-enter the past in order to enlarge and transform one's memories. The second phase, or the progressive, is where one looks towards what is not yet present. In the analytical stage, one examines how both the past and future inhabit the present. At the analytical stage, how might educational researchers bracket such experiences in order to loosen emotional attachments and their respective limit-situations in relation to pedagogical concepts such as, but not limited to: decolonizing one's self? The synthetical is the last stage, where one brings together past, present, and future limitations and possibilities in order to re-enter the present moment, hopefully without instrumental certainty or promise, with a sense of self-understanding, or insight, in relation to such pedagogical concepts. William Pinar's (2012) concept of *currere* has been an integral part of Nicholas Ng-A-Fook's (2009, 2012, in-press) teaching and research at the University of Ottawa.

[3] To learn more about the different components of the larger research project consult the following articles Corrigan, Ng-A-Fook, Lévesque, Smith (2013), Lévesque, Ng-A-Fook, Corrigan (2014), and Smith, Ng-A-Fook, Corrigan (in-press).

[4] Within the scope of this essay we cannot provide an in-depth analysis of both the possibilities and limitations of examining the transnational culture of redress taking place across Western neoliberal and/or neoconservative nation-states such as, but not limited to South Africa, Australia, and Canada. However, in *Reconciling Canada: Critical Perspectives on the Culture of Redress*, Henderson and Wakeham, put forth an excellent edited collection of essays that examine the historical, political, and theoretical, and dimensions of what they call "the culture of redress" (p. 15). What we can take from their arguments put for in this thought-provoking collection, is that several different several different neoliberal Western countries like Canada have sought to control the various political, economic, and discursive mechanisms for acknowledging historical traumas and in turn establishing the parameters around the kinds of redress that are given as part of any future settlements with descendants of interned Japanese-Canadians, Chinese head tax, or residential school survivors as three examples.

[5] Within the scope of this essay we are not able to tease out the complexities of these psychoanalytical concepts in relation to juxtaposition of the texts related to the IRS system and/or Truth and Reconciliation. For a more thorough discussion and potential future juxtaposition of these concepts we strongly encourage readers to read Lisa Farley's (2009) *Radical hope: Or, the problem of uncertainty in History Education*.

[6] Thirty-five years ago, Elliot Eisner (1979) situated the following three different types of curriculum within the contexts of public schooling: 1) Explicit, 2) Implicit, and 3) Null curriculum. The explicit curriculum refers to government policy documents like the Ontario Social Studies curriculum. The implicit refers the values and expectations that are not put forth in the formal curriculum. The null refers to what is excluded from the school curriculum. Often what is included and/or excluded could have significant impacts for different exogenous and/or Indigenous populations in a school. "The concept of evolution omitted from a biology curriculum," as Flinders, Noddings, and Thornton (1986) suggest, "would be an example of this type of exclusion". The null curriculum can also be considered in terms of the exclusion of particular facts. "For example an Ameri-can history unit focusing on the New Deal without reference to the failure of the New Deal to solve the unemployment problem," as these authors argue, "would consign this bit of information to the null curriculum" (p. 35). In Ontario a similar example would be the exclusion of various historical events, like the establishment of the Indian Residential Schooling system, from the history curriculum. Moreover, a lack of Indigenous historical perspectives within existing history textbooks on such events would be another example of the null curriculum. For a more thorough discussion of the different dimensions of the null curriculum see Flinders, Noddings, and Thornton's (1986) essay *The Null Curriculum: Its Theoretical Basis and Practical Implications*.

References

Aoki, T. (2005). Language, Culture, and Curriculum… (2000). In W. F. Pinar & R. L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki*, 321-329. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Angeconeb, G. (2012). Speaking my truth: The journey to reconciliation. In Aboriginal Healing Foundation (Ed.), *Speaking my truth: Reflections on reconciliation & residential school* (pp. 11-36). Ottawa, ON: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing Limited.

Britzman, D. (1998). *Lost subjects, contested objects*. New York, New York: State University of New York Press.

Britzman, D. (2000). If the story cannot end: Deferred action, ambivalence, and difficult knowledge. In R. I. Simon, S. Rosenberg, & C. Eppert (Eds.), *Between hope and despair: Pedagogy and the remembrance of historical trauma* (pp. 27-58). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Corrigan, J., & Ng-A-Fook, N., & Lévesque, S., & Smith, B. (2013). Looking to the future to understand the past: A survey of pre-service history teachers' experiences with digital technology and content knowledge. *Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy*, 49-73.

den Heyer, K., & Abbott, L. (2011). Reverberating echoes: Challenging teacher candidates to tell and learn from entwined narrations of Canadian history. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *41*(5), 610-635. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873x.2011.00567.x

Donald, D. T. (2004). Edmonton Pentimento: Re-reading history in the case of the Papaschase Cree. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, 2*(1), 21-54.

Donald, D. T. (2009). Forts, curriculum, and Indigenous métissage: Imagining decolonization of Aboriginal-Canadian relations in educational contexts. *First Nations Perspectives: The Journal of the Manitoba First Nations Education Resource Centre, 2*(1), 1-24.

Donald, D. (2012). Forts, curriculum, and ethical relationality. In N. Ng-A-Fook & J. Rottmann (Eds.), *Reconsidering Canadian curriculum studies* (pp. 39-46). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9781137008978.0008

Eisner, E. W. (1979) *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Eppert, C. (2000). Relearning questions: Responding to the ethical address of past and present Others. In R. I. Simon, S. Rosenberg, & C. Eppert (Eds.), *Between hope and despair: Pedagogy and the remembrance of historical trauma* (pp. 213-230). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Eppert, C. (2002). Entertaining history: (Un)heroic identifications, apt pupils, and an ethical imagination. *New German Critique, 86*71-101. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3115202

Farley, L. (2008). "An Oedipus for our time: On the un-discipline of historical relations." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *24*(1), 20–31.

Farley, L. (2009). Radical Hope: On the problem of uncertainty in history education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *39*(4), 537–554. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2009.00456.x

Farley, L. (2010). The reluctant pilgrim: Questioning belief after historical loss. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *8*(1), 6–40.

Flinders, D., & Noddings, N., & Thornton, S. J. (1986). The null curriculum: Its theoretical Basis and practical implications. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *16*(1), 33-42. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1179551

Freire, P. (1970/1990). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, New York: Continuum Press.

Haig-Brown, C. (2009). Decolonizing Diasporic Studies: Whose Traditional Land Are We On? *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*. 1(1), pp. 4-21.

Hasebe-Ludt, E., C. Chambers & Leggo, C. (2009). *Life Writing and Literary Métissage as an Ethos for Our Times*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Henderson, J., & Wakeham, P. (2013). (Eds.). *Reconciling Canada: Critical Perspectives on the Culture of Redress*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Kanu, Y. & Glor, M. (2006). 'Currere' to the rescue? Teachers as 'amateur intellectuals' in a knowledge society. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 4(2), 101-122.

King, T. (2012). *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America*. Toronto, ON: Doubleday Canada.

Lévesque, S. (2008). *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the 21st Century*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Lévesque, S., & Ng-A-Fook, N., Corrigan, J. (2014). What does the eye see?: Reading online primary source photographs in history. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Technology and Education*. 14 (1), pp. 1-23.

Malewski, E. & Jaramillo, N. (2011). (Eds.). *Epistemologies of Ignorance*. Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Mishra Tarc, A. (2011). "Reparative Curriculum." *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(3), pp. 350–372. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2011.00554.x

Ng-A-Fook, N. (2009). Inhabiting the Hyphenated Spaces of Alienation and Appropriation: *Currere*, Language, and Postcolonial Migrant Subjectivities. In James Nahachewsky and Ingrid Johnson (Eds.), *Beyond Presentism*, (pp. 87-103). Rotterdam The Netherlands: Sense publishers.

Ng-A-Fook, N. (2012). Navigating M/other-Son Plots as a Migrant Act: Autobiography, *Currere*, and Gender. In Springgay, S. & Freedman, D. (Eds.). *Mothering a bodied curriculum: Emplacement, desire, affect*, pp. 160-185. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Ng-A-Fook, N. (2013). Contemplating A Canadian Curriculum Theory Project: *Currere*, Denkbild and Intellectual Genealogies, (pp. 172-181). In Erika Hasebe-Ludt and Wanda Hurren (Eds.), *Contemplating Curriculum: Genealogies/Times/Places*. New York, New York: Routledge.

Ng-A-Fook, N. (in-press). Autobiography, Intellectual Topographies, and Teacher Development. In Hua Zhang and William F. Pinar (Eds.). *Teacher Autobiography and*

Teacher Development: A Reconceptualization of Teacher Education. New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2004). The Ontario curriculum social studies grades 1-6 History and Geography grades 7-8 [Program of Studies]. Retrieved from: http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/sstudies18curr.pdf (accessed on February 26, 2014).

Ontario Ministry of Education. (2013). The Ontario curriculum social studies grades 1-6 History and Geography grades 7-8 [Program of Studies]. Retrieved from: http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/elementary/sshg18curr2013.pdf (accessed on February 26, 2014).

Perks, R. & Thomson, A. (Eds.). (1998). *The Oral History Reader*. New York, NY: Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203435960

Pinar, W. F. (2006). *The Synoptic Text Today and Other Essays: Curriculum Development after the Reconceptualization*. New York, New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, W. F. (2012). *What is Curriculum Theory?* (2nd edition). New York, New York: Routledge.

Ranck, J. (2000). Beyond Reconciliation: Memory and Alterity in Post-Genocide Rwanda. In Roger I. Simon, Sharon Rosenberg, & Claudia Eppert (Eds.), *Between Hope and Despair: Pedagogy and the Remembrance of Historical Trauma* (pp. 187-212). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Ritchie, D. (2003). *Doing Oral History*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rich, A. (2001). *Arts of the Possible*. New York, New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Sas, J. (2012, December). Uncomfortable truths: Dr. Marie Wilson on the history of residential schools in Canada. *Rabble*. Retrieved from: http://rabble.ca/news/2012/12/residential-schools-uncomfortable-truth-about-canada (accessed on March 1st, 2013).

Seixas, P. (2006). *Benchmarks of Historical Thinking: A Framework for Assessment in Canada* (pp. 1–12). Vancouver, BC.

Seixas, P., & Morton, T. (2013). *The Big Six: Historical Thinking Benchmarks*. Toronto, ON: Nelson Education Ltd.

Simon, R. I. (1982). Dialogue as a scholarly activity. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 12(1), 5-7. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1179743

Simon, R. I. (1987). Empowerment as a pedagogy of possibility. *Language Arts,* 64(4), 370-382.

Simon, R. I. (1992). *Teaching Against the Grain*: *Texts for a Pedagogy of Possibility*. New York, New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Simon, R. I. (2000). *The Paradoxical Practice of Zakhor*. In Roger I. Simon, Sharon Rosenberg, & Claudia Eppert (Eds.), *Between Hope and Despair: Pedagogy and the Remembrance of Historical Trauma* (pp. 9-26). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Simon, R. I. (2013). Towards a Hopeful Practice of Worrying: The Problematics of Listening and the Educative Responsibilities of Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission. In Jennifer Henderson, & Pauline Wakeham (Eds.), *Reconciling Canada: Critical*

Perspectives on the Culture of Redress (pp. 129-142). Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Simon, R. I., & Dippo, D. (1986). On critical ethnographic work. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 17(4), 195-202. http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aeq.1986.17.4.04x0613o

Simon, R. & Eppert, C. (1997). Remembering obligation: Pedagogy and the witnessing of testimony of historical trauma. *Canadian Journal of Education,* 22(2), 175-191. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1585906

Smith, B., Ng-A-Fook, N., Berry, S., & Spence, K. (2011). Deconstructing a Curriculum of Dominance: Teacher Education, Colonial Frontier Logics, and Residential Schooling. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry,* 8(2), 53-70.

Smith, B., & Ng-A-Fook, N., & Corrigan, J. (in-press). Mobile(izing) Educational Research: Historical Thinking, M-Learning, and Technopolitics. *McGill Journal of Education*.

Stanley, T. J. (2006). Whose Public? Whose Memory? Racisms, Grand Narratives and Canadian History. In R.W. Sandwell (Ed.), *To the Past: History Education, Public Memory, and Citizenship in Canada*, (pp. 32-49). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Taylor, H. D. (2012). Cry Me a River, White Boy. In Aboriginal Healing Foundation (Ed.). *Speaking My Truth: Reflections on Reconciliation & Residential School*, (pp. 141-152). Ottawa, ON: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Tomkins, G. (1986/2008). *A Common Countenance: Stability and Change in the Canadian Curriculum*. Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

Tuck, E. & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2013). Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, *29*(1), pp. 72-89.

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230299191

Weenie, A. (2008). Curricular Theorizing From the Periphery. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 38(5), 545-557. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2008.00435.x

Youngblood, H. J. (2013). Incomprehensible Canada. In Jennifer Henderson, & Pauline Wakeham (Eds.), *Reconciling Canada: Critical Perspectives on the Culture of Redress* (pp. 115-126). Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Book Review

Sabah Mushtaq
History Department
Quaid-i- azam University
Islamabad, Pakistan
sabahshah82@gmail.com

Review of:

Tarrow, S. (2015). *War, states, and contention: A comparative historical study*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Sidney Tarrow is Maxwell Upson Emeritus Professor of Government and Visiting Professor of Law at Cornell University. He is the writer of numerous books, including *The Language of Contention: Revolutions in Words, 1688–2012* and *Strangers at the Gates: Movements and States in Contentious Politics*. His book, *War, States and Contention. A Comparative Historical Study,* is a splendid and ground-breaking contribution to the comprehension of how war and states converge with contentious political issues.

Through a double accentuation on the structural foundations of war and dispute, from one perspective, and actor mobilization and repertories of contentious political issues from the other perspective, Sidney Tarrow addresses issues that lie at the heart of contemporary investigation on the restructuring of the state and on the obscuring of territories between internal and external politics. Beginning from the famous contention progressed by Charles Tilly that "states make war, war also makes states," the book adds contentious politics to the equation. This adjunction provides further understandings of the relationship between states and war; contentious politics clarifies why and how states participate in wars, and the impacts of war on states. But the book additionally reveals insight into a second, less known equation of Tilly's, which builds up a relationship between war and natives' rights. Tarrow talks about how war prompts the employment of emergency measures that lessen rights, regardless of whether they are reinstated later. In other words, when a state rolls out war this involves changes in: the nature of internal contentious politics, the state's reactions to conflict, and in state organization.

Tarrow examines these issues through a comparative historical study that uncovers how current structural changes in states, fighting, and types of contentious politics alter what we might see in the time of Western state-building. Drawing on these mechanisms connected to the formation and union of Western European states, Tarrow acknowledges two pivotal upturns. On the one hand, it puts contention between war and the state, considering both opposition from within national boundaries and from outside. Through this, he also studies the various forms through which domestic and international conflict stand in relation to each other. On the other hand, Tarrow updates these issues to the present in the analysis of the U.S. state and the War on Terror. He reveals how structural changes linked to globalisation and internationalisation alter the relationships between states, warfare, and forms of contention.

The author’s argument is built around a triptych—war, state, and contention—and bridges the gap between social movement studies, comparative historical sociology studies, and international relations. The relevance of this approach relies not only on placing three usually separate strands of literature in dialogue with one another, but also on the major results that the book offers. Powerful hypotheses for further research are provided. The present discussion engages with the book’s arguments on three intertwined topics, which

constitute some of its major results: the relation between war and citizens' rights; the transformation of the territoriality of war, states and contention; and the relation between war and the state. The inclusion of contention between war and rights reveals itself to be crucial for clarifying the relationship between the two. This is needed given that the issue seems not entirely solved by the historical sociology of the state, and is almost left unaddressed by research on contemporary wars and social movements. In this respect, one of the most striking results of the book is to reveal at what point the modern state is characterised by periods of restriction of citizens' rights in wartime. In Tilly's argument about war, states and rights, the relation between the three elements has a positive effect on rights. Because he looks at contentious politics, Tarrow demonstrates that the shrinkage of rights in times of war is a recurrent and understudied feature of the state as a specific political system. The advent of this "emergency script" is unveiled through a detailed historical account.

Chapters about U.S. politics after 9/11 shed light on a major transformation related to the use of legal instruments to modify the limits of the legally accepted boundaries of states' interventions on bodies and limitations of individual liberties. The "rule by law" argument provides key understandings of how liberal democracies combine their foundational creeds with increasingly illiberal policies. Instead of despotic emergency rule, what is observed is a creeper process. Formally and procedurally, the U.S. state did not roll back liberal constitutionalism; however, in its content, the latter has been partially reshaped by the transformation of legally accepted boundaries on crucial issues such as the right to a fair trial or to individual integrity. In addition, both the increasing duration of wars and the undefined boundaries between times of war and peace have created a new hybrid status that seems to facilitate the perpetuation of these measures. By showing how the U.S. state deals with composite and long wars, and analyzing the interplay between contention, war, and states' activities, Tarrow provides a critical contribution for the study of the blurred boundaries between domestic and international politics. The study of how international movements engage with states and vice versa sheds light on a major restructuring of the spatial dimension of power, while Tarrow also points out recurrent mechanisms of diffusion from policies for war to civilian policies.

In his book, Tarrow provides a stimulating perspective on the restructuring of state territoriality and its effects. In doing so, he echoes the questions raised by scholars who start from the idea that territoriality—bounded political authority—is a fundamental principle of modern political systems, and are interested in current processes of unbundling territoriality. Sidney Tarrow's investigation gives valuable insight in to the notion new territorialities in politics, and could engage more straightforwardly with these writers and with his own particular past contributions on these issues. Indeed, Tarrow has two fundamental arguments to make in this regard. This first is that he draws on the state-building literature, he indicates how the territorial restructuring of both war and contention influences the state, whose organization is as a matter of first importance territorial. Along these lines, Tarrow puts war back into the examination of state territorial restructuring. While most research sheds light on economics as a main thrust, contentious politics and composite wars additionally involve new types of state intervention and institutional arrangements. The second argument of Tarrow is that the unbundling of political power and rights are mutually related. The historical backdrop of the state and rights is a matter of territorial infiltration, confinement within boundaries, and the definition of the criteria that consider the privileges of political and social rights. A third set of comments highlights war and the transformation of the state in terms of power and bureaucracy. The preparation for war and the state of war opens up new opportunities for state authority in terms of the repression of opponents, as well as for the strengthening of both tax and repressive apparatus.

Tarrow's main consequence for the U.S. state in relation to these issues is fascinating. Indeed, there is an expansion of the structure of government; for example, the scope of the FBI and the Pentagon, as well as the multiplication of new agencies and joint-government organisations. Both the scope and the size of the U.S. state have expanded, despite a strong anti-state tradition. In the War on Terror, the contradiction between the expansion of the national security state and the anti-state movement has been somewhat resolved through increased outsourcing to private firms for the delivery of military and intelligence services. This form of "government though contracts" allows for the preservation of existing budgets in the security sector, while increasing side-expenditure which is more difficult to track and control. The quick and poorly coordinated multiplication of contracts has created a much more intrusive U.S. state, but also a state more vulnerable to penetration from civil society and to regulatory capturing from firms. The writer conceptualizes this transformation of state power through Michael Mann's distinction: there is in this manner a double extension of both the hierarchical and the infrastructural force of the U.S. state in connection to the War on Terror. This point, which is significant to the argument, is to a great degree stimulating.