

Resisting Neoliberal Education Reform: Insurrectionist Pedagogies and the Pursuit of Dangerous Citizenship

E. Wayne Ross
University of British Columbia

Kevin D. Vinson
University of The West Indies

Background and Contexts: Neoliberal Education Reform in the USA and Canada

For more than three decades now, there has been a steady intensification of education reforms, worldwide, aimed at making schools and universities more responsive to the interests of capital than ever before. There was never a golden age of public education in the public interest, but since the rise of neoliberalism in the twentieth century—marked by economic liberalization, free trade, open markets, privatization, and deregulation—education and other public sector services have been subjected to an unrelenting market fundamentalism, or the belief that free markets can solve economic and social problems (Ross & Gibson, 2007).

Neoliberal education reform aims for a large-scale transformation of public education that opens it up to private investment. The global education market is now valued at \$4.4 trillion (up from \$2.5 trillion in 2005), with projections for rapid growth the next five years (Strauss, 2013). Key strategies of corporate-driven education reform include: (1) School choice and privatization; (2) human capital policies for teachers; and (3) standardized curriculum coupled with an increased use of standardized testing.

Charter schools are publicly funded independent schools that are attended by choice. Corporate education reformers promote policies that would close public schools deemed “low performing” and replace them with publicly funded, but privately run, charters and/or expanded use of vouchers and tax credit subsidies for private school tuition.

Human capital policies for teachers aim to alter the working conditions of teachers, which makes eliminating or limiting the power of teacher unions a primary objective of corporate education reform. Human capital education policies include: increasing class size (often tied to firing teaching staff); eliminating or weakening of tenure and seniority rights; using unqualified or “alternatively certified” teachers; increasing the hours that teachers work and reducing sick leave; replacing governance by locally elected school boards with various forms of mayoral and state takeover or private management; and using the results of student standardized tests to make teacher personnel decisions in hiring, firing, and pay (see, for example, Karp, 2012; Saltman, 2012).



Key parts of the education reform discourse in the U.S., which can be traced directly through every Republican and Democratic presidential administration from Reagan to Obama, include a focus on standardizing the curriculum and de-professionalizing teachers, as teaching is increasingly reduced to test preparation. From Reagan's *A Nation At Risk*, to George H. W. Bush's National Education Summits, Clinton's *Goals 2000*, to George W. Bush's *No Child Left Behind Act*, and Obama's *Race to the Top*, there has been an ever-tightening grip on what students learn and what teachers teach. The primary instruments used in the surveillance of teachers and students and enforcement of official knowledge has been the creation of state level curriculum standards paired with standardized tests, creating bureaucratic accountability systems that undermine the freedom to teach and learn (see, for example, Carr & Porfilio, 2011; Gabbard & Ross, 2008; Gorlewski & Porfilio, 2013; Saltman & Gabbard, 2010).

Parallel to the rise of standards-based, test-driven education, there has been an ever-growing resistance to it at the grassroots levels in the U.S. What started as a small movement in the education community in the 1990s—led by groups such as the Rouge Forum (Ross, Gibson, Queen, & Vinson, 2013), Chicago public school teachers and other educators who produce the newspaper *Substance*, including teacher and writer Susan Ohanian, The National Center for Fair and Open Testing (FairTest) and the Rethinking Schools collective—has blossomed into a widespread resistance movement.¹ For example, teachers in Chicago (Gutstein & Lipman, 2013; Kaplan, 2013) and Seattle (Strauss, 2013) have recently won important victories for the resistance to corporate education reforms.

While community-based groups across the U.S. continue to gain traction in efforts to derail test-driven education (Brown, 2013; Jaffe, 2013), the education de-formers led by Obama's education secretary Arne Duncan and corporate/philanthropic backers, including the Gates, Broad, and Walton Family foundations, still have the upper hand (Saltman, 2010), demanding use of student standardized tests results to make teacher personnel decisions in hiring, firing, and pay. And, the next big thing in standardized curriculum is known as the Common Core State Standards, which were created by Gates Foundation consultants for the National Governors Association (*The Trouble with the Common Core*, 2013).² The Common Core is, in effect, a national curriculum that will be enforced via tests currently being developed by publishing behemoth Pearson.³

The political and educational landscape in Canada differs in important ways from the U.S., but it is certainly not immune from the deleterious effects of neoliberal education reform. The Canadian education system is a collection of regional systems in which governments have advanced neoliberal agendas for public education, including fostering private schools (e.g., “increasing choice”), introducing a number of market mechanisms into the public school system, imposing standardized tests, enhancing competition between schools, and allowing private companies to advertise their products in schools. (Schuetze, et al., 2011, p. 62).

¹ See, for example: FairTest's “Testing and Resistance Reform News” (<http://fairtest.org/news/other>); Substance News (<http://www.substancenews.net>); Susan Ohanian's website (<http://www.susanohanian.org>); Rethinking Schools (<http://www.rethinkingschools.org>); and The Rouge Forum website (<http://www.rougeforum.org>).

² See various articles and blogs on the 2012 Quebec student protests here: <http://blogs.ubc.ca/workplace/?s=quebec>

³ See <http://commoncore.pearsoned.com/>

The province of British Columbia, in particular, is an important battleground over neoliberal education reform. BC is home to one of the most politically successful neoliberal governments in the world, and schoolteachers have been waging a pitched battle against the BC Liberals since the party swept into power in 2001.

The BC Liberals have closely followed the neoliberal blueprint by cutting taxes for the wealthy, slashing social programs, privatizing state-owned enterprises, goods, and services, and attacking unions, particularly the British Columbia Teachers Federation (BCTF). In 2002, the Liberal government imposed draconian legislation on public sector workers that overrode provisions in existing collective bargaining agreements. Bills 27 and 28, which applied to teachers, unilaterally deleted contract provisions that applied to class-size maximum; class composition; staffing levels; support for inclusion of students with special needs; length of the school day; and hours of instruction in the school year (Macdonald, 2010). Over the past decade BCTF has challenged and won legal decisions against the government's actions, yet the government has not yet complied with the court decisions. Since the BC Liberals took power, there has been only one voluntarily negotiated collective agreement with the BCTF, which is the single, province-wide bargaining unit for teachers.

School governance in the province is also “an entirely top-down approach, but with the appearance of local influence” via local school planning councils (Schuetze et al., 2011, p.73). While BC does not have the proliferation of standardized tests that exists in the USA, standardized tests scores are used by the Fraser Institute, an influential neoliberal think tank, to rank schools in BC. Fraser Institute rankings are used to promote the notion “choice” in education and generally serve as a means for categorizing poorer, more diverse public schools as “failing,” while wealthy private schools dominate the top spots.

In BC, government retains its authority over public education, but no longer undertakes the responsibility of assuring the educational well-being of the public. Instead, this responsibility is devolved to individual school boards.

Take, for example, the 2010 feud between Vancouver School Board (VSB) and the British Columbia Ministry of Education. Faced with a \$16 million budget shortfall, the Vancouver school trustees, who have a mandate to meet the needs of their students, lobbied for more provincial funding to avoid draconian service cuts. The government refused the request, and its special advisor to the VSB criticized trustees for engaging in “advocacy” rather than making “cost containment” first priority. The special advisor's budget gap solution was for the VSB to close schools, cancel programs, fire teachers, and raise rental rates on non-profit organizations that provide services, such as after-school care, which are in short supply.

The VSB, indeed all school boards and other social services in the province, are now subject to the rule of the market, thus justifying “cost containment” as the first priority of those mandated to deliver education to the public. In this context, education is treated like any other commodity. Free market competition is viewed as the route to assure a quality product. And “efficiency” or “cost containment” is prized.

It was no accident that when the province appointed the special advisor to examine the Vancouver board's budget processes, it specifically excluded the key issue raised by the trustees and every other school board in the province, the structure of the provincial funding model for education. School boards are now expected to become part of the market by relegating the educational needs of their communities and making the financial bottom-line the first priority.

The funding model for public education in BC reflects the neoliberal principle that more of public's collective wealth should be devoted to maximizing private profits rather than serving public needs. The privatization and marketization of public schools in BC is being pursued through multiple strategies, including:

Private schools (known as independent schools in BC) now receive over \$200 million per year in public funding, with some schools receiving 35-50% of their funding from taxpayers and private schools for low-incidence, severely disabled students receiving 100% public funding;

School districts are encouraged to sell seats in public schools to international students. International students pay about \$12,000/year tuition to attend BC public schools, which is about twice as much as the provincial grant for Canadian students in public schools;

Public school districts are now allowed to create private, for-profit business companies to set up overseas schools staffed by BC certified teachers teaching the BC provincial curriculum as a way to make up for inadequate government funding;

Inadequate funding from the province has pushed local parent groups into more and more fundraising and made schools more vulnerable to corporate incursions, which include advertising and corporate-branded private grants to support core curricular as well as extra-curricular school activities. (Schuetze, et al., 2011)

Canada, like the U.S., has also seen a dramatic pushback against neoliberal education reform. Perhaps the most widely known recent action was the 2012 Quebec student protests, aka Maple Spring, in response to government efforts to raise university tuition (Gibney, 2013). One of the more significant examples of resistance to the common-nonsense of neoliberalism in the past decade is the British Columbia teachers' 2005 strike, which united student, parent, and educator interests in resisting the neoliberal onslaught on education in the public interest (Rosen, 2005; Ross, 2005 February; 2005 November).

The first step in resisting neoliberalism is realizing that we are not "all in this together," that is, neoliberalism benefits the few at the expense of the many (Ross & Gibson, 2007). The corporate mass media would have us adopt the mantra that what is good for the corporate capitalist class is good for the rest of us—thus we have the "logic" of "efficiency" or "cost containment" in education prized over the educational well-being of the public.

The central narrative about education (and other social goods) has been framed in ways that serve the interests of capital. For example, in North America, free market neoliberals in think tanks and foundations and in the dominant media outlets have been successful in framing discussions on education in terms of accountability, efficiency, and market competition. The assumptions underlying these narratives are typically unquestioned or at least under-analyzed. Indeed, neoliberal education reforms are not only flawed in their assumptions, but even when judged on their own terms, these reforms are empirical failures and have worsened the most pressing problems of public education, including funding inequalities, racial segregation, and anti-intellectualism (Saltman, 2012; Stedman, 2010; 2011).

It is imperative that educators challenge the dominant neoliberal frames that would define education as just another commodity from which profits are to be extracted. Examples of

resistance include individual teachers working to reframe government-mandated curricula in their classrooms (e.g., Ross & Queen, 2010) as well as collective resistance of students, teachers, parents, and community activists working together on a broad array of fronts, such as the Rouge Forum (Gibson, Queen, Ross, & Vinson, 2009) or the March 4/October 7 movement in the U.S. (Education 4 the People!, 2010).

In the pages that follow, we examine narratives of conflict with and resistance to neoliberal (and neo-conservative) inspired education policies in Canada and the U.S., describing circumstances of teaching and learning in schools where academic freedom and free speech are severely limited and education has become merely a means of social control. In response to these circumstances, we offer ideas that we hope will foster pedagogies of resistance to and subversion of neoliberal schooling—insurrectionist pedagogies aimed to make learners (and teachers) dangerous citizens.

Mac the Turtle, Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and Other Threats to Students in BC Schools⁴

First, Dr. Seuss's *Yertle the Turtle* was deemed too political for British Columbia classrooms, then the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms—specifically the provision that protects free speech—was the subject of censorship in the Prince Rupert School District (No. 52). In an effort to “shield children from political messaging,” Prince Rupert school administrators and trustees have been vigilant (to the point of absurdity) in their attempts to enforce a 2011 arbitrator's ruling that BC students must be insulated from political messages in schools.

Yertle the Turtle—one of six Dr. Seuss books that have repeatedly been banned or censored—is a story of the turtle king of a pond who stacks himself on top of other turtles in order to reach the moon, and then yells at them when they complain (Baldassarro, 2011). Last year, a Prince Rupert teacher was told a quote from the story is a political statement that could not be displayed or worn on clothing in her classroom. The quote in question is: “I know up on top you are seeing great sights, but down here on the bottom, we too should have rights.”⁵ The teacher had included the quote in materials brought to a meeting with school officials after she received a notice about union material that was visible in her car on school property. The story, written in 1958 by Theodor Seuss Geisel, is an allegory of the subversion of fascism and authoritarian rule. Ironically, the Prince Rupert School District website prominently displays a message that “everyone should be safe from bullying. Don't let them control you and keep you down.”⁶

In January 2013, the Prince Rupert school district struck again, banning several teachers from wearing t-shirts that displayed the Shakespearean question “2(b) or not 2(b)” on the front and excerpts from Section 2 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms on the back:

⁴ This section is adapted from Ross' keynote address to the 6th Annual Conference on Equity and Social Justice: Testing Our Limits: Teaching and Learning with Courage and Conviction, State University of New York, New Paltz, March 3, 2013.

⁵ Watch video of *Yertle The Turtle* here:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=9FFfbSWbLWw

⁶ <http://www.sd52.bc.ca/sd52root/%5D>

“Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms: (a) freedom of conscience and religion; (b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication; (c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and (d) freedom of association.”

Three Prince Rupert teachers were told to remove or cover the black shirts they wore during a “dark day for education” event organized to mark the anniversary of Bills 27 and 28, legislation that stripped BC teachers’ rights to collectively bargain class size and composition. The BC Civil Liberties Association (2013) called on the district to reverse the ban, comparing the district’s action to a “badly-written comedy sketch” and stated that, “As a government body, [Prince Rupert] School District No. 52 is bound by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, including the guarantee of freedom of expression and freedom of association. Governments can only limit such rights in a narrow range of circumstances, according to legal tests established by the Supreme Court of Canada.”

Since 2004, there have been a series of disputes between teachers and the British Columbia Public School Employers’ Association (BCPSEA) over teachers’ rights to express their views on public issues. Most recently, arbitrator Mark Thompson delivered a ruling in response to a 2009 grievance filed by teachers after the Southeast Kootnay School District (No. 5) told teachers to remove materials from bulletin boards and classroom doors related to the British Columbia Teachers’ Federation “When Will They Learn” campaign.⁷ The union’s campaign focused attention on school closures, overcrowded classrooms, and lack of support for students with special needs. Thompson’s decision came eight months after arbitrator Emily Burkes found that the Kamloops/Thompson School District (No. 73) was justified in its infringement of teachers’ freedom of expression when district administrators ordered teachers to remove and refrain from talking to students about the black arm bands they were wearing to protest the BC’s Foundation Skills Assessment tests. The British Columbia Teachers’ Federation (BCTF) is appealing Thompson’s decision.

In the case before Thompson, the BCPSEA argued that limiting teachers’ free speech rights was justified in light of several objectives including: (a) schools must be politically neutral; (b) prohibition of partisan political messages is necessary for the maintenance of public confidence in the school system; (c) students must be insulated from partisan political messages while at school; (d) prohibition of political messages displayed by teachers is needed to ensure professionalism of the teaching staff; and (e) regulation of partisan buttons is a necessary exercise of a principal’s authority to manage and organize schools.

The union, in line with the employers, argued that protecting students from hateful or discriminatory speech or indoctrination is an important objective, but that students did not need to be sheltered from political controversy. The materials in this case—which focused on class size and composition and support for special needs students—the union argued, did not fall into the category of partisan political messages. On this point Arbitrator Thompson agreed, describing the materials in question as “issue advertisements.” In other words, the materials addressed educational issues, the messages were political, but not partisan. Thompson’s reasoning was that while the materials appeared in conjunction with elections, “they did not mention a political party, let alone endorse one” (Thompson, 2011, p. 37).

⁷ View a BCTF television commercial from this campaign here: <http://bctf.ca/publications/NewsMagArticle.aspx?id=17420>

Nonetheless, using tortured logic, Thompson reasoned that “insulating students from political messages in the classroom is a ‘pressing and substantial objective’” (p. 45) and concluded that teachers may not introduce the “When Will They Learn” campaign material “either in the form of printed matter or buttons worn on their garments into the classroom or the walls or doors immediately adjacent to classrooms” (p. 47). Further the arbitrator concluded:

that the messages in question were worded to influence parents, not students. However, the location for posters and buttons worn by teachers were unlikely to reach many parents compared to the number of students who would see them. In other words, the impairment on [teachers’] expression directed at parents was minimal. The deleterious effects of the restriction on teachers’ expression were proportional to the salutary effects of the insulation of the students. (p. 46)

While Thompson found the limits on teachers’ expression in this case “proportional” and “minimal” he established a foundation for much more extensive restrictions on teachers’ expression by accepting at face value the school employer’s objective of “insulating students from political discourse in the classroom.” In a similar case in the United States (*California Teachers Association v. Governing Board of San Diego Unified School District*, 1996) that involved teachers wearing buttons, the court stated that “the only practical means of dissociating a school from political controversy is to prohibit teachers from engaging in political advocacy during instructional activities” (p. 6).

Of course it is easy to identify the potential problems of partisan electoral politics in schools. (Although one might also describe electoral politics in North America as generally serving to distract the people from issues that matter in much the same way as watching the National Football League and drinking beer.) The issues of the teacher as authority figure and students as impressionable and “vulnerable to messages from teachers” are always at the forefront of these discussions. And, inevitably someone uses the phrase about “the role of teachers moulding young minds,” and that is exactly the point. In his decision, Arbitrator Thompson writes that, “when a teacher advocates political views...this intrudes on the political neutrality of the school” (p. 25). Indeed, all the parties in the Cranbrook arbitration, including the teachers’ union, agreed (albeit with slightly different levels of significance) that “maintenance of political neutrality in schools” was an objective. Is this naiveté or the result of arguments undone by a logical fallacy? Either way, the belief that schools are or could be politically neutral belies the nature of schools and the way they function in society.

Ideology of Neutrality, or What Exactly Are We Protecting Students From?

It is not really surprising that the BCTF agreed with the schools’ employers that schools should be “politically neutral.” Educators often eschew openly political or ideological agendas for teaching and schools as inappropriate or “unprofessional.” The question, however, is not whether to allow political discourse in schools or to encourage particular social visions in the classroom, but rather what kind of social visions will be taught?

There is a misguided and unfortunate tendency in our society to believe that activities that strengthen or maintain the *status quo* are neutral or at least non-political, while activities that critique or challenge the status quo are “political” and inappropriate. For example, for a company to advertise its product as a good thing, something consumers should buy, is not viewed as a political act. But, if a consumer group takes out an advertisement charging that the company’s product is not good, perhaps even harmful, this is often understood as political action.

This type of thinking permeates our society, particularly when it comes to schooling and teaching. “Stick to the facts.” “Guard against bias.” “Maintain neutrality.” These are admonitions or goals expressed by some teachers when asked to identify the keys to successful teaching. Many of these same teachers (and teacher educators) conceive of their roles as designing and teaching courses to ensure that students are prepared to function non-disruptively in society as it exists. This is thought to be a desirable goal, in part, because it strengthens the status quo and is seen as being an “unbiased” or “neutral” position. Many of these same teachers view their work in school as apolitical, a matter of effectively covering the curriculum, imparting academic skills, and preparing students for whatever high-stakes tests they might face. Often these teachers have attended teacher education programs designed to ensure that they were prepared to adapt to the status quo in schools.

Anyone who has paid attention to the debates on curriculum and school reform knows that schooling is a decidedly political enterprise (DeLeon & Ross, 2010; Mathison & Ross, 2008a; Mathison & Ross, 2008b; Ross & Gibson, 2007; Ross & Marker, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c). The question in teaching (as well as teacher education and school reform) is not whether to allow political discourse in schools or whether to advocate or not, but the nature and extent of political discourse and advocacy. “The question is not whether to encourage a particular social vision in the classroom but what kind of social vision it will be” (Teitelbaum, 1998, p. 32).

It is widely believed that neutrality, objectivity, and unbiasedness are largely the same thing and always good when it comes to schools and teaching. But, consider the following. *Neutrality is a political category*—that is—not supporting any factions in a dispute. Holding a neutral stance in a conflict is no more likely to ensure rightness or objectivity than any other and may be a sign of ignorance of the issues. Michael Scriven (1991) puts it this way: “Being neutral is often a sign of error in a given dispute and can be a sign of bias; more often it is a sign of ignorance, sometimes of culpable or disabling ignorance” (p. 68). Demanding neutrality of schools and teachers comes at a cost. As Scriven points out there are “clearly situations in which one wants to say that being neutral is a sign of bias” (p. 67). For example, being neutral in the debate on the occurrence of the Holocaust; a debate on atomic theory with Christian Scientists; or a debate with fundamentalist Christians over the origins of life and evolution. To rephrase Scriven, it seems better not to require that schools include only neutral teachers at the cost of including ignoramuses or cowards and getting superficial teaching and curriculum.

Absence of bias is not absence of convictions in an area, thus *neutrality is not objectivity*. To be objective is to be unbiased or unprejudiced. People are often misled to think that anyone who comes into a discussion with strong views about an issue cannot be unprejudiced. The key question, however, is whether and how the views are justified (e.g., Scriven, 1994).

“A knowledge claim gains objectivity...to the degree that it is the product of exposure to the fullest range of criticisms and perspectives” (Anderson, 1995, p. 198). Or as John Dewey (1910) argued, thoughts and beliefs that depend upon authority (e.g., tradition, instruction, imitation) and are not based on a survey of evidence are prejudices, prejudgments. Thus, achieving objectivity in teaching and the curriculum requires that we take seriously alternative perspectives and criticisms of any particular knowledge claim. How is it possible to have or strive for objectivity in schools where political discourse is circumscribed and neutrality is demanded? Achieving pedagogical objectivity is no easy task. The objective teacher considers the most persuasive arguments for different points of view on a given issue; demonstrates evenhandedness; focuses on positions that are supported by evidence, etc.

This kind of approach is not easy, and often requires significant quantities of time, discipline, and imagination. In this light, it is not surprising that objectivity is sometimes regarded as impossible, particularly with contemporary social issues in which the subject matter is often controversial and seemingly more open to multiple perspectives than in the natural sciences. However, to borrow a phrase from Karl Popper, objectivity in teaching can be considered a “regulative principle,” something toward which one should strive but which one can never attain. (Corngold & Waddington, 2006, p. 6)

The “ideology of neutrality” that dominates current thought and practices in schools (and in teacher education) is sustained by theories of knowledge and conceptions of democracy that constrain rather than widen civic participation in our society and functions to obscure political and ideological consequences of so-called “neutral” schooling, teaching, and curriculum. These consequences include conceptions of the learner as passive; democratic citizenship as a spectator project; and ultimately the maintenance of status quo inequalities in society.

Education for (Dangerous) Citizenship

Schools have always been about some form of social or citizenship education—about helping students to become good or effective citizens—framed primarily from an essentialist view of good citizen as knower of traditional facts, but there have been attempts to develop a social reconstructionist view of the good citizen as agent of progressive (or even radical) social change or from some other competing view (e.g., Kincheloe, 2011). Given its fundamental concern with the nature of society and with the meaning(s) of democracy, social studies education has always been a contested domain, a struggled-over territory in the classroom and curriculum.

Next we consider what a contemporary critical social studies/citizenship education might mean, both in terms of the challenges it presents to school curriculum and in terms of the pedagogy through which it approach might be actualized.

Social Control and Citizenship Education

Yes, citizenship—above all in a society like ours, of such authoritarian and racially, sexually, and class-based discriminatory traditions—is really an invention, a political production. In this sense, one who suffers any of the discriminations...does not enjoy the full exercise of citizenship as a peaceful and recognized right. On the contrary, it is a right to be reached and whose conquest makes democracy grow substantively. Citizenship implies freedom...Citizenship is not obtained by chance: It is a construction that, never finished, demands we fight for it. It demands commitment, political clarity, coherence, decision. For this reason a democratic education cannot be realized apart from an education of and for citizenship. (Freire, 1998, p. 90)

The nature of citizenship and the meanings of citizenship education are complex, as are their multiple and contradictory implications for contemporary schooling and everyday life. The issues citizenship education presents are critical and inexorably linked to the present and future status of public schooling and the maintenance, strengthening, and expansion of individual and democratic rights.

In his classic book *Democracy and Education*, John Dewey (1916) opens with a discussion of the way in which all societies use education as a means of social control. Dewey argues that education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind. In other words, there is no “objective” answer to questions about the means and ends of citizenship education, because those purposes are not things that can be discovered.

In *Normative Discourse*, Paul Taylor (1961) succinctly states a maxim that has the potential to transform our approach to schooling, curriculum, and educational reform: “We must decide what ought to be the case. We cannot discover what ought to be the case by investigating what is the case” (p. 278). We—educators and citizens—must decide what ought to be the purpose of education. That means asking what kind of society, what kind of world we want to live in and then taking action to make it a reality. And, in particular, in what sense of democracy do we want this to be a democratic society? In order to construct meaning for education, we must engage these questions not as merely abstract or rhetorical, but in relation to our lived experiences and our professional practice as educators.

Not surprisingly then, civics and citizenship education—which is generally accepted as a primary purpose of the school curriculum—has always been a highly contested curricular area. The tapestry of topics, methods, and aims we know as social studies education has always contained threads of social reconstructionism (e.g., Hursh & Ross, 2000; Stanley, 2006). Social reconstructionists in North America, such as George S. Counts, Harold Rugg, and later Theodore Brameld, argued that teachers should work toward social change by teaching students to practice democratic principles, collective responsibility, and social and economic justice. Dewey advocated the democratic reconstruction of society and aspects of his philosophy inform some aspects of citizenship education. The traditional patterns of social studies teaching, curriculum, and teacher education, however, reflect little of the social reconstructionist vision of the future, and current practices in these areas are more often focused on implementing standardized curriculum and responding to high-stakes tests than developing and working toward a vision of a socially just world (Gabbard & Ross, 2008; Mathison & Ross, 2008; Vinson & Ross, 2003). Indeed, in North America, self-described social studies “contrarians” who advocate the “transmission” of “facts” and reject pluralism in favor of jingoistic nationalism and monoculturalism (e.g., Leming, Ellington, & Porter-Magee, 2003) seem to have the upper hand in most schools and classrooms, despite spirited resistance (Ross & Marker, 2005a; 2005b; 2005c).

Undoubtedly, good intentions undergird North American citizenship education programs such as *Expectations of Excellence*, *CIVITAS*, and *National Standards for Civics and Government*. And yet, as Vinson (2006) points out, too often their oppressive possibilities overwhelm and subsume their potential for anti-oppression, especially as states, the national government, and professional education associations continue their drive to standardize, and to impose a singular theory and practice of curriculum, instruction, and assessment (e.g., The National Governors Association’s Common Core State Standards Initiative).

Making Dangerous Citizens?

The Tucson (AZ) Mexican American Studies Program

The Mexican American studies program at Tucson (AZ, U.S.) High Magnet School provides a vivid example of the oppressive and anti-oppressive possibilities of civics and

citizenship education (as well as an illustration of how education functions as normative social control). In response to a 1974 racial desegregation order, Tucson schools established an African-American studies program and later added Mexican- American studies to the curriculum. The Mexican-American studies program included course work about historical and contemporary Mexican-American contributions, social justice, and stereotypes. Students examined U.S. history from a Chicano perspective, reading highly acclaimed works such as Rodolfo Acuña's *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* in addition to classics such as Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Lacey, 2011; Reinhart, 2011). Studies conducted by the Tucson schools have shown that Mexican-American students in the program scored higher on statewide tests (AIMS), were twice as likely to graduate from high school, and were three times as likely to go on to college as Mexican-American students who do not participate (Reinhart, 2011).

Early in 2010, Arizona passed anti-immigration legislation, which was widely condemned as undermining basic notions of fairness by politicians and commentators on the left and right as well as by religious, business, and law-enforcement leaders (Nichols, 2010). Less well known was the passage of another law, written by Arizona schools chief Tom Horne, which targeted Latino/a and other students in the state's public schools. The law (known as House Bill 2281) banned schools from teaching ethnic studies. And in January 2011, Horne, who was by then Arizona's Attorney General, declared the Mexican-American studies program in Tucson schools "illegal" stating it violated the law's four provisions, which prohibit any classes or courses that:

1. Promote the overthrow of the United States government;
 2. Promote resentment toward a race or class of people;
 3. Are designed primarily for pupils of a particular ethnic group; or
 4. Advocate ethnic solidarity instead of the treatment of pupils as individuals.
- (Horne, 2010; House Bill 2281, 2010)

Despite the solid curriculum and academic success of the program, Horne described the program as "propagandizing and brainwashing," less about educating than about creating future activists. If the program was not immediately scrapped, Horne said the Tucson school district would lose ten percent of its funding, which amounted to \$15 million.

The New York Times reported that students asked teachers if they were now considered terrorists since Horne described them as wanting to overthrow the government. If not terrorists, the state of Arizona declared these students, and their teachers, enemies of the state—dangerous citizens—for studying the history of the U.S. from a Chicano perspective, a perspective that makes it impossible to ignore the historical and contemporary manifestations of racism, imperialism, as well as social, economic, and political inequalities. Indeed, what Horne and the Arizona legislature did was make it illegal for students in Arizona to examine the key elements of capitalism: social relations, people and their struggle with nature to produce and reproduce life and its meanings, human beings seeking rational knowledge in order to survive, and individuals and groups fighting for freedom (Gibson & Ross, 2009).

Social Control and the Rewriting of History in Texas (and Florida)

In another example from the U.S., the 2010 revision of the Texas state curriculum standards was judged by historians as undermining the study of history and social sciences in

schools by misrepresenting and distorting the historical record of U.S. society (e.g., stressing the superiority of capitalism, questioning the secular state, and presenting conservative philosophies in a more positive light). The Texas curriculum standards are important not just to the education of students who reside there, but to the whole of the U.S. Because Texas is such a huge market for social studies and history textbooks, its curriculum standards are a template for the content textbook publishers produce for all U.S. schools.

The Texas curriculum standards outline the content of history and the social sciences for kindergarten through secondary school and present an ideologically conservative vision of history and society. Historian Eric Foner (2010) notes that,

Judging from the updated social studies curriculum, conservatives want students to come away from a Texas education with a favorable impression of: women who adhere to traditional gender roles, the Confederacy, some parts of the Constitution, capitalism, the military and religion. They do not think students should learn about women who demanded greater equality; other parts of the Constitution; slavery, Reconstruction and the unequal treatment of nonwhites generally; environmentalists; labor unions; federal economic regulation; or foreigners. (para. 3)

The curriculum revisions approved by the elected Texas Board of Education include removing mention of key events, documents, and people related to the women's rights movement (e.g., Declaration of the Seneca Falls Convention, John and Abigail Adams, and Carrie Chapman Catt). Thomas Jefferson (author of the Declaration of Independence and third President of the U.S.) was removed from a list of people who inspired 18th and 19th century revolutions and replaced by the religious and conservative figures St. Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, and William Blackstone.

As examples of “good citizenship” for third graders, the new curriculum deletes African-American abolitionist Harriet Tubman. And the “role of religion”—but not the separation of church and state—receives emphasis throughout. For example, religious revivals are now listed as one of the twelve major “events and eras” from colonial days to 1877. Curriculum revisions also include a reduction in the discussion of slavery (the trans-Atlantic slave trade is even renamed “Triangle Trade”); the Double-V Campaign of World War II (in which African-Americans demanded that victory over the Axis powers be accompanied by the end of racial segregation and discrimination in the U.S.) was deleted from the curriculum.

In economics, Texas students will now study the free-market economic theories of Milton Friedman and Friedrich von Hayek and be required to understand the “benefits,” but none of the deleterious effects, of capitalism, which has been re-named the “free enterprise system.” *The New York Times* quoted one conservative member of the Texas Board of Education as saying, “Let’s face it, capitalism does have a negative connotation, you know, ‘capitalist pig!’” as a justification for the name change (McKinley, 2010). The kindergarten curriculum deletes food, shelter, and clothing from its list of “basic human needs.” And, third graders taking geography no longer need to identify the Amazon or the Himalayans and so on (Foner, 2010).

The new Texas social studies curriculum is so distorted that the American Historical Association (AHA) condemned its “arbitrary selections and deletions” and noted among other things, that the Texas curriculum discounts “the importance of human activity in North America before the British colonization of the Atlantic Coast” and “omits the key elements of Indian,

Spanish, African, and Mexican people's presence and actions" thus resulting in a historical narrative that cannot be described as accurate (AHA, 2010).

Lastly—and adding evidence to recent claims that rationality is under assault and that the U.S. is awash in public stupidity—the Florida legislature has attempted to “raise historical literacy” by mandating the “teaching of facts” in the social studies curriculum. Indeed, Florida's elected officials have gone so far as officially banning historical interpretation in public schools, effectively outlawing critical thinking, with the passage of the Florida Education Omnibus Bill which specifies that,

American history shall be viewed as factual, not constructed, shall be viewed as knowable, teachable, and testable ... The history of the United States shall be taught as genuine history. (Craig, 2006)

Of course, as Westheimer (in press) points out, it matters not to Florida's politicians that historians almost universally regard history as exactly a matter of interpretation.

Dangerous Citizenship

So what to do?

In these circumstances, progressive educators must pursue, as obviously some already do, an agenda dedicated to the creation of a citizenship education that struggles against and disrupts inequalities and oppression (DeLeon & Ross, 2010; Ross & Queen, 2013). Classroom practice must work toward a citizenship education committed to exploring and affecting the contingencies of understanding and action and the possibilities of eradicating exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence in both schools and society. Freire, as illustrated in the quotation above, like Dewey, teaches us that citizenship education is essential to democratic education, and that democratic education is essential to a free and democratic society. In this same vein, Chomsky's assertion that “a fundamental need of human nature is the need for creative work, for creative inquiry, for free creation without the arbitrary limiting effects of coercive institutions,” challenges the foundational core of public schooling, which we have seen is geared toward social control. As Chomsky points out, it follows from this assertion that “a decent society should maximize the possibilities for these fundamental human needs to be realized in an effort to create a society in which “human beings do not have to be forced into the positions of tools, of cogs in a machine” (Achbar & Wintonick, 1992).

Students must know that birth, nationality, documents, and platitudes are not enough. They must understand that the promises of citizenship—that is, for example, freedom—and the fulfillment of its virtues, are unfinished, and that they remain an ongoing, dynamic struggle. And they must come to act in a variety of creative and ethical ways, for the expansion and realization of freedom and democracy, the root of contemporary notions of citizenship, is in their hands, and it demands of them no less than the ultimate in democratic and anti-oppressive human reflection and human activity.

Contemporary conditions demand an anti-oppressive citizenship education, one that takes seriously social and economic inequalities and oppression that result from neoliberal capitalism and builds upon the anti-oppressive possibilities of established and officially sanctioned approaches. Some new and potentially exciting directions and alternatives exist, however, within

the recent scholarship surrounding Freirean and neo-Freirean pedagogy, democratic education, and cultural studies.

Against the problematics just described, we propose an admittedly idiosyncratic notion, “dangerous citizenship.” The pedagogical power of “dangerous citizenship,” resides in its capacity to encourage students and educators to challenge the implications of their own education or work, to envision an education that is free and democratic to the core, and to interrogate and uncover their own well-intentioned complicity in the conditions within which various cultural texts and practices appear, especially to the extent that oppressive conditions create oppressive cultural practices, and vice versa. Too often citizenship education implies “docile” and “conforming,” spectatorial behavior and thought, a setting imposed and reinforced by controlling images, power-laden and reproductive sociopedagogy.

The practice of citizenship, critical citizenship, or social justice-oriented citizenship, requires that people, as individuals and collectively, take on actions and behaviors that bring with them certain necessary dangers; it transcends traditional maneuvers such as voting and signing petitions, etc. For citizenship today, from this perspective, requires a praxis-inspired mindset of *opposition and resistance*, an acceptance of a certain strategic and tactical stance. Of course, the implication here is that dangerous citizenship is dangerous to an oppressive and socially unjust status quo, to existing hierarchical structures of power.

Dangerous citizenship embodies three fundamental, conjoined, and crucial generalities: *political participation*, *critical awareness*, and *intentional action*. Its underlying aims rest upon the imperatives of resistance, meaning, disruption, and disorder.

Political participation implies partaking in the “traditional” rights and responsibilities of democratic citizenship. It does not intend, however, and should not be read to intend any sort of complacency or comfort relative to the dominant status quo. In fact, political participation might ironically insinuate *non-participation*. At its most simplistic political participation suggests such activities as (1) acting on the feasibilities of the freedoms of speech, assembly, religion, the press, and so on; and (2) undermining the actions of corporate-state government relative to, for example, abusing personal privacy and to contradicting the principles of justice, freedom, and equality (e.g., consider marches, demonstrations, petitions, etc.).

The second key component, *critical awareness*, builds on such constructs as Paulo Freire’s (1970) *conscientização*. Overall, its point and purpose is to enable the range of interested stakeholders to understand: (1) how things are; (2) that things can be different; and (3) how things might or should be. It is grounded, in part, within Freire’s conception of “reading the world” and Marx’s construction of “class consciousness” among other critical views (see Lukács, 1967).

The third and easily most complicated factor, *intentional action*, clearly could connote a range of useful activities. Intentional action refers most directly to those behaviors designed to instigate human connection, true engagement with everyday life, meaningful experience, communication, and change—behaviors that forcefully challenge passivity, commodification, and separation.

The challenge is what kind of pedagogies can be employed in support of dangerous citizenship? And, since we will not likely find inspiration for these pedagogies within the walls of the coercive and controlling institutions we call schools or in schools of education, where do

we look? Below we explore sources of inspiration, imaginaries, that might be used to create insurgent pedagogies—pedagogies that attempt to maximize the possibilities that education can fulfill the fundamental human needs for creative work, creative inquiry, and for free creation without the limiting effects of coercive institutions.

Pedagogical Imaginaries for Insurgent Pedagogies

As rigid, coercive, and hierarchical institutions in service of neoliberal capitalism, schools are not environments in which pedagogical imaginations are fostered or encouraged, though many creative teachers overcome the circumstances of their work (e.g., Ross & Queen, 2013). We have been pedagogically inspired by a wide range of theoretical and social practices outside the realm of education per se.

One example is Foucault's use of the *parrhesia*, or speaking openly and truthfully with the use of rhetoric, manipulation or generalization. Parrhesia is:

a kind of verbal activity where the speaker has a specific relation to truth through frankness, a certain relationship to his own life through danger, a certain type of relation to himself or other people through criticism (self-criticism or criticism of other people), and a specific relation to moral law through freedom and duty. More precisely, parrhesia is a verbal activity in which a speaker expresses his personal relationship to truth, and risks his life because he recognizes truth-telling as a duty to improve or help other people (as well as himself). In parrhesia, the speaker uses his freedom and chooses frankness instead of persuasion, truth instead of falsehood or silence, the risk of death instead of life and security, criticism instead of flattery, and moral duty instead of self-interest and moral apathy (Foucault, 2001, pp. 19-20)

Employing insurgent pedagogies may not be a life-threatening proposition it is certainly is risky one and there is no doubt that governments, school boards, and teacher education programs do much to discourage “truth-telling” in the classroom.

Another example is the work of Abraham P. DeLeon and a small cadre of educators who have done much to bring anarchist ideas to bear on educational practice (Anster, DeLeon, Fernandez, Nocella, & Shannon, 2009; DeLeon, 2008; 2010). As DeLeon points out there is an historical presence of anarchism in educational practice (Avrich, 2005; Gribble, 2004), but the subversive potential of anarchism in the classroom includes infusing teaching and learning with the spirit of revolt, using DIY techniques of social action, and conceptualizing the work of teaching as that of an agent infiltrating “the capitalist training grounds that public schools represent...”

... anarchists who want to provide a counter-narrative within these spaces, or, to perform *epistemological sabotage*, can utilize this type of strategy. Deconstructing state exams, questioning the textbook, providing alternative histories and voices and openly discussing resistance are a beginning, but it also must move to actually showing students how to resist. (DeLeon, 2010, p. 6)

As DeLeon points out, these practices come with great risk “as the public school classroom is filled with students who represent varying levels of political ideologies and indoctrination [and] must be done carefully if one is interested in keeping their employment” (p.

6). DeLeon also points to the need to construct anarchist pedagogical actions “within the context of community action combined with individual pursuits” (p. 6).

There are myriad other examples of post-left/insurrectionary anarchism that reflect the tenets of dangerous citizenship. Politically inspired performance artists described in *The Interventionists: User’s Manual for the Creative Disruption of Everyday Life* (Thompson & Sholette, 2004) are exemplary role models of dangerous citizenship and have much to offer teachers interested in creating pedagogies of resistance:

- Artists producing work that encourages individual mobility and freedom (Ruben Ortiz-Torres);
- Artists who produce actions that occur within the public sphere (Surveillance Camera Players);
- Artists who deploy aesthetic strategies in other discourses including anthropology and urban geography (e.g. simulating “dirty bombs,” recreating germ warfare tests) (subRosa; Critical Art Ensemble); and
- Artists who produce tools and clothing to augment the wearers’ sense of personal autonomy (The Yes Men, Center for Tactical Magic).

Social movements to preserve the commons such as Occupy and Standing Man (Taksim Square in Istanbul) are rich models for thinking about how to appropriate public education spaces for common rather than capitalist interests (Holmes, 2013).

In the following sections we explore de Certeau’s (1984) understanding of *la perruque* and the Situationist International’s techniques of *dérive* and *détournement* as imaginaries for pedagogies that might foster dispositions and behaviors consistent with the conception of dangerous citizenship. We present these techniques as frameworks for intentional actions that might be reconfigured as insurrectionist pedagogies. But there are many sources that can serve as inspiration for the creation of pedagogies that aim to engender dangerous citizenship; thus we are not presenting a program to be carried out in all circumstances, but rather attempting to provoke pedagogical imaginations.

La Perruque as Insurrectionist Pedagogy

La perruque is the worker’s own work disguised as work for his [sic] employer. It differs from pilfering in that nothing of material value is stolen. It differs from absenteeism in that the worker is officially on the job. *La perruque* may be as simple a matter as a secretary’s writing a love letter on “company time” or as complex as a cabinetmaker’s “borrowing” a lathe to make a piece of furniture for his living room. Under different names in different countries this phenomenon is becoming more and more general, even if managers penalize it or “turn a blind eye” on it in order not to know about it. Accused of stealing or turning material to his own ends and using the machines for his own profit, the worker who indulges in *la perruque* actually diverts time (not goods, since he uses only scraps) from the factory for work that is free, creative, and precisely not directed toward profit. In the very place where the machine he must serve reigns supreme, he cunningly takes pleasure in finding a way to create gratuitous products whose sole purpose is to signify his own capabilities through his work and to confirm his solidarity

with other workers or his family through spending his time in this way. With the complicity of other workers (who thus defeat the competition the factory tries to instill among them), he succeeds in “putting one over” on the established order on its home ground. Far from being a regression toward a mode of production organized around artisans or individuals, *la perruque* reintroduces “popular” techniques of other times and other places into the industrial space (that is, into the Present order). (de Certeau, 1984, pp. 25–26).

Mr. Hand: Am I hallucinating here? Just what in the hell do you think you’re doing?

Jeff Spicoli: Learnin’ about Cuba and havin’ some food.

Mr. Hand: Mister Spicoli you’re on dangerous ground here. You’re causing a major disturbance on my time.

Jeff Spicoli: You know, I’ve been thinking about this Mr. Hand. If I’m here and you’re here, doesn’t that make it *our* time?⁸

La perruque represents what could be the most fundamental and subversive mode of pedagogical resistance. But, in order to grasp its utility, its import, several convictions must first be considered. Schooling must, for instance, be seen as “our time” and not simply a managed or enculturating time, unquestioned labor-work, controlled by and supportive of the authorities (though frequently this is the case). Moreover, the rationale for enacting *la perruque* must be consistent with promoting democracy, collectivity, and authenticity and opposed to oppression. Third, *la perruque* must be about capabilities and solidarity, that is it must empower teachers and students to chase their interests, desires, skills, and abilities while simultaneously encouraging them to connect and form communities with one another—within and across classrooms and within and across schools, etc.

What matters most, then, is that here students and teachers enact a program aimed at counteracting the neoliberal status quo. Thus, for example, representations that posit particular views of, say, the good teacher or good student or good school, or that privilege certain constructions or relationships of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, language, and religion (etc.), must be vigorously and critically challenged. Teachers and students should pursue their own everyday lives in schools, therefore, as schools make sense only within the everyday lives of teachers and students.

To illustrate, *la perruque*–inspired instruction might create school “assignments” that attack school assignments. If schools have a homework policy, for instance, teachers and students might create projects in which they examine critically homework’s positive and negative aspects. They might develop “tests” in which essays ask students to critique standardized testing. They might use “their” time to critique and create their own content standards. Of course teachers and students might simply use their time to do things other than mandated schoolwork, perhaps operating directly against formal dictates. (We are not necessarily

⁸ Student Jeff Spicoli to teacher Mr. Hand in *Fast Times at Ridgemont High*, after Jeff orders a pizza delivered to his social studies classroom (Heckerling & Crowe, 1982)

advocating any particular techniques, but merely offering samples of what might be done. We encourage teachers and students to develop their own situated pedagogies. We note, too, that this section might lead one to think of the actions of student Eddie Pilikian [played by Ralph Macchio] in the movie *Teachers* [Hiller & McKinney, 1984] as he succeeds in videotaping the many absurdities that occur at his school in the name of education.) What is at stake, at minimum, is who controls school time and to what ends, who gets to decide what education is, what forms of teaching and learning matter, and what finally it actually means to matter. For we are not suggesting that teachers and students “waste” time or that they engage in unimportant activities.

What these actions do, though, is clarify how *la perruque* might be used as an insurgent pedagogy and within the demands of democracy, authenticity, the collective good, and anti-oppression. Teachers, students, and schools would be playing with their stereotypical images, whether as good, or bad, or mediocre, or hardworking, or lazy, or whatever. Schools, teachers, and students typically seen as good, hardworking, and mainstream might now be would be seen as radical and bad, perhaps even as failing. Those viewed as failing would be able to claim that they are hardworking (they are doing homework and taking tests after all) and as successful as those against whom they are usually held up to as competitors. Ideally, all would come to challenge the mechanisms of what counts as a “good education” in the neoliberal age, especially its potentially negative consequences, and to question the evidence upon which such images are produced and disseminated and the motives of those who perpetuate them.

Further, teachers and students would begin seeing their broad and intimate relationships with one another, across classrooms, schools, and districts, and that under dominant circumstances some are unfairly held up while some are unfairly held down (i.e., because of economics, power, race, ethnicity, neighborhood, language, religion, and so forth). Such work would be radically democratic as it would reside primarily in the hands of students and teachers themselves and thus dangerous to the status quo. It could be anti-oppressive to the extent that it frustrated Freire’s conception of banking education and that it negated the five faces of oppression as outlined by Young (1992), namely exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence (Vinson, 2006). It would be authentic as it would reflect the lived experiences of teachers and students and as it took their individual and collective wants, needs, desires, interests, backgrounds, and subjectivities as uniquely legitimate.

Dérive and Détournement as Insurrectionist Pedagogy

In the mid-twentieth century, Guy Debord and other members of the Situationist International (SI) advocated techniques not yet extensively explored for their conceivable and critical pedagogical significance, yet these techniques of special interest given their promise vis-à-vis the controlling and enforcing propensities of standards-based education its companion, high-stakes testing.⁹

⁹ The published works of Guy Debord and other members of the Situationist International are widely available online. The Bureau of Public Secrets (<http://bopsecrets.org>) and the library at nothingness.org (<http://library.nothingness.org>) are excellent resources.

The first, the *dérive*, literally “drifting,” implies “a mode of experimental behavior linked to the conditions of urban society: it is a technique of transient passage through varied ambiances” (Situationist International, 1981, p. 45). According to Debord (1981):

In a *dérive* one or more persons during a certain period drop their usual motives for movement and action, their relations, their work and leisure activities, and let themselves be drawn by the attractions of the terrain and the encounters they find there. The element of chance is less determinant than one might think: from the *dérive* point of view cities have a psychogeographical relief, with constant currents, fixed points and vortexes which strongly discourage entry into or exit from certain zones. (p. 50)

For the SI, “psychogeography” referred to “the study of the specific effects of the geographical environment, consciously organized or not, on the emotions and behavior of individuals” (p. 45).

On the second technique, *détournement*, literally “diversion,” is short for “*détournement* of preexisting aesthetic elements or the integration of present or past artistic production into a superior construction of a milieu” (Situationist International, p. 45-46).

Détournement involves a quotation, or more generally a re-use, that “adapts” the original element to a new context, the theft of aesthetic artifacts from their contexts and their diversion into contexts of one’s own device. In short, a *détournement* is a variation on a previous media work, in which the newly created one has a meaning that is antagonistic or antithetical to the original.

Examples of *détournement* can be found scattered across the landscape of popular culture. For example, culture jamming in the form of conceptual artist Barbara Kruger’s (1987) black and white photographs with overlaid captions such as “I shop therefore I am” and Adbusters magazine’s “Subvertisements” aim to disrupt and subvert corporate advertising (Adbusters spoof ads, n.d.; Discussion, n.d.; Lasn, 2009).

Artist and punk rocker Frank Discussion is known for his adaptation of Situationist tactics and the development of “antistasiology” or the study of resistance (Antistasiology, n.d.). Discussion subverts or derails events by intervening with an out-of-place element in the physical world, aimed at raising critical consciousness and critiquing society. For example, Discussion created and distributed 5,000 copies of “Bored With School,” a broadside against school and work, which was made to look like an official statement from the elected chief of the Arizona Department of Education (Discussion, 1981). His “Bush spells out ‘War is Peace’ policy” is a *détournement* of a CNN.com news report that brilliantly illustrates the doublespeak of contemporary politicians and the mainstream media (Discussion, n. d., War is Peace).

In the early 1980s, Discussion and his band, Feederz, *détourned* an image of Ronald Reagan for the cover of the album *Let Them Eat Jellybeans!*, which was one of the earliest compilations of punk rock/art rock in North America (*Let Them Eat Jellybeans!*, 1981). More recently Jello Biafra and the Guantanamo School of Medicine followed suit by adapting the Barack Obama “Hope” poster for the cover of their album *Audacity of Hype* (Biafra, 2009).¹⁰

¹⁰ For additional examples of *détournement* see Ross (2010, 2011).

Together *dérive* and *détournement* sprang from Debord and his colleagues' "dreams of a reinvented world," a world of experiment and play. According to Greil Marcus (1989):

These means were two: [jointly] the "dérive," a drift down city streets in search of signs of attraction or repulsion, and "détournement," the theft of aesthetic artifacts from their contexts and their diversion into contexts of one's own device. ...

[Ideally] to practice *détournement*—to write new speech balloons for newspaper comic strips, or for that matter old masters, to insist simultaneously on a "devaluation" of art and its "reinvestment" in a new kind of social speech, a "communication containing its own criticism," a technique that could not mystify because its very form was a demystification—and to pursue the *dérive*—to give yourself up to the promises of the city, and then to find them wanting—to drift through the city, allowing its signs to divert, to "detourn," your steps, and then to divert those signs yourself, forcing them to give up routes that never existed before—there would be no end to it. It would be to begin to live a truly modern way of life, made out of pavement and pictures, words and weather: a way of life anyone could understand and anyone could use. (pp. 168, 170)

As techniques of resistance aimed toward the enforcement elements of neoliberal education and high-stakes testing, what might *dérive* and *détournement* mean? What might they look like? How might they be applied? And how might they work?

Applied to schooling and high-stakes testing, the *dérive*, the more difficult of the two, demands first a re-understanding of the geographical shifts brought on by changes in gaze-based technologies and advanced state capitalism. *Dérive* is a social act, and might include students and teachers would move communally, cooperatively, drifting as it were through buildings, courses, curriculum, but also through cyberspace, virtual space, hyperspace, through the various architectures of contemporary schooling, as they were attracted or repelled, as their emotions and behaviors were piqued.

Perhaps the most recent and best example of *dérive* is from China's "Jasmine Revolution" (named in homage of the Middle East uprisings) where, on February 20, 2011, anonymous tweets from a blogger (Jason Ng aka Shudong) produced public gatherings in more than a dozen cities (2011 Chinese pro-democracy protests, 2011). The protests did not escalate beyond large roaming crowds, such as the one that formed at a McDonald's restaurant in Wangfujing, Beijing's major retail shopping district. Yet, journalists reported an "ambiguous revolutionary atmosphere" even though the crowds were not actually protesting (Demick & Pierson, 2011). What turned into regular Sunday strolls became a highly effective psychological operation against the Chinese government. These *dérives*, where people simply come out and psychogeographically walk, circumvent the bans on public protest in China, but they brought on serious responses from China's massive security apparatus, which included the arrest of over 30 pro-democracy activists (including prototypical dangerous citizen Ai Weiwei, an internationally known artist, cultural critic, and dissident whose work blurs the boundaries of art and politics), as well as censorship, stepped up security measures, and the banning of the jasmine flower.¹¹ By

¹¹ Videos of the Wangfujing strolls are available on the internet, see for example: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DkBceA-WEmQ>

March 2011 *dérives* were taking place at 55 locations in 41 cities, all of them popular gathering spots such as Starbucks in Guangzhou and in front of the statue of Mao Zedong in Chengdu (Boxun, 2011; “Jasmine Revolution” Beijing Wangfujing assembly, heavily guarded, 2011).

Taking their lead from China’s Jasmine Revolution, student drifters might, for instance, freely enter or exit schools (both physical and virtual) as they were encouraged or discouraged to do so, and they would seek simply to experience, to disrupt, or to play. They would surf websites, confronting relevant images, come and go, utilize monitors and web cams for “travel,” compelled toward or away from various zones, from, say, “official” image bases, from control, and from the enforcing effects of standardization schemes.

Conceivably, albeit in the extreme, they could drift in and out of—even hack into—testing locales and interrupt them, create with them, toy with them, occupy them. They could, moreover, enter and exit classrooms, schools, central offices, government domains, and media positions where high-stakes testing is enacted and where, in the end, controlling images are most oppressively enacted, all as a means of resistance.

Consider too the lessons to be learned by civic educators from Wikileaks (<http://wikileaks.org/>)—the nonprofit media organization that enables independent sources to leak information, including state secrets (e.g., Afghan War Diary; Iraq War Logs; and hundreds of thousands of U.S. State Department cables), to journalists.

Wikileaks is not the one-off creation of a solitary genius; it is the product of decades of collaborative work by people engaged in applying computer hacking to political causes, in particular, to the principle that information-hoarding is evil. (Ludlow, 2010)

Wikileaks, and hacktivist culture in general, are based upon the “hacker ethics” of (1) all information should be free; and (2) mistrust of authority and the promotion of decentralization (Levy, 1984), two ideas that must be seriously engaged with in any educational endeavor that claims to promote democracy and freedom.

With respect to *détournement*, the implications for resistance are perhaps clearer, especially within the contexts of surveillance, and spectacle.

Consider, for example, this plausible newspaper headline:

PRESIDENT OBAMA, SECRETARY DUNCAN ANNOUNCE
“RACE TO THE TOP”

Plan Emphasizes Paying Teachers Based On Student Test Scores

In and of itself, this seems (or may seem to some) innocuous, even positive, in that the administration will be devoting billions of dollars to schools, seeking to ensure that data collection tells us whether improvements are actually happening, and tying student achievement to assessments of teachers. Suppose, however, that as a mode of resistance, the headline is juxtaposed next to a poster illustrating what we know about the history of paying teachers for student performance, which is that pay for performance gains are mostly illusions:

- In England, when payment-for-results was finally dropped in the 1890s, the overwhelming judgment was that it was unsound policy. Cynics referred to schools as “grant factories” and children as “grant-earning units.”

- Payment-by-results appeared briefly in Canada in 1876, causing conservatives to rejoice because it made teachers and students work harder to avoid failure. The Canadian experience showed that test scores could be increased quickly, so long as the subject matter could be narrowed and measured. But, as in England, the system caused teachers to focus their energies on students who were most likely to succeed, helping them cram for examinations while ignoring the others. In 1883, a public outcry ended the experiment abruptly.
- Nearly a century later in the U.S., a “performance contracting” experiment in Arkansas produced only scandal and the lack of results ultimately doomed performance contracting, and it was declared a failure. Like the earlier English and Canadian experiments, performance contracting once again showed how financial incentives failed to produce expected gains, while at the same time generating damaging educational effects.

As a second example, imagine this newspaper headline:

HALF OF STATE’S PUBLIC SCHOOLS DON’T MAKE THE GRADE
IN READING AND MATH
*Schools Rated Poorly Could Lose Students or be Closed*¹²

Suppose, further, an accompanying chart with the names of schools or districts in one column and mean standardized test scores in a second column, perhaps with pass-fail cutoff scores indicated.

Now consider recent (mind-boggling but true) news reports that within a particular state, funding has been provided to equip school system administrators with smart phones at a cost of thousands of dollars, while because of budget cuts at the school level, parents have been asked to donate supplies, including toilet paper, as a means to save money that might otherwise have to be diverted from instruction. (According to some reports, some schools actually have engaged in a system of bartering donated supplies, again, including toilet paper, in order to obtain necessary educational material.) Now, re-imagine the image. The headline:

HALF OF STATE’S PUBLIC SCHOOLS DON’T MAKE THE GRADE
IN READING AND MATH

The chart? Column One: names of schools or districts. Column Two: number of rolls of donated toilet paper (with appropriately arbitrary pass-fail levels reported). As with the first case, both meaning and significance have been changed.

At the heart of *détournement* rests the notion that in all instances either the image is altered to “fit” the context, or the context is altered to “fit” the image. Such processes—or pedagogical strategies—enable students, teachers, and others to confront and combat the enforcing/enforcement properties of high-stakes testing *as* image.

What they require, though, are access to and facility with those technologies that make such enforcement possible, as well as an understanding—a *critical consciousness*—of

¹² The Pittsburg *Post-Gazette* ran this headline on August 13, 2003: “Half of Pa. public schools don’t make the grade in math and reading—Under new U.S. law, schools rated poorly could lose students.” Retrieved from <http://www.post-gazette.com/localnews/20030813schoolreport0813p1.asp>

controlling images, surveillance, and spectacle. Joined with *dérive* (and *la perruque* as well as *parrhesia*, sabotage, etc.), *détournement* provides an untapped mode of situated and critical resistance.

Conclusion

Neoliberal education reforms have had a devastating effect on teaching and learning in schools, laying waste to humanistic approaches to education, reducing education to the immense accumulation of test scores, and undermining the principle that public schools should be operated in the public interest. There is no tinkering toward utopia. Subversive resistance from within schools is a dangerous, but necessary, undertaking. We believe schools can be sites of liberation (as opposed to training camps for the neoliberal economy), and this work to transform schools puts both teachers and students at risk, but for good reason.

The pedagogical practices inspired by *la perruque*, *derive*, and *détournement* as presented here are not absolutes or final statements on what the practice of dangerous citizenship is or could be, but they are quotidian and incremental praxis, a tentative set of steps toward reestablishing the place of living and authenticity as against alienation, passivity, antidemocracy, conformity, and injustice. For in the end, standardized education and high-stakes testing is not the whole story, but merely a piece of the bigger story, one in which we and our children are author and character, subject and object, player and played on. Perhaps this is our true test. If so, then the stakes are high indeed.

References

- 2011 Chinese pro-democracy protests. (n. d.). Retrieved March 13, 2012 from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2011_Chinese_pro-democracy_protests
- Achbar, M. (Producer/Director), & Wintonick, P. (Director). *Manufacturing consent: Noam Chomsky and the media* [film/DVD]. Canada: Humanist Broadcasting Foundation in association with National Film Board of Canada.
- Acuña, R. (2007). *Occupied America: A history of Chicanos* (6th Ed.). New York: Longman
- Adbusters spoof ads. (n. d.). *Adbusters*. Retrieved <http://www.adbusters.org/spoofads>
- American Historical Association. (2010). American Historical Association calls on the Texas State Board of Education to reconsider amendments to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies. Retrieved from http://www.historians.org/press/2010_05_18_Texas_State_Board_of_Education.htm
- Amster, R., DeLeon, A., Fernandez, L., Nocella II, A., & Shannon, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Contemporary anarchist studies: An introductory anthology of anarchy in the academy*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, E. (1995). The democratic university: The role of justice in the production of knowledge. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 12(2), 186-219.
- Antistasiology: The study of resistance. (n. d.). Retrieved from <http://www.feederz.com/antistasiology.html>
- Avrich, P. (2005). *The modern school movement: Anarchism and education in the United States*. San Francisco: AK Press.

- Baldassarro, R. W. (2011). Banned book awareness: Dr. Seuss. Retrieved from <http://bannedbooks.world.edu/2011/09/11/banned-books-awareness-dr-seuss/>
- Biafra, J. (Artist). (2009). Audacity of hype. [Digital image]. Retrieved from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Jellobiafra-audacity-of-hype-thumb.jpg>
- Boxun. (2011, February 20). A report on Jasmine Revolution in China. Retrieved from http://www.boxun.us/news/publish/chinanews/A_report_on_Jasmine_Revolution_in_China.shtml
- British Columbia Civil Liberties Association. (2013). BCCLA challenges “laughable” ban on free speech by Prince Rupert school board. Retrieved from <http://bccla.org/news/2013/02/bccla-challenges-laughable-ban-on-free-speech-about-free-speech-by-prince-rupert-school-board/>
- Brown, A. (2013, April 9). At Occupy the DOE, a push for democratic, not corporate education reform. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <http://www.thenation.com/article/173728/occupy-doe-push-democratic-not-corporate-education-reform - axzz2YluGWUNC>
- California Teachers Association v. Governing Board of San Diego Unified School District, 45 Cal App. 4th 1383 (1996).
- Carr, P. R., & Porfilio, B. J. (2011). *The phenomenon of Obama and the agenda for education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Corngold, J., & Waddington, D. I. (2006). Teacher neutrality: implications for the political science classroom. *American Political Science Association Annual Meeting*, Philadelphia. Retrieved from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p151023_index.html
- Craig, B. (2006). History defined in Florida legislature. *Perspectives on history*. Retrieved from <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/issues/2006/0609/0609nch1.cfm>
- Debord, G. (1981). The theory of dérive. In K. Knabb (Ed.), *Situationist International anthology*. Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets.
- De Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- DeLeon, A. (2008). Oh no, not the “A” word! Proposing an “anarchism” for education. *Educational Studies*, 44(2), 122-141.
- DeLeon, A. (2010). Anarchism, sabotage and the spirit of revolt: Injecting the social studies with anarchist potentialities. In A. DeLeon & E. W. Ross (Eds.), *Critical theories, radical pedagogies, and social education: Toward new perspectives for social studies education* (pp. 1-12). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- DeLeon, A., & Ross, E. W. (Eds.). (2010). *Critical theories, radical pedagogies, and social education: New perspectives for social studies education*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Demick, B., & Pierson, D. (2011, March 5). Calls for subtle protests have China security forces in tizzy. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/05/world/la-fg-china-jasmine-revolution-20110305>
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: Free Press.

- Discussion, F. (Artist). (n. d.). Subvertisements. [Digital images]. Retrieved from <http://www.feederz.com/subvert.html>
- Discussion, F. (Artist). (1982). Bored with school. [Digital image]. Retrieved from <http://www.feederz.com/bws.html>
- Discussion, F. (Artist). (n. d.). War is peace. [Digital image]. Retrieved from <http://www.feederz.com/warispeace.html>
- Dr. Seuss. (1958). *Yertle the turtle*. New York: Random House.
- Education 4 the People! (2010). Retrieved from <http://ca.defendpubliceducation.org/>
- Foner, E. (2010, April 5). Twisting history in Texas. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <http://www.thenation.com/article/twisting-history-texas>
- Foucault, M. (2001). *Fearless speech*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach* (D. Macedo, D. Koike, & A. Oliveira, Trans.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gabbard, D. A., & Ross, E. W. (2008). *Education under the security state*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gibney, E. (2013, June 20). After Quebec's Maple Spring, the outlook is uncertain. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/features/after-quebecs-maple-spring-the-outlook-is-uncertain/2004831.article>
- Gibson, R., & Ross, E. W. (2009). The education agenda is a war agenda: Connecting reason to power and power to resistance. *Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor*, 16, 31-52. Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/workplace/article/view/182226/182289>
- Gibson, R., Queen, G., Ross, E. W., & Vinson, K. D. (2009). The Rouge Forum. In D. Hill (Ed.), *Contesting neoliberal education: Public resistance and collective advance* (pp. 110-136). New York: Routledge.
- Gorlewski, J., & Porfilio, B. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Left behind in the race to the top: Realities of school reform*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Gribble, D. (2004). Good news for Francisco Ferrer – How anarchist ideals in education have survived around the world. In Purkis, J. & Bowen, J. (Eds.). *Changing anarchism: Anarchist theory and practice in a global age*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Gutstein, E., & Lipman, P. (2013). The rebirth of the Chicago Teachers Union and possibilities for a counter-hegemonic education movement. *Monthly Review*, 65(2). Retrieved from <http://monthlyreview.org/2013/06/01/the-rebirth-of-the-chicago-teachers-union-and-possibilities-for-a-counter-hegemonic-education-movement>
- Heckerling, A. (Director), & Crowe, C. (Writer). (1982). *Fast times at Ridgemont High* [film/DVD]. United States: MCA/Universal.
- Hiller, A. (Director), & McKinney, W. R. (Writer). (1984). *Teachers*. United States: United Artists.

- Holmes., A. A. (2013, June 26). Everywhere is Taksim: The crackdown on the commons. *Counterpunch*. Retrieved from <http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/06/26/everywhere-is-taksim/>
- Horne, T. (2010, December 30). Finding by the state superintendent of public instruction of violation by Tucson unified school district pursuant to a.r.s. § 15-112(b). Retrieved from <http://www.azcentral.com/ic/pdf/horne-findings-ethnic-studies.doc>
- House Bill 2281. (2010). Amending title 15, chapter 1, article 1, Arizona Revised Statutes relating to school curriculum. Retrieved from <http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/bills/hb2281s.pdf>
- Hursh, D. W., & Ross, E. W. (Eds.). (2000). *Democratic social education: Social studies for social change*. New York: Falmer.
- Jaffe, S. (2013, July 4). Taking the caring out of teaching. *In These Times*. Retrieved from http://inthesetimes.com/article/15245/taking_the_caring_out_of_teaching_new_yorks_new_teacher_evaluation_system_i/
- “Jasmine Revolution” Beijing Wangfujing assembly, heavily guarded. [Video file]. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DkBceA-WEMQ>
- Kaplan, D. (2013). The Chicago teachers’ strike and beyond. *Monthly Review*, 65(2). Retrieved from <http://monthlyreview.org/2013/06/01/the-chicago-teachers-strike-and-beyond>
- Karp, S. (2012). Challenging corporate education reform. *Rethinking Schools*, 26(3). Retrieved from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/26_03/26_03_karp.shtml
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2011). Civics in the social studies: Critical democratic citizenship education in a corporatized hyperreality. In J. L. DeVitis (Ed.), *Critical civic literacy: A reader* (pp. 63-80). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kruger, B. (1987). Untitled (I shop therefore I am) [photographic silkscreen]. Retrieved from http://www.maryboonegallery.com/artist_info/pages/kruger/detail1.html
- Lacey, M. (2011, January 7). Rift in Arizona as Latino class is found illegal. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/08/us/08ethnic.html?_r=1
- Lasn, K. (2009, March 4). Clearing the mindscape. *Adbusters*. Retrieved from http://www.adbusters.org/blogs/adbusters_blog/kalle_lasn_clearing_mindscape.html
- Leming, J. S., Ellington, L., & Porter-Magee, K. (2003). *Where did social studies go wrong?* Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
- Levy, S. (1984). *Hackers: Heroes of the computer revolution*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Ludlow, P. (2010, October 4). Wikileaks and hacktivist culture. *The Nation*. Retrieved <file://localhost/http://www.thenation.com/article:154780:wikileaks-and-hacktivist-culture>
- Lukács, G. (1967). *History and class consciousness*. London: Merlin Press. (Original work published 1920) Retrieved from <http://www.marxists.org/archive/lukacs/works/history/lukacs3.htm>
- Macdonald, D. (2010). Charter challenge to Bills 27 and 28. Retrieved from <http://www.bctf.ca/publications/NewsMagArticle.aspx?id=21534>

- Marcus, G. (1989). *Lipstick traces: The secret history of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mathison, S., & Ross, E. W. (Eds.). (2008a). *Battleground schools* (Vols. 1-2). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Mathison, S., & Ross, E. W. (Eds.). (2008b). *Nature and limits of standards-based reform and assessment*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McKinney, Jr., J. C. (2010, March 12). Texas conservatives win curriculum change. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/13/education/13texas.html?_r=0
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. (n.d.). *Common core state standards initiative*. Retrieved September 18, 2012 from <http://www.corestandards.org/>
- Nichols, J. (2010, April 23). Arizona law is not “merely cruel,” it is “immoral.” *The Nation*. Retrieved [file://localhost from http://www.thenation.com/blog/arizona-law-not-merely-cruel-it-immoral](http://www.thenation.com/blog/arizona-law-not-merely-cruel-it-immoral)
- Reinhart, M. K. (2011, January 3). Tom Horne: Tucson Unified School District runs afoul of ethnic studies law. *The Arizona Republic*. Retrieved from <http://www.azcentral.com/news/election/azelections/articles/2011/01/03/20110103arizona-ethnic-studies-tucson-tom-horne.html>
- Rosen, B. (2005, October 25). BC teachers go back to work—Who won the battle? MRzine. Retrieved from <http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2005/rosen251005.html>
- Ross, E. W. (2005, February). Public schools and neoliberal madness in Canada. *Substance News*. Retrieved from <http://www.substancenews.com/content/view/174/81/>
- Ross, E. W. (2005, November). British Columbia teachers’ strike. *Substance News*. Retrieved from <http://www.substancenews.com/content/view/296/81/>
- Ross, E. W. (2010). *Education for dangerous citizenship: War, surveillance, spectacle, and the education agenda*. Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Distinguished Lecture, University of Texas, San Antonio, November. Retrieved http://www.ewayneross.net/E_Wayne_Ross/Talking_Heads_files/SA_Talk.ppt
- Ross, E. W. (2011, February 23). Social control and the pursuit of dangerous citizenship [PowerPoint slides]. Keynote presentation Ninth International Conference on Research in Teaching of Social Sciences, *The Formation of Social Thought and the Construction of Democracy in the Teaching of Social Sciences, Geography and History*. GREDICS (Research Group on the Teaching of Social Sciences), Barcelona. Retrieved from <http://ubc.academia.edu/EWayneRoss/Papers>
- Ross, E. W., & Gibson, G. (Eds.). (2007). *Neoliberalism and education reform*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Ross, E. W., Gibson, R., Queen, G., & Vinson, K. D. (2013). How do I keep my ideals and still teach? In E. A. Daniels & B. J. Porfilio (Eds.), *Dangerous counterstories in the corporate academy: Narrating for understanding, solidarity, resistance, and community in the age of neoliberalism* (pp. 203-223) Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

- Ross, E. W., & Marker, P. M. (2005a). (If social studies is wrong) I don't want to be right. *Theory and Research in Education*, 33(1), 142-151.
- Ross, E. W., & Marker, P. M. (Eds.). (2005b). Social studies: Wrong, right, or left? A critical analysis of the Fordham Foundation's "Where did social studies go wrong?" (Part II). *The Social Studies*, 96(5).
- Ross, E. W., & Marker, P. M. (Eds.). (2005c). Social studies: Wrong, right, or left? A critical analysis of the Fordham Foundation's "Where did social studies go wrong?" *The Social Studies*, 96(4).
- Ross, E. W., & Queen, G. (2010). Globalization, class, and the social studies curriculum. In D. Kelsh, D. Hill, & S. Macrine (Eds.), *Class in education: Knowledge, pedagogy, subjectivity* (pp. 153-174). New York: Routledge.
- Ross, E. W., & Queen, G. (2013). "Shut up. He might hear you!" Teaching Marx in social studies education. In C. S. Malott & M. Cole (Eds.), *Teaching Marx across the curriculum: The socialist challenge* (pp. 207-232). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Saltman, K. J. (2010). *The gift of education: Public education and venture philanthropy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saltman, K. J. (2012). *The failure of corporate school reform*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Saltman, K. J., & Gabbard, D. A. (2010). *Education as enforcement: The militarization and corporatization of schools* (2nd Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Schuetze, H. G., Kuehn, L., Davidson-Harden, A., Schugurensky, D., & Weber, N. (2011). Globalization, neoliberalism, and schools: The Canadian story. In L. Olmos, C. A. Torres & R. Van Heertum (Eds.) *In the shadow of neoliberalism: Their years of educational reform in North America* (pp. 62-84). Oak Park, IL: Bentham.
- Scriven, M. (1991). *The evaluation thesaurus*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Situationist International. (1981). Definitions. In K. Knabb (Ed.), *Situationist International anthology*. Berkeley, CA: Bureau of Public Secrets.
- Stedman, L. C. (2010). How well does the standards movement measure up? an analysis of achievement trends, academic course-taking, student learning, NCLB, and changes in school culture and graduation rates. *Critical Education*, 1(10). Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/issue/view/182200>
- Stedman, L. C. (2011). Why the standards movement failed: an educational and political diagnosis of its failure and the implications for school reform. *Critical Education*, 2(1). Retrieved from <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/criticaled/issue/view/182201>
- Stanley, W. B. (2006). Education for social reconstruction in critical context. In K. L. Riley (Ed.), *Social reconstruction: People, politics, perspectives* (pp. 89-110). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Strauss, V. (2013, February 9). Global education market reaches \$4.4 trillion and is growing. The Washington Post. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/02/09/global-education-market-reaches-4-4-trillion-and-is-growing/>

- Strauss, V. (2013, May, 16). Seattle teachers boycotting test score a victory. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/wp/2013/05/16/seattle-teachers-boycotting-test-score-a-victory/>
- Taylor, P. (1961). *Normative discourse*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Teitelbaum, K. (1998). Contestation and curriculum: The efforts of American socialists, 1900-1920. In L. E. Beyer & M. W. Apple (Eds.), *The curriculum: Problems, politics, and possibilities*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- The Trouble with the Common Core. (2013, Summer). *Rethinking Schools*, 27(3). Retrieved from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/27_04/edit274.shtml
- Thompson, M. (2011, May 9). Freedom of expression grievance between British Columbia Public School Employer's Association and British Columbia Teachers' Federation/Cranbrook District Teachers' Association. Cranbrook, BC. Retrieved from <http://www.sd5.bc.ca/pdfs/No2011-18AttachmentThompsonDecisionFreedomofExpressi.pdf>
- Thompson, N., & Sholette, G. (2004). *The interventionists: User's manual for the creative disruption of everyday life*. North Adams, MA: MASS MoCA.
- Vinson, K. D. (2006). Oppression, anti-oppression and citizenship education. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3rd Ed., pp. 51-75). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Vinson, K. D., & Ross, E. W. (2003). *Image and education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Westheimer, J. (2014). Teaching students to think about patriotism. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems and possibilities* (4th Ed., pp. 127-137). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Young, I. M. (1992). Five faces of oppression. In T. E. Wartenberg (Ed.), *Rethinking power* (pp. 174-195). Albany: State University of New York Press.