View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by The University of Utah: J. Willard Marriott Digital Library

DETERRITORIALIZING MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: RE-CONCEPTUALIZING SOCIAL JUSTICE CURRICULUM AND TEACHING

by

Engin Atasay

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Education, Culture and Society

The University of Utah

August 2014

Copyright © Engin Atasay 2014

All Rights Reserved

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The dissertation of **Engin Atasay**

has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

Frank Margonis	, Chair	**04/29/2014** Date Approved
Edward Buendia	, Member	**04/29/2014** Date Approved
Edmund Fong	, Member	**04/29/2014** Date Approved
Clayton T. Pierce	, Member	**04/29/2014** Date Approved
Mary S. Strine	, Member	**04/29/2014** Date Approved

and by **Edward Buendia** , Chair/Dean of

the Department/College/School of **Education, Culture and Society**

and by David B. Kieda, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

In an effort to begin rethinking multicultural education, this dissertation intends to problematize multicultural education social justice discourse. I analyze multicultural education's territorial assumptions about power—and the subsequent social arrangements of power (social justice, equality and democracy)—which limit its conceptualizations of progressive social change and social justice education. Later I explore how territorial frameworks render MCE assumptions about social justice education amenable to neoliberal discourses that endorse liberal versions of social equity and associate greater social justice with capital accumulation. Lastly—with particular attention to multicultural education curriculum and teaching—my research strives to propose deterritorial notions of power, social justice and teaching to help imagine explorative multicultural education pedagogies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT……………………………………………………………………………...iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS………………………………………………………….....vi

Chapters

1. INTRODUCTION: RECONCEPTUALIZING MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION……………………………………………….............................1

    Introduction………………………………………………………….........1
    Territorializing Multicultural Education………………………………….........7
    Territorial Displacement of the Individual and the Terrain of Power and Politics in Multicultural Education……..………………..................................10
    Governmentalizing Multicultural Education: The Neoliberal Overtake of the Territorial Social Justice Education Discourses ……………………………….21
    Deterritorializing Multicultural Education ……….……………………………27
    Chapters……………………………………………………………………...34

2. TERRITORIAL MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION …………………………... 37

    Introduction………………………………………………………………….37
    Construction of a Territorial Conception of Power…………………………….39
    Multicultural Education Territorializing Power Relations……………………..42
    Political Territory of “Individuals” in Multicultural Education………………..50
    Political Territory of Multicultural Individuals: Citizenship Education……….55
    Multicultural Education Is Culturally Relevant Pedagogy……………………..60

3. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST-CENTURY FLAT WORLD: NEOLIBERAL MULTICULTURALISM AND THE REPRESSION OF DIFFERENCE …………………………… ……………………………………67

    Introduction.…………………………………………………………………67

- Brief Note on Neoliberal Economy and Educational Reform…………………70
- Multicultural Education Against Neoliberal Reform…..……………………...77
- A Global Flat World, Neoliberal Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education………………………………………………………………………80
- Multiculturalized Neoliberal Education and the Repression of Social Difference………………………………………………………………………89
- Multicultural Education and Neoliberal Subjectivity…………………………..95
- Funds of Knowledge Approach to Multiculturalism……...............................103

4. DETERRITORIALIZING MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: AN IMAGINATIVE AND COLLECTIVE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENT……………………….……………………………………...109

    - Introduction…………………………………………………………………...109
    - Deterritorialization: Utopian Imaginative Futures……………………………113
    - Border Utopia: Deterritorialization Attempts in Social Justice Education.......119
    - Deterritorialization: A Positive Engagement with Power Relations…………126
    - From ‘Doing’ to Tantruming: Deterritorializing Multicultural Education Through Failure and Self Estrangement………………………………………129
    - Tantrums………………………………………………………………………133
    - Failure…………………………………………………………………………138
    - Self-estrangement……………………………………………………………..144
    - Deterritorializing Multicultural Education Through Collective Performance………………………………………………………150
    - Tantruming Multicultural Education Through Funds of Knowledge………...158

5. DETERRITORIAL MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE CLASSROOM……………………………………………………………………163

    - Introduction…………………………………………………………………...163
    - The “Problem” of Demographics……………………………………………..164
    - From ‘Who Am I?’ to ‘What I May Become?’………..……………………...171
    - Tantruming Teacher: Deterritorializing Empire in a 4th-Grade Classroom….175
    - A Non-Last Tantrum: An Act of Poetry………………………………………178

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY ……………………………………………………………..180

7. NOTES ………………………………………………………………………...192

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my family for their support and patience throughout the dissertation process. Special thanks to my wife Sherrill Atasay and my daughter Ayla Atasay for their love and support. I also would like to recognize the invaluable guidance and mentoring of faculty, colleagues and friends at the Department of Education, Culture and Society. I want to thank Dr. Harvey Kantor for his support during the early stages of my dissertation proposal and helping me shape my thoughts. I am also grateful for the extensive feedback and constructive comments provided by my academic advisor and dissertation chair Dr. Frank Margonis. I am also grateful for the guidance Dr. Clayton Pierce has provided in helping me find my niche in my research as an education scholar. I also would like to thank Dr. Ed Buendia for his continual support of my work during my time at the Department of Education, Culture and Society. I am also grateful for the tremendous support Dr. Edmund Fong and Dr. Mary Strine have provided for improving my research and writing.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: RECONCEPTUALIZING MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

> A world in which we should be nothing more than an accident, in which the passing cur, even the stones of the roads, would complete and explain us.
>
> (Émile Zola, *The Masterpiece*)

Introduction

Multicultural education (MCE) in the U.S. stands for an ambitious ideal, that is, it aims at creating teaching philosophies and practices that are designed to promote democracy by fostering antiracist, pluralistic and equitable educational settings and socio-political norms. As part of this project, multicultural education extends beyond the classroom and acquires a socio-political role for creating sensitive social relationships to tackle many political issues faced by pluralistic societies and in schools. Multicultural education therefore strives to ensure high levels of educational, social and economic achievement "for all students" in a diverse society. This requires that individuals develop positive attitudes towards learning from each other in educational settings and provide opportunities to incorporate knowledge about diverse cultural, ethnic, class and gender groups. Hence, the goal of MCE is to promote a transformative educational discourse that fosters antiracist and equitable education. However, the way in which MCE scholars conceptualize educational goals for transformative education *neglects to question the discourses that capture multiculturalism itself*.

An examination of the writings of some of the leading multicultural education scholars suggests that the potential for transformative education is often hindered by the very categories and assumptions these authors use to conceptualize the world, which is the focal point of my research. Although I am critical of the discourses that capture multicultural education and weaken its transformative potential, I do not intend to dismiss or diminish the progressive social justice work carried out by multicultural education scholars and texts. Instead, I wish to offer a reconceptualization of the approach to MCE and illustrate that MCE is under-theorized and risks being co-opted by discourses it sets out to oppose and challenge. My attempt to deterritorialize MCE is an inclusive approach rather than a dismissive position. It is not a rejection of the MCE work that is on-going, it is rather a new drawing board for different approaches to social justice education to intermingle, improvise and imagine. Thus my reconceptualizing of MCE draws on ‘culturally relevant teaching’ (CRT) and ‘funds of knowledge’ (FoK) approaches to MCE to illustrate the positive potential that resides within MCE approaches that are comfortable with uncertainties and shifting territories. I try to demonstrate how we may deterritorialize MCE by opening up endless educational approaches to social justice education and the multiplicities of lived experiences students bring into educational settings, multiplying the new conceptions to think about difference and power relations.

In an effort to begin rethinking multicultural education, my work problematizes multicultural education on two interrelated grounds. First, I try to illustrate MCE's tendency to resort to limited assumptions about power relations in formulizing its social justice discourse, which reduces its scope and activism to already prescribed political terrains. By critiquing these limitations of MCE discourses, I also plan to carry out an investigation of the likelihood of limited discourses about power relations to produce limited conceptions of social difference (identity, race, ethnicity, culture, class). I argue that MCE discourses, which objectify knowledge about a complex multitude of individuals and power relations, ultimately undermine the progressive potential of multicultural pedagogy. My second problematization questions the possibility of MCE's limited assumptions about 'power relations' and individuals being amenable to neoliberal economic discourses. In other words, I investigate a possible connection between MCE limited assumptions about 'power' and neoliberal economic discourses that capitalize on them. My study points out discourses within MCE texts about social justice education that risk being co-opted by neoliberal versions of social justice—which aim at generating greater objectification of individuals and of democracy by mirroring a human capital model of society and commercialization of education.

My study is a Michel Foucault inspired reading of multicultural education discourse. My study begins with an investigative proposal Foucault uses to express how individual thought and practice often get captured by discourses, which states that "people know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don't know is what they do does."[1] Foucault is cautioning us to be critical of short-term problem-solving approaches to conduct and thought, which often presume an immediate reality/present to react upon and resolve. Such hasty means to address action and thought often neglect critical examinations of their effects. I try to argue that MCE is experiencing a similar inability to know what its epistemological and conceptual framework *does*. Thus, my study tries to point out the directionality of MCE discourses and how they can be analyzed, why they need to be analyzed and what conceptual alternatives can be imagined. To put it short, I ask "*what does MCE do and what does this 'doing' do to the conceptual as well as practical scope and aim of multicultural education?*"

I strive to study MCE's conceptual strengths and weaknesses by largely examining how MCE discourses attend to, understand and conceptualize power relations and the individuals caught in these relations. In *Foucaultian Discourse Analysis*, Michael Arribas-Ayllon and Valerie Walkerdine[2] point attention to Foucault's insistence on processes of subjectification in pursuing discourse analysis. They state that discourse analysis "attends to mechanisms of power and offers a description of their functioning…directed to subjectification—the material/signifying practices in which subjects are made up." Similarly, I seek to show 'how' MCE operates in social justice education discourse "not in the sense of 'How does it manifest itself?' but 'by what means is it exercised?' and 'what happens when individuals exert (as they say) power over others?'"[3] I examine MCE's assumptions that construct and govern MCE discourses about individuals and power relations, which are mobilized to conceptualize social justice education. By questioning the discourses MCE uses to locate power relations in society, I critique how MCE discourses territorialize and construct certain forms of knowledge, populations and identities to "understand" and "challenge" power relations, which I argue, displace and reduce individuals to mere effects of a territory. I provide a critical reading of MCE's conceptual assumptions, such as MCE's normative views that depict and essentialize the location of power in society and argue that these assumptions assign attainable and knowable territories that strive to define a generalized world view, i.e., what democracy *is*; acceptable forms of political representation (citizenship); and correct social justice praxis.

My study first sets out to critically address territorial discourses in MCE discourses that seem to hinder its transformative potential by exposing limitations of MCE discourses that treat power as a tool that can be grasped, gained or wielded. The resulting effect limits MCE's conceptualization of power relations and reduces them to territorial depictions of power as a tool that can facilitate the attainment of status, capital, justice and democracy. My study then raises attention to a second territorial discourse in MCE texts that categorizes individuals into prescribed acceptable and knowable territories (i.e., oppressors, marginalized students) which are presumed to be equipped with a particular understanding of consciousness and identity. Moreover, MCE's attempt to territorialize individuals and the location of power in order to attain and wield power results in a limited political territory in which individuals are forced to behave, represent and maneuver in prescribed political terrains. MCE definitions of politics that rely on territorial conceptions begin to construct narrow terrains and definitions of social justice, democracy and citizenship. The resulting political territory of MCE therefore merely duplicates and mobilizes the territorial assumptions about individuals and power relations into already defined notions of political thought and action.

Later in my study, building on my critique of how territorial discourses in MCE's conceptualize individuals, power relations and politics, I question the likelihood of such territorial discourses to render multicultural education amenable to neoliberal economic discourses. I try to demonstrate that territorial MCE discourses are not only conceptual shortcomings but also risk being co-opted by economic discourses. I argue that *territorial MCE discourses that treat 'power' as a commodity that can be attained by the territorial figure of individuals begin to align MCE social justice discourse with economization*. Territorial MCE discourses tend to commodify multiculturalism and social justice discourse and become part and parcel of neoliberal processes of subjectification that target creating market oriented social sensibilities that are cultivated to sustain a neoliberal society.

The final part of my study explores a new language to address MCE. I propose deterritorializing the territorial assumptions of MCE discourses through a utopian philosophy that seeks to imagine a creative future for MCE that does not resort to ideal and fixed notions of 'power relations' and individuals. My goal is to offer territorial conceptions such as identities and political frameworks as part of a *process* that we need to continually evolve and theorize, hence create a dialogue that treats territorializations as verbs rather than nouns. Thus, deterritorialization offers reading of power relations as processes rather than treating them as relations to be wielded into fixed definitions and static political terrains. I argue that a deterritorial approach has immense potential in cultivating collective, creative and experiential learning settings that may enable education research and practice to explore multiplicities of new venues to improvise multicultural education and social justice. In the last chapter, I try to develop illustrative instances of how social justice educators may begin to approach multicultural education through deterritorial conceptions of curriculum and teaching.

Territorializing Multicultural Education

In this brief section, I will try to explicate why and how I use the term ‘territory’ in my study of MCE. My aim is to use ‘territories’ to refer to discourses that depict ‘power’ as simply something that can be wielded or possessed by the individual who is situated within a presumed political terrain. Territorial discourses are concepts that facilitate the production of the individual subject as an effect of power which then operates within an assigned ontological political territory. Territorial discourses also strive to pin ‘power’ into relations that are presumed to exist within static locations of power, such as in binary relations of oppressed vs. oppressor, or in presumed commodified locations such as economic class or money/status.

Foucault’s study of ‘power relations’ enables me to offer an illustrative critique of how MCE discourses rely on limited territorial definitions of individuals, power relations and a territorial political terrain of social justice education to formulize its transformative goals. Foucault’s work on modernity traces who and how territorial discourses aim at constructing knowable signs/territories (such as states, law, citizen, rational self) to depict power relations in society. His genealogical studies illustrate how certain discourses create or normalize “territories” that trivialize and administer conduct, conceptual knowledge and perceptions. For Foucault, a power relation we take part in “supervises every instant in the disciplinary institution, compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it *normalizes*.”[4] I therefore make use of Foucault’s genealogical work to expose the limits of static and taken-for-granted descriptions, i.e., territorializations such as identity, power relations and democracy in multicultural education discourses.

Foucault reads power relations through action and effects that construct repressive territories of conduct. Such work is not limited to Foucault; similarly, the Frankfurt School philosophers[5] have used the term "culture industry" when trying to articulate a socio-psychoanalytical critique of bourgeois society and how capitalist production of the myths of Enlightenment produces a homogenized cultural territory for the reproduction of industrialism. Deleuze and Guattari also offer us ways to attend the power relations in so-called modern capitalist society by mapping territorializations and instances where power can be mapped through its strategic accumulations.[6] Similarly, educational philosopher John Dewey[7] refers to 'modernity' as a "quest for certainty" in which intrinsic knowledge categories construct and limit knowledge into observable and finalized territories that annul experimentation in favor of absolutism. In *Cosmopolis*, Stephen Toulmin traces the history of ideas in Western philosophy from Renaissance to mid-20th century modernity and states that modern thought and practice strives "to discover some *rational method* for demonstrating the essential correctness or incorrectness of philosophical, scientific, or theological doctrines."[8]

These different approaches merge on the idea that the resulting effect of this discourse is the creation of a political cosmology or territory in which reason, practice and meaning unite under a harmonious unity (cosmos) of a presumed 'certainty.' Foucault's work however also allows us to trace territories as constructs of discourse. Foucault states that "territory is no doubt a geographical notion, but it's first of all a juridico-political one: the area controlled by a certain kind of power."[9] Foucault traces territorializations in power relations and in discourse—not confined to categories, states and institutions, i.e., not necessarily a material territory. Foucault further elaborates:

> The longer I continue, the more it seems to me that the formation of discourses and the genealogy of knowledge need to be analyzed, not in terms of types of consciousness, modes of perception and forms of ideology, but in terms of tactics and strategies of power. Tactics and strategies deployed through implantations, distributions, demarcations, control of territories and organizations of domains which could well make up a sort of geopolitics where my preoccupations would link up with your methods.[10]

Foucault describes geopolitics of territorializations as the beginning of a genealogical study of power relations and knowledge. In his lectures on *Security, Territory and Population*, he further emphasizes a study of territorializations and argues that a governmentalized state is a state of government that is "concerned about…men in their relationships, bonds, and complex involvements with things like wealth, resources, means of subsistence, and of course, the territory with its borders, qualities, climate, dryness, fertility, and so on."[11] What this suggests is that the government of subjects (students, managers, families and desires) and institutions depends on the invention and innovation of multiplicities of territorializations—including individuals, research conceptions and political praxis—as knowable, observable and thus docile territories. My study of territorial MCE is informed by Foucault's analysis of how territorial discourses construct relationships, assumptions and political 'realities' to argue that territories hinder the transformative potential of social justice education.

Territorial Displacement of the Individual and the Terrain of Power and Politics in Multicultural Education

This section sets out to illustrate how territorial definitions of individuals, power relations and a political terrain limit MCE's conceptualizations. My research has enabled me to find territorial definitions of individuals in MCE discourses that assume the existence of identifiable people who are assumed to be *deprived* of resources for a better quality of life. I often find MCE discourses that assume a reality which assigns certain cultures or groups in society possession of more resources than *others*. The consequent assumption advocates for the equitable redistribution of those resources between the "dominant" and "dominated" groups for social justice and democracy. In many cases, the "dominant" is represented as White, middle-class, and heterosexual. For example, in Beverly Daniel Tatum's work *"Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?"* (a popular text in MCE curriculum) the norm to address individual difference in MCE is embedded in territorial identifications of "young, White, heterosexual, Christian, able-bodied, thin, middle-class, English-speaking, and male."[12] While trying to illustrate the complexities of identity to progressively address myths about inequality between dominant and subordinate social groups, Tatum resorts to territorial discourses in her depictions of individual differences, which ultimately result in exclusions of multiplicities of individual differences. In these instances MCE is limited to relying on norm/al territories to identify and hierarchize individuals as it sets out to challenge inequality in social and educational settings.

In *Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering?*[13] Elizabeth Ellsworth reflects on the downside of these territorial assumptions in approaching individual difference. Ellsworth argues that normative assumptions about people and knowledge not only reduce the complexity of individual subjectivity and cultural differences to narrow categorizations but also cultivate exclusionary educational practices. Ellsworth reflects on her classroom experiences to argue that such normalized territorial approaches to different individuals in the classroom splinter the class and recreate distances between students who hold different views and share different experiences. Students are expected to adapt and function within norms/territories that are prescribed for them by territorial discourses that say “I am this,” “Don’t label me as this.”[14] My work encounters such exclusionary language in James A. Banks’ work, as he calls out to MCE educators to “select pedagogical knowledge and content that empower students from diverse racial, ethnic, cultural and social-class groups. They [teachers] should help students to understand and to critically examine all types of knowledge and to become knowledge producers themselves. Only by experiencing this kind of education can students become thoughtful and effective citizens in pluralistic free societies.”[15] Banks’ statement about MCE is entirely dependent upon an imaginary that posits a democratic society, populated by a rational and presumably informed citizenry. Moreover, these conceptions essentialize an objective form of knowledge as emancipatory and assume its relevance and association with a compulsory and typified individual (e.g., ‘critical-thinker’) as its audience and consumer. Certain individuals are envisioned in need of enlightenment about knowledge systems and myths that are presumed to have sustained a socio-economic, ethnic and racial status quo. It is also assumed that the only way individuals can begin to deconstruct and resist myths and ideologies of the dominant discourse is by understanding and knowing “reality” [territory] of social division of power and racial marginalization.

My study does not deny the mitigating effect of power relations in society. But I want to stress attention to statements that assign educational experience with the authority to give the necessary/legitimate knowledge and the skills to students who are assumed to *lack* them in order to empower and emancipate them from assumed suppression. The resulting educational experience is reduced to a typified learner and makes her/him a multicultural citizen who is “capable” of resisting racial, ethnic and classist injustice and becoming an “effective citizen” or gaining “critical consciousness.” But the transformative shortcomings of multicultural education are not just problems of individual implementation or lack of consciousness as articulated by Banks and other mainstream MCE debates. They are largely due to the territorial discourses about the individual multiculturalism is embedded in, which encapsulate MCE’s political message into prescribed territories and nulls alternative ways to engage power relations. Michel Foucault offers a strong critique of how modern discourse disciplines and carves out a territory for the modern individual. Similarly, MCE texts treat the individual “as a sort of elementary nucleus, a primitive atom, a multiple and inert material on which power comes to fasten or against which it happens to strike, and in so doing subdues or crushes individuals.”[16] MCE further assumes the role of granting individuals with skills to produce knowledge that can help them resist oppression. These territorial assumptions enclose a territorial political and subjective space by assigning individuals as the owners of power, by defining power’s form (enemy) and function (victory) within these territorial limits. MCE therefore defines power through “limit and *lack* [emphasis added],”[17] that sets the premise for a struggle for its attainment between haves and have-nots.

My work suggests that this is a limited understanding of progressive politics, bound to political strategies that have become prevalent during the Civil Rights movement in the United States. James Banks traces the emergence of multicultural education as a direct consequence of educational institutions' response to the success of Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision (1954) which gave momentum to the Black civil rights movements, which in the 1960s and 1970s also "caused other ethnic groups of color on the margins of society, such as Mexican Americans, Asian Americans, and Puerto Ricans, to make similar demands for political, economic, and educational changes."[18] Banks rightfully states that "school desegregation, bilingual education, multicultural education, and affirmative action have brought the nation closer to the democratic values stated in its founding documents (i.e., the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights)."[19] However, Banks' historical argument is problematic in its assumptions about political unity for bringing the multiplicities of interests and political debate closer, i.e., under-one-nation. Iris Marion Young in *Inclusion and Democracy* offers a telling criticism of how assumptions about 'civil unity' represent a "Rousseauist dream"[20] emphasizing the limiting political imagination of homogenizing Enlightenment vision of individuals engaged in civil action to uphold the ideals created by rational citizens. Later in *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Young argues that direct democracy that seeks to bring all its members 'closer' for a face-to-face political interaction overlooks the potential of "disorderly, disruptive, annoying, or distracting means of communication"[21] that may be necessary for multicultural societies.

Indeed, in James Banks, we find that MCE’s scope consists of constructing diversity under a unifying nation-state as Banks sets out to argue that “valid and accurate explanations and theories about these groups that can be used to improve their lives and help them become full participants in their societies and nation-states. Multicultural research assumes that valid, accurate, and comprehensive knowledge about marginalized groups can be used to help them attain freedom and to become full citizens and change agents within their nation-states.”[22] Banks’ statement not only presumes static universal territories about complex sets of people but also portrays a prescribed negativity. Banks portrays people as totalized by the power relations they conduct, assigns a promissory role to MCE for “improving” and “freeing” marginalized ‘noncitizens’ to attain the power they need to become “full participants” in power (perceived as an attainable commodity) and foster change by becoming change agents or citizens (power brokers). Banks’ assumption neglects to acknowledge that “the individual is not a pre-given entity which is seized on by the exercise of power. The individual, with his identity and characteristics, is the product of a relation of power exercised over bodies, multiplicities, movements, desires, forces.”[23] Foucault emphasizes that such political frameworks fall within the disciplinary regime of territorial understandings of individuals and their agency, ultimately limiting our efforts to find alternative modes of engagement with power relations by reducing individual desire for transformative conduct to already defined territories of action, politics and desire. Territorial propositions in MCE portray power as an entity that can be wielded by those who would pursue social justice, and this is too simplistic. Complicating the notion of a unified and historicized identity movement, particularly examining Latino politics, Christina Beltrán, in her book *Trouble* *with Unity* argues that panethnic movements—seeking the unity of a common way of life or political destiny—are influenced by the legacy of the civil rights movement in which many Latino political movements found enormous political energy in constructing recognizable and unified "Latino political interests."[24] Her work however argues that the consensus over a common Latino identity ("Latino Leviathan") and iconic political-will is fictional and oppressive because it does disservice to multiplicities and wider sets of political activism, such as Latina women and homosexuals. Beltrán states:

> The belief that shared culture could produce a unified political perspective was compellingly inclusive, but it turned disagreement into betrayal…those who challenged norms and traditions became culturally and politically suspect…feminists were vilified and lesbians silenced—in the name of community, unity, and *familia*.[25]

Beltrán's work opts for a more diffused, emergent and less politicized sense of pan-Latin ethnicity rather than seeking activism in homogenizing political blocs. Similarly, my study proposes MCE as a process that moves away from the dichotomies and consensual political civility of the civil rights movements era to a more dispersed and explorative reading of individuals and institutions as effects of power relations, which may allow us to expand (deterritorialize) the territorial and historical assumptions about politics, identity and culture in MCE. Foucault insists that individuals are "already one of the prime effects of power," that "certain bodies, certain gestures, certain discourses, certain desires, come to be identified and constituted as individuals. The individual, that is, is not the *vis-à-vis* of power; it is, I believe, one of its prime effects."[26] Approaching individuals as always in relation to rather than in possession of power may enable us to avoid using presumed characteristics of individual practice based on rationality, consciousness, history and culture. It may allow us to focus on experiential encounters with individual difference, knowledge and praxis and treat power as a relation. Foucault argues that this requires us to read power "as something which circulates, or as something which only functions in the form of a chain. . .Power is employed and exercised through a netlike organization. . .Individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application."[27] This opening up, or deterritorialization of the individual in relation to power—compromising and exploding the confines of territorial depictions of individuals—has important implications for rethinking and "doing" MCE, which will be the focal point of Chapter 4 and 5.

MCE social justice discourse depicts power as an attainable force or a territory that needs to be conquered, acquired or altered for the good of all. Power is depicted as residing in a political framework that can be understood and identified in terms of territories, such as in individuals (Kings, Whites, upper classes) and institutions (laws, schools) and thus can be wielded. Although no doubt these territories do indeed exert influence over power relations in society, these power relations are also decentered and are not controlled by and do not belong to a single group or institution. Power is, rather, a set of relations dispersed in society. Foucault alerts us to refrain from referring to power as a static territorial possession and states that his work is "not referring to Power with a capital P, dominating and imposing its rationality upon the totality of the social body. In fact, there are power relations. They are multiple; they have different forms, they can be in play in family relations, or within an institution, or an administration."[28]

Territorial MCE discourses on the other hand, conceive 'power' as an attainable commodity with a capital P, existing in a binary relationship between two opposite territories, i.e., the dominant oppressor who has power and the marginalized oppressed who lacks it. For instance, in *Affirming Diversity*,[29] Nieto and Bode treat power as a tool owned by "dominant groups" to suppress or exert privilege over "dominated students." Nieto and Bode tell us that MCE is "for all students" since students "from dominant groups are prone to develop an unrealistic view of the world and their place in it" as well as "children from dominated groups [who] may develop feelings of inferiority based on their schooling."[30] Defining "all" students within the confines of a narrow negative relationship of power—fixed in two opposing territories (dominant vs. dominated binary)—allocates difference based on that repressive binary that territorializes student subjectivities. 'Power' is juggled between the territorial figures that take part in the binary relation, i.e., dominator vs. dominated. 'Power' then becomes the epiphenomenon of domination and can only be perceived in *negativity*—reflecting the assumption that power needs to be regulated since it *represses* those who are assumed to lack it and idolizes those who command and impose it. These territorial MCE discourses are entangled in what Foucault calls, a "repressive hypothesis"[31] as they prescribe their political agendas for equity and justice based on a presumed location of power. This approach to politics merely seeks to pin power in judicial and political apparatuses such as in notions of law, race and cultural identity as means to combat inequality and redeem justice.

In James Banks' work, I find illustrative examples of how 'power' in territorial MCE discourse is treated as a commodity that social justice education must redeem and point attention to by formulizing territorial locations of power. Banks asserts that MCE must expose "which groups have the power to define and institutionalize their conceptions within schools, colleges and universities"[32] in order to foster transformative change. These territorial formulizations limit the scope of MCE to a binary understanding of power relations. Binaries solely offer MCE texts generalizations about how ‘power relations’ operate in society, thus instantiating a territorial discourse that perceives ‘power’ through a repressive imaginary—a territorial instrument that must be attained for equity and justice. Territorial discourses about the location of power assign reinscribed roles for political action, citizenship and democracy. These territories of power limit our understanding of power relations by encapsulating our theories, practices and desires for social change into already established perpetual negativities that stem from territorial binaries between oppressed vs. repressed, dominant vs. subordinate and so on. In other words, as Deleuze and Guattari put it “*every intention at the level of the human being always obeys the laws of its conservation, its continued existence.”*[33] *Territorial discourses mitigate efforts for transformative education by seeking to find and describe an ‘intention’ (e.g., a definitive goal or rationality) for individuals and power relations.* Consequently, MCE’s calling for social justice becomes a dogmatic missionary call that hails and exhibits rigid loyalties to territorial figures (citizen, critical thinker) and territorial power (commodity to be wielded) for changing power relations. Ultimately, territorial assumptions repress our understanding of how individuals and groups exercise power and do politics. Yet again, I acknowledge that Banks’ assumptions stem from the historical experience of minorities and the political struggle they improvised to counter injustices in U.S. society. Without losing sight of that historical legacy which enables MCE educators to point attention to issues of equity, my study proposes a new approach to how we can come to terms with power relations in education and society.

In *Affirming Diversity*, Nieto and Bode exhibit another territorial repressive assumption about power as they focus on seven characteristics of multicultural education as “antiracist, basic, important for all students, pervasive, education for social justice, a process and critical pedagogy.”[34] For Nieto and Bode, antiracist education makes antidiscrimination explicit in the curriculum and teaches all students the skills to combat racism and other forms of oppression. Although I am sympathetic to the idea that all students have means to influence power relations to foster change, I am hesitant to grant that agency to students based on an assumption that prescribes a location of power embedded in territorial assumptions about who has or needs power and what political consciousness and action is required to wield it. In *An Analysis of Multicultural Research in the United States,*[35] Christine Sleeter and Carl Grant reflect on the sociopolitical role of MCE, a cornerstone text in the field for defining goals and approaches to MCE. Sleeter and Grant suggest that MCE is about an in-depth, comprehensive study that moves specific groups from the margins by providing information about the group's history, including experiences with oppression and resistance to that oppression. The goal is to reduce stratification and create greater access to power. Sleeter and Grant draw the political territory of MCE which relies on a ‘center-periphery model’ in which people in the periphery are marginalized, oppressed and lack recognition in schools and society. This binary political territory also prescribes individual political conduct in territorial assumptions about power relations. In their model, the oppressed individuals from the periphery or the enlightened antiracists from the center, gain the necessary knowledge for critical consciousness and begin to fight for the attainment of emancipatory power (educational attainment, political recognition) in order to challenge and change the center of power. My research argues that these depictions are very limited and often mitigate transformative efforts of MCE by trapping its conceptualizations and political terrain into narrow territorial categorizations about individuals and power relations.

In my experience with teaching and observing MCE classes with preservice and in service teachers, territorial discourses situate the engagement with social justice in prescribed notions of White privilege or marginalization, which forces students to question their positionality from a preconceived binary of oppression or suppression. In many cases, it forces students to identify themselves as White or urges them to retreat to that racial category and grapple with it. In many cases, as one of my students in my introduction to MCE class confided in me, “students end up feeling awful for being White and perpetuating racism,” or cultivate resentment towards content as it rushes to assign political identities with less concern for the complexity of individuals. As a scholar who is not originally from the U.S. (born and mostly raised in Turkey) I also have grappled with my own racial identification. When asked about by my race, I hesitate until I get instructed to refer to my race as White.

Unfortunately, in MCE classes, instructors begin with the assumption of pre-existing individual subjectivities and locations of power, i.e., “White-middle-class-conservative” students are in a privileged position and exert power over presumably oppressed non-White students and content. In my research I grapple with the problem of MCE educators creating syllabi with the assumption that privileged youth do not know about the educational and economic circumstances of nonprivileged youth. These generalizations are useful for starting dialogues about socio-political issues in classrooms. However, the notion of knowing oppression or naming its location and causes results in a dialogue that leaves very little room for contestation by reinscribing student subjectivities as well as the scope and goals of transformative education. Rancière points out this limitation as an effect of ‘consensual’ democracy, which merely polices consent. Alternatively, he argues for ‘dissensus’ which is not merely “conflict of interest, of opinions, or of values” but “a dispute over what is given and about the frame within which we sense something is given.”[36] The social justice framework of MCE has to consider the possibility of a post-civil rights identity politics that avoids seeking consensual bodies for affirming difference and diversity. I am suggesting that MCE is in need of a different approach to individual differences and social justice, which refrains from its obsession with the ‘repressive hypothesis’ about power, in order to consider a political understanding of identity and power relations that celebrates the complexity of engaged learners and shared experience. Territorial points of reference and generalizations about student populations need to be deterritorialized in order to avoid inaccurate depictions of student identities and power relations which often operate as mechanisms of consensual surveillance over the practice and scope of social justice education.

Governmentalizing Multicultural Education: The Neoliberal Overtake of the Territorial Social Justice Education Discourses

One of the central tenets of my study is to demonstrate the possible dangers associated with territorial MCE discourses about individuals and politics. My research is not only a conceptual reevaluation or a theoretical critique of territorial MCE discourses but also involves an examination of the likelihood of these territorial MCE discourses becoming amenable to neoliberal economic discourses that target commercializing education and individual subjectivity. Thus this section is devoted to introducing the idea that territorial MCE discourses are prone to being co-opted by neoliberal economic discourses; I argue that neoliberal economic discourses threaten to inflict greater social disparities and objectification of individuals.

Over the last decade, social justice formulations of MCE scholars began to portray multiculturalism as a geopolitical and economic instrument to empower the underprivileged and promote national security and welfare. Increasingly, we witness the emergence of MCE discourses that validate their own credibility by embedding social justice rationales into economic discourses that entail optimization of individual skills. Multiculturalism is increasingly co-opted into *neoliberal discourses that equate greater economic opportunity with social justice* to merely become justifications for neoliberal economism. For instance, recent MCE work—such as Linda Darling-Hammond's book *The Flat World and Education*—have begun placing greater emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) education as part of social justice education and treat it as a natural consequence of the 21st-century. Darling-Hammond often justifies the significance of STEM by assuming that it has an assisting role in fostering pluralistic and diverse STEM educational settings that produce diverse entrepreneurs from all factions of society.[37]

Linda Darling-Hammond's contribution to MCE explicitly argues for educating "all" students as multicultural "citizens" who understand pluralism and have competency in the so-called culturally interdependent global world. Darling-Hammond identifies multiculturalism with the "kind of knowledge and abilities needed in the 21st-century,"[38] creating citizens who are not just savvy in multicultural cosmopolitanism but also in math, science, consumption and so on. Her work outlines MCE in the context of neoliberal discourses and appoints multiculturalism the role of the mediator in a socio-economic race for wealth and power. In some cases, her work equates MCE discourse with the desire to 'learn' to compete in the global market to ensure the perpetuation of U.S. global hegemony, which consequently perpetuates the myth of creating a "just" U.S. society. As many critical education scholars such as Pauline Lipman point out, these discourses are driven by a neoliberal project aimed at increasing economic opportunities for private interests and further economic and political disinvestments in groups of color.[39] The nationalistic, 21st-century "citizenship" discourse further imposes a dismissal of groups that do not identify with the U.S. nation and its geopolitical hegemonic agenda.

My study of the territorial MCE discourses that treat 'power' as a commodity that can be attained by territorial individuals (dominated or racialized groups and citizens) begin to fall prey to neoliberal economic discourses that thrive by aligning social justice discourse with economization. For instance, MCE social justice discourses often prioritize the importance of increasing educational attainment for under-represented students in order for them to obtain equitable education and economic opportunity structures.[40] These presumptions stem from assumed territorial location and function of power relations in society, which assume that there is a positive and direct correlation between investment in education (particularly Science and Math) and economic growth, which is associated with a means to possess power. Thus, territorial MCE discourses strategize social justice based on raising not only awareness about inequalities faced by oppressed students, but also by providing them access to “power” structures that help them become successful in schools and be effective participants in society. These territorial discourses are easily captured by neoliberal economic discourses that aim at reforming educational policy and individuals based on the basic promise of increasing economic welfare for all factions of society to benefit.

MCE discourses often get co-opted by the administrative mechanism of neoliberal economic discourses that instantiate economic rationales for conceptualizing social justice and pressure individuals to conceive of themselves as learners and citizens of a 21st-century economic regime. Territorial assumptions render multiculturalism amenable to neoliberal discourses, i.e., they endorse liberal versions of “social justice” discourses aimed at generating greater objectification and commercialization of education as well as the individual subject. These assumptions generate a human capital model of education, where individuals are conceptualized as capital and begin to rationalize their own existence with economic modes of conduct. For instance, in many recent multicultural texts and particularly in James Banks’ work on ‘citizenship education,’ we often see the formulation of progressive goals for social justice education embedded in concerns for raising awareness about individual duties of citizenship and cosmopolitanism. In Banks, the discourse of “*e pluribus unum*—out of many, one”[41] dictates social justice and progressivism. Banks’ ‘out of many, one’ discourse envisions social justice through the national unity of a ‘learning society’ that cultivates culturally and ethnically diverse citizens who are well equipped to face the changing nature of culture, economy and globalism and to create equitable societies. However, the ideal picture of a unified nation reduces individual differences to acceptable forms and channels of political representation.

Moreover, numerous Foucault-inspired education scholars whose work tries to expose the interrelationships between neoliberal governmentality and 'neoliberal schooling'[42] have suggested that the discourse of 'citizenship' and 'learning society' represents a territorial depiction of individuals who are imagined to be autonomous and rational beings, who are pursuing competitive economic ends, such as life-long learning and self-investments in education, health and other means of optimizing human capital. They point attention to potential of these neoliberal discourses about individuals to render social justice a personal matter and a competitive selective politics of economization which fosters deeper social stratification.[43] I draw on their work as well as Foucault's study of governmentality to argue that territorial depictions made by territorial MCE discourses often result in being co-opted by neoliberal economic discourses that also aim at individualizing and economizing relationships. Foucault suggests discourses that individualize populations are part of a neoliberal technology of power or governmentality. The notion of defining a specific 'population' as a unified entity by itself is a territorial construct aimed at establishing conventions of governance. Foucault argues that these territorial discourses about populations are further territorialized into individuals, hence Foucault's interpretation of *e pluribus unum* suggests that it is an attempt to seize power through individualizing. As Foucault puts it:

> The new technology that is being established is addressed to a multiplicity of men, not to the extent that they are nothing more than their individual bodies, but to the extent that they form, on the contrary, a global mass that is affected by overall processes characteristic of birth, death, production, illness, and so on. So after a first seizure of power over the body in an

> individualizing mode, we have a second seizure of power that is individualizing but, if you like, massifying.[44]

Individualization, the concern of governments with bodies, exemplifies the shift from a disciplinary society to an administrative one. This new art of government entails the recognition of ‘power’ not only in the territorial repressive apparatuses of the state and institutions but in multiplicity of relationships between different sets of territories and discursive constructs (i.e., self, family, school, hospital) through which individuals conduct their daily lives, seemingly without any visible or territorial power of governmental interference.

Foucault argues that with governmentality “instead of a pastoral power and a political power…there was an individualizing ‘tactic’ that characterized a series of powers: those of the family, medicine, psychiatry, education and employers.”[45] It is in this individualizing tactic that we begin to see the emergence of the neoliberal territories of the ‘self’ (and other multiplicities of territories, family, school, prison) as a technique of power which allows governments to rule *with* the subjects rather than *over* them. Foucault identifies the *homo economicus* as the bearer of this power relationship.[46] Power in these terms is no longer conducted through rights and laws but rather situated in an active practice of productivity, investment and optimization—treating the “body as a machine.”[47] As Foucault puts it:

> Government has to do with is not territory but, rather, a sort of complex composed of men and things. The things, in this sense, with which government is to be concerned are in fact men, but men in their relations, their links, their imbrication with those things that are wealth, resources, means of subsistence…the climate, irrigation, fertility and so on; men in their relation to those other things that are customs, habits, ways of acting and thinking.[48]

We witness the direct translation of these neoliberal economic discourses dictating territorial MCE texts, for instance, when James Banks states that “multicultural education is to help students to acquire the reading, writing and math skills needed to function effectively in a global and “flat” technological world—that is, one in which students in New York City, London, Paris, and Berlin must compete for jobs with students educated in developing nations such as India and Pakistan.”[49] Banks’ assumptions about the goal of MCE appeal to neoliberal logics of justice and social care, which set the basis for an economistic pluralism discourse and individual subjectivity driven by commercial desires. What is at stake when territorial MCE discourses become translators of neoliberal economic discourse is an ontological transformation of subjectivity through discourses of subjectification that normalize and internalize economic discourses in pursuing/desiring learning, prosperity, social justice and caring.

Deterritorializing Multicultural Education

My research is not merely an attempt to critique territorial MCE discourses that are easily co-opted by neoliberal economic formulizations of education. My study is also invested in finding approaches within social justice education that have the potential to challenge territorial and neoliberal discourses. I therefore present deterritorializing MCE as an experimental approach to transformative education, which may allow MCE scholars and educators to reconceptualize and build new creative ways to address difference and power relations in education and society. In this section, I briefly introduce how we may theoretically begin to address deterritorialization and where we may seek similar deterritorialized instances in MCE discourse and practice. My goal is to illustrate the processes of deterritorializing MCE as philosophical experiments, which actively search for new concepts and practices to rethink and re-create the scope and goals of social justice education. Praxis of deterritorializing MCE is thus a sort of philosophizing that is not solely limited to theorizing but heavily draws upon creating applicable new concepts for addressing and performing social justice education.

Deterritorializing is thus an inclusive approach rather than a dismissive position. It is not a rejection of the MCE work that is on-going, it is rather a new drawing board for different approaches to social justice education to intermingle, improvise and imagine. While deterritorializing MCE, I draw on ‘culturally relevant teaching’ (CRT) and ‘funds of knowledge’ (FoK) approaches to MCE to illustrate the positive potential that resides within MCE approaches that are comfortable with uncertainties and shifting territories. For instance, I try to demonstrate how we may deterritorialize MCE through Norma Gonzalez’s and Luis Moll’s valuable work on interculturality. Tracing FoK, I try to convey how MCE can open up endless educational approaches to social justice education and the multiplicities of lived experiences students bring into educational settings, multiplying the new conceptions to think about difference and power relations.[50] I seek such rich venues for a deterritorial approach to ‘doing’ MCE, which avoid presumed assumptions about the location of power relations, identities and knowledge. Deterritorializing MCE through approaches such as FoK render MCE comfortable with newness, and as Sharon Todd asserts, “such uncertainty compels educators to develop thoughtful approaches to the Other rather than to carry out a set of repeated and predetermined behaviors.”[51] Moreover, the encounter with newness has given educators reasons to avoid territorial definitions of who their students are and what they may desire from their education and the world around them. Ultimately, deterritorializing the desire for transformative education by dispersing the territorial sign-posts that have trivialized how we imagined individual differences, economic welfare and power relations.

I often appeal to Jacques Ranciere's work on education when trying to describe deterritorializing MCE, and claim that it is an embrace of 'ignorance'[52] in learning and teaching contexts and refuses to remain limited to territorial discourses which construct certainties about learning, individual difference and power relations. Deterritorial educational experiences decline to be dictated by normative assumptions about content knowledge and who the students are and what constitutes their conduct, participation and consciousness. In Foucault's words, deterritorial approaches treat individuals, institutions, relations and discourses as "vehicles of power, not its points of application,"[53] and they do not search for formulizations to understand and possess knowledge. Deterritorialized educational experiences treat learning not as a possession belonging to certain individuals but rather see learning as an open ended and on-going complex set of encounters with compromises and negotiations, ideas, identities, cultures, beliefs and knowledge.

Deterritorializing MCE strives to render learning an open-ended site, foregrounding individual experiences for creating collective experiences. Such settings allow for pedagogical and ethical responsibilities towards what Gert Biesta calls the "plurality of otherness,"[54] acknowledging the potential of a multiplicity of differences as the agent of progressive change. In other words, deterritorial MCE would not assume that students need to be equipped with 21st-century human capital skills in order to be "successful" and encamp all experience through a single objective. A deterritorialized

MCE can cultivate vibrant classroom atmospheres of unpredictable eruptions of frustration and joy, where individual differences are constantly interrupted by fluctuations that bring out their creative playfulness, their multiplicity of desires and differences. Sharon Todd's work describes such instances as pedagogies that cross borders without settling for a single border and that learn *from* differences rather than *about* them,[55] enabling multiplicities of learners and desires to perform collective experiences. It is within these collectivities that deterritorial approaches to MCE refrain from treating student identities, goals and capacities as fixed points but rather put them into motion by allowing them to be catalysts for creative knowledge rather than territories to be breached or conquered.

Deterritorial MCE allows for blurring the binary lines of right versus wrong, acceptable versus faulty forms of knowledge and the individual. It achieves this by inviting classroom collectivities into performances where authority structures and normative assumptions about content and individuals are contested. Judith Butler has taken up this task of creativity by embedding it in performativity. She explains that performativity "is not a 'pure' opposition, a 'transcendence' of contemporary relations of power, but a difficult labor of forging a future from resources inevitably impure."[56] Butler's search for the 'future' resonates with a deterritorial multiculturalism that is not a mere fixed alternative space, but instead an attempt to explore in-between events and conditions in classrooms for performances of differences and ambivalences to collectively engage with content and power and improvise a future for MCE.

Kris Gutierrez provides an illustrative example with a theatrical act in which the students engage in a brief *teatro* act and attempt to fly by flapping their arms, their "wings"; the metaphors of flying and wings are used to reframe the leading activity of learning, reading their course texts as "flying with our minds" and the course readers themselves as "wings" and "tools."[57] During the act students engage one another through their differences and lived experiences as they try to collectively play out how reading books can or cannot become the vehicle by which dreams come true. Gutierrez shows that the collective nature of social dreaming, imagining and creating can take place within the shifting locations of students' desires and how these differences can initiate interstitial instances to interrogate authority and foster respect for difference. I acknowledge that moving toward such performative pedagogies will undeniably lead to debate, conflict and frustration. But the challenges, frustrations and explosions themselves provide the intensity needed for in-between pedagogies to give voice to desires that may disrupt institutional territorializations of education. Such work needs to be dirty, disorderly, rootless and unrecognizable to a territorial gaze.

These deterritorial settings may encounter students whose desires are sanctioned by the institution and who desire their own oppression. Students often feel uncomfortable when they do not know what would get them an 'A' or what the 'required' assignments are. I propose deterritorialization as an invitation to individuals engaged in education that urges them to attest their eagerness to risk, create and contest, to break the territorial molds that confine them into positions of passive voyeurism. Mary Bryson and Suzanne de Castell, in their quest for "what is queer pedagogy," characterize a similar decentered teaching, asserting, "praxis makes im/perfect; that is to say, an eclectic mélange of the wonderful, the awful, and the in-between. And perhaps, in pedagogical matters, im/perfect outcomes are necessarily the norm."[58] Indeed, such deterritorialized approaches to MCE can be powerful transformative tools that may reveal what Homi Bhabha refers to as the performative nature of different identities.

> The regulation and negotiation of those spaces that are continually, *contingently*, 'opening out', remarking the boundaries, exposing the limits of any claim to a singular autonomous sign of difference – be it class, gender or race. Such assignations of social differences – where difference is neither One nor the Other but *something else besides, in-between* – find their agency in a form of the 'future' where that past is not originary, where the present is not simply transitory…an interstitial future, that emerges *in-between* the claims of the past and the needs of the present.[59]

These "in-between" borders of cultural differences for Homi Bhabha are signs of new cultural identities that emerge across differences. Bhabha insists that cultural identities cannot be accounted for by pregiven cultural essences to understand the conventions of difference. Instead, Bhabha insists on problematizing territorial claims and beginning a "borderline work of culture," which demands an encounter with 'newness.'[60] The conditions of this continual encounter with newness are performative, meaning that the representation of difference and culture in these settings are in a state of on-going negotiation that prioritizes cultural hybridities and contestation of fixed ontologies. A deterritorialized educational setting enables ambivalently and continually opening out forms of representation, which may allow multicultural educators to join in a new dialogue.

However, educators must be careful not to territorialize performativity of newness by assigning new territorial assumptions about an essence, e.g., an "oppressed" performing actor—subjugated into a territory of power—and turn deterritorialization into a *scenario* in which a repertoire of territorial pedagogy situates the educator as the *discoverer* or grantor of newer territories (e.g., critical consciousnesses), which "control the scene"[61] by allocating *what* knowledge needs to be produced and *who* needs to take part in critical pedagogy. And yet a deterritorial MCE performativity is not merely an arbitrary intervention that occurs in a discursive field. It is a slippery process of grappling with signification, *a*signifiation and resignification that include "both the often traumatic force of normalization and that which resists it."[62] My study of deterritorial instances in classrooms has allowed me to argue that individuals who become co-creators of knowledge and translators of difference are in an ambivalent and partial presence within the discourse of dominant power relations in society. Their partial presences open up immanent spaces for the educational practices to interrupt the authority of power. The in-between slippages instantiated by the *ambivalence* of deterritorial MCE "does not merely 'rupture' the discourse, but becomes transformed into an uncertainty which gives the colonial subject a *partial* presence."[63] Henry Giroux offers us an example of this deterritorialization while grappling with how to address individual difference. Giroux highlights the positive potential of partial and ambivalent presences in classrooms and suggests a positive reading of power relations associated with Whiteness. Giroux tries to offer a splintering of territorial identifications and articulates a partial positionality for Whiteness that has "to learn and unlearn, engage in critical pedagogy of self-formation that allows" White students "to be border-crossers, crossing racial lines not to be black, but so they can begin to forge multiracial coalitions based on an engagement rather than a denial of whiteness."[64] Giroux's emphasizes that White students should not be confronted with binary choices which either accept Whiteness or dismiss it as racist, which would merely be reactionary engagement with a racialized social power dynamic. Instead, Giroux maintains that whiteness should be understood as an evolving partial "multilayered identity"[65] that flattens binaries and has progressive and oppositional elements. My study searches for such deterritorial instances, which may have the potential to undermine territorial discourses that locate 'power' in predetermined figures and political terrains. Deterritorial MCE may offer social justice education new directionalities that are not so easily dictated by territorial discourse amenable to neoliberal economization.

Chapters

In Chapter 2, I map out territorial discourses in MCE. I argue that the scope and aim of social justice education is significantly hindered by territorial MCE discourses that strive to create observable and 'knowable' categories for multicultural education. To exemplify, I study MCE discourses that treat power as a possession to be grasped by certain individuals, which also create territorial confinements that dictate MCE's conceptualizations of individual difference and social justice politics. These territories operate as boundaries that discipline and administer thought and action. I discuss how the individual is constructed as a unified territorial self with the consciousness and the agency to create a world of his/her making. I argue that the coupling of territorial conception of the individual with an essentialized view of power relations in society is reflective of a limited territorial MCE strategy for progressivism. Using insights from MCE texts, I illustrate how multicultural education discourses in the U.S. are often crippled by their own categorizations while trying to identify difference and cope with the socio-political context of educational issues such as racial marginalization and culturally relevant pedagogy. By examining the work carried out by James Banks, Sonia

Nieto and other prominent MCE scholars, I articulate how territorial MCE conceptions about ‘power’ construct essentialized territories for social justice education and individual praxis in a multicultural society, which ultimately reduce their differences and multiplicities into pregiven loyalties, e.g., citizenship and identity. The chapter questions how and why these territories are constructed through the administrative MCE discourses that structure, situate and construct so-called “suitable” identities as well as political actions for its audience.

My goal in Chapter 3 is to illustrate how by risking being co-opted by neoliberal economistic discourses territorial assumptions about individuals and social justice may further impair MCE’s efforts to forefront difference and offer venues for transformative education. I highlight the dangers of neoliberal economic discourses taking control over MCE’s social justice agendas—such as educational attainment and scientific literacy—in order to instantiate educational incentives and neoliberal forms of social control driven by capital. I argue that neoliberal conceptions about educational skills and educational subjects have already begun to structure a human capital model of the multicultural individual, which increasingly equates diversity and democracy with economic competitiveness.

Chapter 4 will offer approaches to rethink MCE through a poststructuralist reading of power and individuals, which may enable educators to utilize slippages and ambivalent discourses that contest and transform territorial assumptions of power and difference. My attempt is to argue for an in-between approach to multiculturalism that does not reject progressive agendas nor fully endorse finalized (depleted) territorial strategies. I suggest that a splintering of territorial discourses may allow for those territories to become ambivalent shifting lines, rather than finalized reference points. I propose that MCE can be imagined to explode into playful and uncertain possibilities for transformative education and social justice. Hence, my work in the final chapter tries to put forward MCE as a performative experience that contests and deterritorializes structural claims to power, knowledge and student identities. I argue deterritorial approaches give way to multiplicities of creative, collective relations within which individuals become active participants in learning. In such deterritorial education settings, territorial codes that prescribe meaning and knowledge are contested, and neoliberal economic discourses that discipline agency, desire and emotions are rejected.

The final chapter offers some of my own personal encounters with deterritorial potentials in the classroom. I problematize assumptions MCE educators often resort to when trying to name their student demographics and student identities. I draw on my experiences as a teacher to offer MCE educators possibilities for deterritorializing their classrooms and suggest approaches to curriculum and teaching.

CHAPTER 2

TERRITORIAL MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

> Over immense periods of time the intellect produced nothing but errors. A few of these proved to be useful and helped to preserve the species: those who hit upon or inherited these had better luck in their struggle for themselves and their progeny. Such erroneous articles of faith... include the following: that there are things, substances, bodies; that a thing is what it appears to be; that our will is free; that what is good for me is also good in itself.
>
> (Nietzsche, F. *The Gay Science*)

Introduction

Multicultural education is social justice education. It attempts to promote transformative educational discourses that challenge mainstream notions of difference, identity and privilege while challenging racism and other biases as well as the inequitable structures, policies, and practices of schools and, ultimately, of society itself. In pursuing its mission, MCE discourses foster the transformative value of starting courageous conversations about inequalities in education, such as lack of educational attainment by underrepresented students, educational structures and policies that yield different social outcomes for different factions of society, and curriculum that misrepresent or dismisses the cultural richness and points of view of different nonmainstream groups in the U.S.

education. In this chapter, I would like to offer a close analysis of MCE texts in order to illustrate the shortcomings of a territorial approach to MCE, which is limited to merely react to a ‘reality’ constructed by territorial discourses. By examining and reacting to power as a force with a center and definitive territory, I argue that certain MCE discourses create binaries of the dominant and the dominated, which inscribe territorial discourses for the social justice agenda of MCE. These territorial approaches to MCE fail to make use of the transformative potential that resides in movements that stem from multiple points of subversion that are outside of already defined categories and fields of action. In an effort to rethink MCE, this chapter will map some of the MCE territorial discourses that (i) territorialize power relations and rely on (ii) territorial assumptions about individuals with a particular political territory.

To illustrate, I will first examine how the territorial conception of power in MCE discourses create observable and predictable ‘territories of power,’ consequently narrowing its scope and aim. Then I will try to map the political terrain created by territorial conceptions of power relations and territorial MCE discourses used in identifying individual differences. Articulating on how territorial MCE conceptions construct an ontological territory for individuals in a multicultural society, I will argue that territorial MCE discourse reduces individual difference and multiplicities of identities to pregiven political loyalties. I question how territorial MCE discourse aims at structuring, situating and constructing so-called “suitable” identities as well as political thought and action. However, I do not wish this chapter to construct a totalizing view about multicultural education. My research has also allowed me to map out an emerging future in the way MCE discourses deal with power relations, which do not necessarily territorialize particular conceptual tools, such as culture and individual difference. The final section of this chapter will therefore briefly highlight the positive potential embedded in some of the approaches to MCE.

Construction of a Territorial Conception of Power

In this section, I find it useful to briefly carry out a very brief genealogical analysis of the territorial definition of 'power' in the leading sociopolitical texts written by scholars who have significantly influenced contemporary political thought and practice. Reading their work as examples of territorial discourses may enable us to develop a critical language to investigate MCE texts. I will try to demonstrate that territorial MCE discourses are often representative of or have been influenced by political discourses that have struggled to categorize and resolve uncertainty through territorial conceptualizations.

As early as Thomas Hobbes' 1651 book titled *Leviathan*, which is regarded as a foundational text that sets the conceptual premises of modern political thought and practice, we see territorial conceptions that try to make sense of individuals and their political conduct. Hobbes argues that mankind in nature is greedy and without a political system: mankind is always in pursuit of more power. Nevertheless, Hobbes also believes that people are rational, which enables mankind to overcome the 'natural' and give way to "art" or politics whereby the 'modern' man flourishes. Mankind creates artificial entities or works of art that reflect its rational sensibilities, such as communities, governments, Kingdoms and so forth. The great Leviathan or the Common-wealth is one great art of man in which individuals surrender their sovereign pursuits to a common covenant which carries a “greater stature and strength than the Naturall” [1]state of being. For Hobbes, life could only be just and safe under the reign of a Leviathan. The Leviathan is the absolute territorial representation of all power surrendered by individuals into a single center governed by an all powerful sovereign entity (such as a king, nobility, etc.), which in return determines and maintains justice and the protection of rights.

Another century later, John Locke, who, unlike Hobbes, believed that it would be foolish and suppressive for mankind to submit to an absolute all powerful monarch when the political society they surrender to, by its own will, can establish a commonwealth through a civil society of equal liberties.[2] For Locke, a monarch cannot rule a civil society commonwealth because there will be no society under an all-powerful Leviathan. Locke argued that societies emerge from men’s inalienable right for self-preservation and his/her property as part of their liberty, their preservation, which they negotiate to create a covenant under civil liberties. Locke highlighted the individual as a unified being with inalienable rights to life, liberty and property that creates a society and a commonwealth to preserve his/her rights. By taking those fundamental rights away from the individual, the very basic premise of society would be undermined. After Hobbes, Locke exerts the territory of individual as the foundational figure of political life.

During the same period, partially in agreement with Locke’s ideas about individual rights and civil society, J.J. Rousseau lays out a detailed description of democracy. Although he remains highly critical of property rights, Rousseau describes democratic processes to involve people who enter into a ‘social contract’ reflecting and representing the individual wills, rights and desires of each member of society. The social contract instantiates what Rousseau calls a “General Will,” created by the people and for the people who become the composers and contributors of the power, rules and norms they live under as citizens. The General Will, for Rousseau is then where every man is free and as citizens everyone is equal and has no more power or influence on the General Will than any other citizen in the society. As Rousseau puts it, “each man, in giving himself to all, gives himself to nobody; and as there is no associate over whom he does not acquire the same right as he yields others over himself, he gains an equivalent for everything he loses.” [3] Locke’s and Rousseau’s assumptions about creating political order and wielding power nevertheless remain within the territorial paradigm of power outlined by Hobbes a century before.

Although Locke and Rousseau challenge some of Hobbes’ epistemological assumptions about mankind, they operate within the same ontological territory of political theory. ‘Power’ needs to be wielded and regulated and thus exists as a commodity or a tool. ‘Power’ is regulated through the creation of territories, leviathan, inalienable rights, general will and so forth. The individual, who is the bearer of reason which carves a distinguished territory for him/her in nature, creates a political center for power (a depository so to speak) that will be just and egalitarian. These territorial conceptions theorized by Enlightenment philosophers for finding a location for power that will be harmonious or result in democratic society define for us a territorial discourse for political thought and action. Preceding sections will try to illustrate how in some cases, multicultural education literature is embedded in such territorial depictions of ‘power’ in its approach to social justice and individual difference.

Multicultural Education Territorializing Power Relations

The tendency of some multicultural education discourses to mirror territorial prescriptions which rely upon essentialized descriptions of equity (such as access to education and equal opportunity) exemplify ways in which MCE is amenable to endorsing territorial forms of power relations. Chicana scholar and activist Maria de la Luz Reyes' essay clearly demonstrates this tendency of conceptualizing the world through territorial discourses. Reyes argues that her work is "concerned with empowerment of the *entire* oppressed community of color—males and females….advancing the concerns of my community, improving the literacy and graduation rates among our youth, and improving its economic and political status."[4] Reyes constructs several territories of power in her brief statement, depicting binaries of "community of color" versus dominant other, and the community of color is perceived in terms of a narrow gender binary of "males and females." Reyes assumes that power is lacking in the territories of color, as she portrays them as oppressed and in need of redeeming power. Reyes situates the empowerment of the oppressed in territories which are composed of "graduation rates" and "improving economic and political status."

Another common occurring theme in territorial MCE discourses that emerge out of such territorial binaries of power is engraved in the militaristic discourse of "allies" or "White allies." A culturally-competent *ally who is prepared to teach—for instance in Gloria Ladson-Billings work—African American students*[5] *by learning their distinctive racial experience in U.S. history and or "*constructing a positive white racial identity." [6] The discourse constructs a racial territory (White) based on an assumption about the center of power as well as who is equipped to combat these power centers that cause inequalities. *Constructing racial categories to overcome racialization* is thus reminiscent of territorial political assumptions of power and the identity of individuals who are capable of subjecting themselves to essentialized categories to transcend such externalities.

In James Banks' work, multiculturalism resorts to territorial assumptions about power and identity claiming that MCE's aim is to "help students of color and low-income students to experience academic success, and thus become effective citizens."[7] Here Banks' discourse prescribes repressed identities as given territorial identities of "students of color and low-income" groups and their acceptable institutional transformation prescribed under the territory of academically successful "citizens." The territorial discourse that is operating in this assumption sets the regulatory mechanism that divides social difference into territorial categories in order to be governed through the territorial identification of power relations. The "effective citizen" is depicted as the territorial figure that is capable of identifying its learning role within the presumed territorial locations of power. This requires that MCE must "know" the desires of individuals or have critical consciousness that renders certain territorial positions as aware of these centers of power and identities that have power or in need of empowerment.

In *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society,* James Banks offers us a territorialization that is characteristic of the MCE literature, in suggesting that MCE research:

> Pursues questions that are related to the lives of groups that have historically been marginalized and discriminated against in society. Its aim is to construct valid and accurate explanations and theories about these

> groups that can be used to improve their lives and help them become full participants in their societies and nation-states. Multicultural research assumes that valid, accurate, and comprehensive knowledge about marginalized groups can be used to help them attain freedom and to become full citizens and change agents within their nation-states.[8]

Banks further suggests that in schools this is only possible if we know "which groups have the power to define and institutionalize their conceptions within schools, colleges and universities."[9] Banks' argument implies that in MCE research we need to construct a 'location of power' as an image for individuals to reflect on and become active participants in a territorial political imagination.

Banks' argument situates and often limits MCE to create marginality in order to influence a political center of power MCE assumes to be location of power. Largely because for James Banks transformative research usually "originates within marginalized communities and presents concepts and paradigms that challenge established [dominant] ones."[10] MCE must therefore have the wisdom or the arrogance to produce marginality by "knowing" the location of power, i.e., where and what the margins are and what experiences, politics and desires will characterize these territories. For Banks, this is the genesis of critical consciousness and the unified individual who understands and is able to subvert power by learning and wielding its location. Such MCE discourses see, hear and speak the oppressive forms of power where it disciplines, suppresses and defines subjects by reacting to presumed oppressive structures.

As I have tried to show in the previous chapter using Foucault's critique of territorial conceptions of 'power,' Banks' approach to 'power' is a repressive hypothesis of power and does not always reflect the multiplicities of how power relations operate or the immanent ways in which different people engage power. Banks' assumptions about the center of power and who occupies it or who doesn't limits transformative political action within assumed territories of marginality or domination. For instance, when Banks describes why MCE must decode racial processes, he adopts a territorial notion of power that not only treats race as mere political tool but also a repressive identification of difference. Banks argues that "race is one of the main categories used to construct differences. Groups with power within a society use race to construct racial categories that privilege members of their groups and to justify the exclusion and marginalization of groups with different and inferior racial characteristics."[11] Here, by assuming a lack of power on behalf of racialized groups and a possession of power by Whites, Banks' own construction of marginalization depicts race as a gadget that is wielded by White mainstream groups to exert power. For Banks, democratic education then becomes an effort to gain 'power' over or an oppositional consciousness to subvert the apparatuses and forms of power. As a result of such coarse generalizations, MCE gets embedded in the repressive imagination of territorial power by associating education and learning as simply an instrument for "success" that is defined in terms of attaining 'power.' Social justice is then broadly associated with cosmopolitan citizenship and power sharing between different centers and territories, i.e., between Whites and Blacks, lower and higher-income classes. For instance, when Sonia Nieto elaborates that MCE is "for all students" she makes ontological assumptions about the identities, experiences and normative experiences of these students. Nieto argues that students "from dominant groups are prone to develop an unrealistic view of the world and their place in it" as well as "children from dominated groups [who] may develop feelings of inferiority based on their schooling."[12] Nieto defines "all" students within the boundaries of a narrow, negative, repressive relationship of power (dominant vs. dominated binary) and allocates degrees of variance/difference based on that principle. Nieto's approach to student identities encapsulates them into fixed positions of power, which results in territorializing their perceptions of power relations, individual differences and praxis.

Individual differences in territorial MCE discourse are then acknowledged as political categories in which culture, race, ethnicity, class and gender become political territories students must embrace to gain power and social justice educator to understand and invent political strategies to empower students. 'Power' is thus treated as a transferable commodity that can be wielded and redistributed, a metaphorical sword which grants power to those who master it to combat through and to a presumed location of power. Social justice is reduced to theories and practices that aim at locating and occupying the territory of power. The mastery of power is assumed to be achievable through 'educational attainment' and the 'equal opportunity' to obtain equal status and position of power in society. For this "just" cause James Banks for instance and other territorial MCE texts are willing to formulate certain identities as marginalized and in need of empowerment and also decide their learning goals and desires on their behalf; i.e. their "need" to learn the necessary skills to be successful and increase opportunity structures for access to the decision making systems of a pluralistic 21st-century society.[13] This sort of territorial militant approach towards the location of power in politics and the missionary roles appointed to the right kind of "soldier" identity (social justice advocate, critical thinker, White-ally) not only essentializes the activism of individuals who are passionate about transformative education, it also reduces their knowledge of tactics and strategies for social change to already defined territorial confines of territorial power and politics.

Thus, it is no surprise that in MCE texts we find passages about ‘power sharing’ and customary legal judicial engagements with power, e.g., Banks’ assertion that “genuine discussion between traditionalists and multiculturalists can take place only when power is placed on the table, negotiated, and shared.”[14] The table metaphor here echoes the “knights of the round table” where all seated around it would have the same stature and political decisions would be made in a setting of power sharing where all parties are equal. The following statement by Banks illustrates how territorial MCE’s discourses shape its formulizations:

> Textbooks have always reflected the myths, hopes, and dreams of the people in society with money and power. As African Americans, Latinos, Asians, and women become more influential participants on the power stage, textbooks will increasingly reflect their hopes, dreams, and disappointments…it is the dominant group or groups in power that have already shaped the curriculum, institutions, and structures in their images and interests.[15]

Although Banks’ statement is useful in pointing out the power relations that influence the educational settings, the ‘power stage’ is based on a territorial imagination and poses “money” as power and textbooks as apparatuses of suppression or liberation. Social justice is then defined as attaining enough money to participate in the general will of a textbook, which in this case becomes the political territory transformative educators must react to in order to change society and knowledge. The commodity hypothesis of power—in our neoliberal moment—is especially dangerous when material status and educational attainment begin to prevail in defining the goals of democracy and social justice education through economic incentives.

When James Banks theorizes social justice as a struggle on a “power stage,” he constructs a war-zone where ‘power’ is an instrument in the hands of dominant groups. Consequently, the purpose of social justice education is derived from the subsequent effect of that struggle and domination, yet again as an instrument of power or empowerment against domination. This sounds a lot like Hobbes’ ‘war of all against all’ hypothesis which dictates how and why a society determines its governance and forms of justice. For Banks, this is how students “learn how to practice democracy” and citing John Dewey, Banks states “all genuine education comes through experience.”[16] While giving credit to Dewey’s pragmatic take on experience, culture, society and democracy, Banks nevertheless territorializes MCE discourse by projecting experience as mere expression of territorial depictions of culture, suppression, discrimination and identity that needs to be incorporated into the cultural democracy of multicultural citizens. Dewey’s work would have never accepted being part of a democracy that is pregiven and defined by the universal rights of essentialized multicultural entities. Experience for Dewey is not just the cultural component of an already expertly established roadmap of a thing called democracy.[17] Experience is not a condition for democracy but it is rather what keeps it open and creative and multiple, not bound to commitments or cultural territories or ideals. Thus, when Banks refers to educational setting where MCE is about “teaching students to know…about the experiences of different ethnic and racial groups,”[18] Banks is actually reducing democracy, experience and cultural complexity into observable territorial variables. Even though Banks believes that cultures are dynamic and complex and changing, he insists that we can know about them by our “ability to understand and interpret values and behavioral styles that are normative within the ethnic group."[19]

In his essay, *The Historical Reconstruction of Knowledge about Race: Implications for Transformative Teaching*, James Banks carries out critique of how discourses can influence political imagination and exert totalizing views about individual difference. Banks uses a historical case study of the construction and reconstruction of race between the late 19th century and the 1940s to "document the ways in which the social, cultural, political, and historical contexts in which knowers are embedded influence the knowledge they construct and reconstruct"[20] about race. Nevertheless, Banks fails to see that he is taking part in a similar discourse by arguing that social justice education must have the ability to know and understand the experiences of diverse groups. Banks attempt to deconstruct discourse of race doesn't explore using it as a self-reflective method to reevaluate MCE's basic assumptions about social justice, and its theoretical and political conceptual frameworks. Social justice education is thus treated as territorial field of action for individuals who are assumed to be empowered by their consciousness, governed by reason and rights to tackle inequalities. In the next section, I'd like to develop this idea about how territorial MCE discourses envision individuals and question how social justice education is trivialized by the territorial political terrain it is embedded in.

Political Territory of "Individuals" in Multicultural Education

MCE scholar Christine Sleeter argues that "power holders in education are mainly the education establishment: administrators, classroom teachers, university professionals, and community constituents who support school policies and practices that multicultural education advocates wish to change."[21] Sleeter clearly carves out a territory for 'what' and 'where' 'power' is located by referring to it as a commodity possessed by a certain location of power, an influential office or an individual. 'Power' is treated as a possession or capacity of someone to force his/her will over others. By carving the territories (who has it, where it is located), MCE begins to construct the political and individual territory of 'how' power can be redeemed or redistributed. My research on multicultural education suggests that territorial discourses administer MCE's attempts to voice the desires of diverse populations when formulizing educational experiences for a politics of social change and justice. Territorial MCE discourses imagine a political territory in which students are territorialized to emerge as docile bodies whose desires are mediated and shaped by territorial pedagogical assumptions about power relations in society. Although much of MCE work is centered on debunking and exposing myths about identity, race and authority, MCE nevertheless holds on to those myths in order to challenge them, which consequently mitigates its social justice aim and scope.

For example, in *Why Are All Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?*, Beverly Daniel Tatum's contribution to MCE on how to 'teach about racism' makes territorial claims about power relations on behalf of complex set of individuals by stating that "dominant groups, by definition, set the parameters within which the subordinates operate. The dominant group holds the power and authority in society relative to the subordinates and determines how that power and authority may be acceptably used."[22] Tatum declares a territorial political framework, which she argues is determined and constructed by 'dominants' to exert power. Tatum also recognizes that this power relation constructs identities: "The parts of our identity that do capture our attention are those that other people notice and that reflect back to us."[23] Tatum stresses the existence of processes that construct political terrains and identities. In other terms, she acknowledges that politics and identities are discursive constructs and yet insists on using these territories (defined by a limited binary reading of power) as the foundational categories for beginning social justice activism and education. Tatum's work describes for us learning and experiential processes in which teaching about racism not only reflects the experiences of oppressed groups but also "needs to shift from an exploration of the experiences of victims and victimizers to that of empowered people of color and their white allies."[24] The shift Tatum advocates for is however futile as Tatum's analysis remains defined by the territorial discourses about individuals and power relations. Consequently Tatum creates essentialized perspectives that grant certain students "acceptable" channels of experience, activism and understanding of justice that mask other workings of desire.[25]

Territorial MCE discourses first grapple to know the individual, then grant individuals the knowledge and skills they need to become effective agents or combatants of progressive change; this requires a political territory. MCE political territory requires the creation of individuals who belong to a hierarchized categorization that is premised upon a repressive power relation hypothesis, which encapsulates political formulations to negative effect of power. As Foucault emphasizes “we must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it ‘excludes’, it ‘represses’, it ‘censors’, it ‘abstracts’, it ‘masks’, it ‘conceals’. In fact power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production.”[26] Foucault wants us to see that power relations produce objects and yet these constructs must not be the basis of analysis. Because such a lens would merely treat individuals as objects of power defined by a negative relationship between oppressors and oppressed. Individuals are rather active subjects within a relation of multidirectionality of outcomes of power relations, as opposed to being possessed by territories.

Christine Sleeter’s work which tries to articulate MCE as a “social movement” attests to another telling example of this territorial discourse about politics and individuals. Sleeter states that MCE educators “need to view children of oppressed groups, their parents, their communities, and their grassroots advocacy organizations as the natural constituency of multicultural education. Multicultural education ought to be about empowering this natural constituency.”[27] Individuals (students, groups, communities) are then established as the premise for a multicultural democratic society centered on the view that the territory of self reflects the cosmology it builds. The idea of a common political movement and identity is imaginary activism. A social justice movement does not need to be deeply rooted in an ideology, history or policy. Christina Beltrán’s work *The Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity* illustrates how an iconic social movement is a Euro-centric myth of doing politics and these outmoded political discourses often neglect to see the emergent, negotiated, more complex coalitions of social justice movements in the United States.[28] Territorial discourses that target the creation of an ‘acceptable’ individual territory in MCE texts are also apparent in Lisa Delpit’s quote, which she borrows from the words of a Native Alaskan MCE educator: “In order to teach you, I must know you. I pray for all of us the strength to teach our children what they must learn, and the humility and wisdom to learn from them so that we might better teach.”[29]

I find this statement explanatory of a territorial MCE discourse and yet extremely contradictory. It situates the individual as an object to be discovered, which the educator first must know and learn about, in order to learn from. Once again we are witnessing the construction of an ‘other’ or a ‘margin’ in order to learn from it. Ultimately defeating the purpose of engaging in a genuine ethical engagement with otherness as the discourse constructs its own otherness after its own image. It learns from it, only what it has deemed acceptable. Hence, teachers enacting territorial MCE discourses are only prepared to hear particular types of responses from students. Gert Biesta argues that such an account of knowing individuals thinks of “eduation as socialization, as a process of the insertion of newcomers into a preexisting “order” of humanity.”[30] Identifications are not useless or have no value in dealing with systems of discrimination, but as Sharon Todd tells us the ethical conditions of education “means giving up on the idea that learning about others is an appropriate ethical response to difference.”[31]

Consequently, the territory of individuals in MCE discourses emerge as an object of power—“its points of application”[32]—and inhibits individual subjectivity and activism to territorial political terrains. For example, in James Banks MCE work, an individual is shaped and shapes his/her regional (immediate reality), cultural (values, beliefs), national (civic duties) and global identifications.[33] For Banks, in a democratic society, these four layers are reconciled in a harmonious fashion and the individual should not be over-determined by any one of these layers of identification. Banks argues that multicultural education should promote such cosmopolitan citizens, thus, triumphing the individual as the territorial figure of reason and the sole composer of history accomplished by knowing and improving the inherent and objective internal structure and objective of individuals (desires, choices, and needs).

Banks describes for us a Newtonian orderly cosmos in which reason, logic and universal laws of the universe are aligned with human beings, who can or must live in harmony simply by reflecting on the order of the universe. In other words, human existence and society as knowable 'realities' necessitate a political territory as the binding sensibility of orderly individuals as citizens living in an orderly polis (country, world, universe). This was the ultimate goal of the Enlightenment project: the creation and the reconciliation of the binary between nature and human (savage and civilized), the particular and the universal in order to form its harmonious political system that preserved order without sacrificing individual freedom. Foucault traces the discourses that lead to the development of the "modern sovereign state" and argues that "the modern autonomous individual" and sovereign state "co-determine each other's emergence."[34] The subject is granted a genesis in which it is born into a knowable territory. To illustrate this tendency, Foucault maps technologies that aim at capturing individual conduct and argue that with modernity there is an increase in "investment of the body at the level of desire" and that the political conduct of subjectivities are no longer only disciplined by material repressive apparatuses but instead are also administrated through ethical surveillances that target subjects' desires.[35] The territory of the individual is rendered conscious of the structural constraints of the so-called centres of power, e.g., anarchic natural state of being, feudalism, capitalism, racial power centres and so forth. The individual becomes a "citizen" who then rationalizes political frameworks to come to terms and cope with these locations of power, i.e., by participating in territorial platforms such as democracy, revolution, community, identity and psychology.

Political Territory of Multicultural Individuals: Citizenship Education

Evidence of this territorial discourse about individuals is vivid in James Banks' *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, in which Banks articulates identification as a process in which "students should develop a delicate balance of cultural, national and global identifications."[36] These different territories assign rational individuals a presumably-known cultural, national and global trait and consciousness, while developing educational goals and societal ideals. Banks calls this process 'citizenship education' in which MCE plays a significant role:

> Citizenship education must be transformed in the 21st-century because of the deepening racial, ethnic, cultural, language, and religious diversity in nation-states. Citizens in a diverse democratic society should be able to maintain attachments to their cultural communities as well as participate in the shared national culture. *Unity without diversity results in cultural repression and hegemony. Diversity without unity leads to Balkanization and the fracturing of the nation-state.* Diversity and unity should coexist in a delicate balance in democratic multicultural nation-states. [37]

Banks explicitly and rightfully critiques a Eurocentric democracy but nevertheless his assumptions do not reject or transcend the territorial political framework of power relations constructed by Eurocentric assumptions about individuals and their role in society. His understanding of citizenship remains within the abstract notion of enlightened individuals with rights which we find in the texts of Hobbes, Rousseau and Locke.

Although Banks' endeavor to bring in the racial, ethnic, cultural, language, and religious diversity into the composition of citizenship is a noble project, it is limited by its territorial assumptions about power. Banks presupposes a cultural democracy for protecting the right to preserve the language and culture of one's own cultural group is only conceivable within a territorial political framework of citizenship. By presuming that power is located in a political representative body called the nation-state, Banks perpetuates a territorial repressive framework for political agency and transformative activism for groups that do not identify with the national unity. Repressive largely because it confines agency into already prescribed notions of politics. For instance, Banks' engagement with difference suggests a method of inclusion that is premised on territorial assumptions of difference as well as power and political agency. Banks tells us that a "major challenge facing the United States today is how to structurally include the millions of indigenous peoples of color who remain largely on the fringes of society, politically alienated within the commonwealth, and who share little in the nation's wealth."[38] The discourse that governs Banks' statement constructs a "margin" as a challenge to the institutional legality of a nation-state, which Banks conceptualizes as something that stems from the territorial reconciliation of differences under an inclusive general will and civic platform for sharing power and wealth. Difference in Banks' territorial discourse first appears as a challenge and then as an institutional transformation project which is resolved in an institutional language of acceptable political praxis, i.e., multicultural citizens who are "democratic subjects."

Banks risks reducing MCE discourse to a mere pedagogical apparatus of power mediation in a struggle for social justice, which becomes a teleological dispute within territorial borders of power defined in negative terms. The concern for citizenship exemplifies this tendency of being unable to theorize democracy without resorting to territorial pregiven ideals of its acceptable notions of individual agency and politics. More importantly, Banks' resolution for voicing diversity through citizenship merely becomes a method of governing difference within a territorial political framework which in many cases is extremely problematic for diverse cultural and ethnic groups that reject being identified within Eurocentric territories of political loyalty and activism. In other words, it assigns an instrumental role for cultural difference. As Troy A. Richardson points out, by ignoring the extrapolitical differences of Indigenous American youth, the language of citizenship in multicultural education texts and in schools, completely erases the relationship of members of "Native" nations have with the US and its schools.[39] Indeed, this tendency to territorialize power and political action for democracy may mitigate the potential for social justice education, because it seeks verifications for its transformative goals within the terrain of 'power' that grants prescribed territories for subjects and their field of conduct.

Territorializing the political framework of democracy regulates multiplicities of desires and captures it within rational, institutional, and legal definitions. Sonia Nieto's canonical work, *Affirming Diversity*, also illustrates this limitation as Nieto uses an indoctrinative territorial repertoire:

> Although the connection of multicultural education with students' rights and responsibilities in democracy is unmistakable, many young people do not learn about these responsibilities, the challenge of democracy, or the central role of citizens in ensuring the privileges of democracy.[40]

Unfortunately Nieto's attempt to initiate dialogue about a multicultural, plural and democratic just society—critical of racialized narratives and respectful of ethnic and cultural differences—remains limited as it relies on the discourse of "citizenship." It assigns 'citizenship' as the acceptable channel or territory for cultural dialogue. Multiculturalism is therefore treated as a tool that encourages cultural difference and actively seeks empowering individuals to voice them as long as it takes place within the territorial political framework of nation. It assumes that individuals can possess particular cultural and intellectual traits that need recognition and implementation (which in itself is a territorial approach to individuals) and only a national framework is appropriate for these venues to flourish and intermingle. In other words, the promised recognition of individual differences is granted though citizenship which reinscribes perceptions about power relations, activism and politics into already defined territorial assumptions about agency.

James Banks suffers from similar limitations when he argues that "every nation needs an overarching set of values and goals to which all members of the nation state are committed and there is a need for a national identity that is shared by all ethnic and racial groups…[which] also recognizes the need for Americans to maintain attachments to their ethnic communities."[41] The idea of being attached to these different layers of identity is a territorial understanding of the conditions of freedom and democracy. Social justice is equated with a political project that seeks universal harmony which is presumed to stem from reconciliation of differences in a national identity, which occurs within a split between the need of individual self-preservation and the political need for civil society, i.e., a Rousseauian 'General Will.' Therefore, in territorial multicultural education texts the notion of freedom to preserve one's own culture and ethnicity is often understood within the domains of a territorial political universe/nation or a Leviathan that is composed of the sum of all differences and diverse set of wills. As Banks in his work also states "citizens should be able to maintain attachments to their cultural communities as well as participate effectively in the shared national culture."[42] For Banks this requires:

> A new kind of citizenship "for the 21st-century, which "recognizes and legitimizes the rights and need of citizens to maintain commitments both to their ethnic and cultural communities and to the national civic culture. Only when the national civic culture is transformed in ways that reflect and give voice to the diverse ethnic, racial, language, and religious communities that constitute it will be viewed as legitimate by all citizens. Only then can they develop clarified commitments to the commonwealth and its ideals.[43]

Banks politicizes culture as an individual political 'will' that must be represented in the General Will of society. The political territory Banks advocates for reduces individual difference into a simple political problem that can be resolved if all differences can be accumulated to fit into the political territories of mainstream democracy.

Thus, Banks believes that multicultural education could be part of a political project to bring about democracy in pluralistic and diverse U.S. society and even help expand the frontiers of democracy across the cosmos and facilitate not only a national but a global cultural interdependence and harmony. For Banks "multicultural education is designed to help unify a deeply divided nation rather than to divide a highly cohesive one. MCE supports the notion of *pluribus unum*—one out of many…unum [however] must also involve power sharing and participation by people from many different cultural communities.” [44] The role of individuals and groups of individuals, no matter how different and diverse they may be, is rendered identical by Banks’ insistence on their taking part in a General Will democracy. The territorial conception of power—which assumes that there are power centers and that the governing institution or entity is in control of this power; ‘whoever holds state holds power,’—influences Banks who also assumes that establishing a governing sovereign power in accordance with the general will inevitably ensure that all voices are heard within a form of civil liberty and freedom. The political territory Banks operates in demands that social justice multicultural education redeems the center of power by creating a participatory *cultural democracy*,[45] which carries on an instrumental view of individual differences and multiculturalism.

Multicultural Education Is Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

In their 1987 empirical study of MCE texts in the US, Sleeter and Grant have shown that MCE texts mostly target combating unequal distribution of goods and power among different social groups, emphasizing issues such as poverty, institutional discrimination, and powerlessness.[46] Although the work carried out by MCE texts in pointing attention to these territories that characterize social inequalities is very important, the conceptual assumptions carried out to combat or change these inequalities runs the risks of being encapsulated by a territorial depiction of power. In this section I wish to start a conversation on how rethinking territorial multicultural education texts that struggle for influencing power relations may be carried out through experiential action and circumstantial improvisations. So far, I’ve tried to demonstrate that the location of power sought in territorial frameworks limits MCE conceptions about power relations and individual differences. Nevertheless, there is an emerging discourse within MCE texts that strives to steer analysis away from 'powerlessness' to positive potentiality that resides in the students who are deemed oppressed or marginalized.

In *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice,* Geneva Gay explains how nonessentialized MCE approaches to MCE may begin to address individual differences. Gay states:

> Like any other social or biological organism [culture] is multidimensional and continually changing. It must be so to remain vital and functional for those who create it and for those it serves. As manifested in expressive behaviors, culture is influenced by a wide variety of factors, including time, setting, age, economics, and social circumstances. This expressive variability does not nullify the existence of some core cultural features and focal values in different ethnic groups…Designating core or modal [cultural] characteristics does not imply that they will be identically manifested by all group members. Nor will these characteristics be negated if some group members do not exhibit any of them as described. How individual members of ethnic groups express their shared features varies widely for many different reasons. [47]

Culturally relevant pedagogy (CPR) is a significant component of MCE. It aims to utilize students' culture as a vehicle for learning, which has provided recent MCE texts conceptual tools to refrain from facilitating transformative educational settings that stems from repressive hypothesis about 'power.' Although there is still room for more epistemological work in theorizing CPR, its positive approach to processes of knowledge production by voicing the presumed 'margins' and the potentiality of enriching multiculturalism by learning *from* the abundance of experiences those traditionally excluded populations, provides MCE educators new terrains to engage social justice education. What is CPR? Gloria Ladson-Billings[48] argues that culturally relevant teaching addresses inequity in educational and socio-cultural realms by focusing on three tenets and goals: promoting academic achievement for students from diverse backgrounds, preparing cultural competence for teachers, and promoting sociopolitical consciousness to challenge mainstream norms in curriculum and society at large. In *The Dreamkeepers*, Ladson-Billings suggests that CPR occurs through what "each student brings to the classroom. Students are not seen as empty vessels to be filled by all-knowing teachers. What they know is acknowledged, valued, and incorporated into the classroom."[49]

CRP approach to multicultural education thus strives to ensure students' strengths and funds of knowledge as instructional starting points in which teachers cultivate nurturing collective learning environments. For instance, Funds of Knowledge approach to MCE carried out by Norma Gonzalez[50] is centered on the principle that the best way to engage multiplicities of difference and learners is through an emphasis on households or everyday life practices of learners. It validates students' funds of knowledge and life as positive and enabling and familiar, embracing what Jacques Ranciere refers to as the belief that "equality is not given, nor is it claimed; it is practiced, it is *verified*."[51] Through a FoK approach, voicing a desire to learn therefore no longer means that 'teacher' or the institution tells the learners what and how they must desire or learn. But learning and voicing justice and multiplicities of desires are rather experienced as on-going projects and verified through exchange and dialogue. Gloria Ladson-Billings rightfully states that within these contexts learning and teaching become "art" rather than "technical skills."[52] These creative contexts thus enable what many MCE texts often strive to achieve: fluidity in attempts to understand the social construction of knowledge which influence definition of culture and student identities. James Banks and Sonia Nieto often resort to *hybridity* to define culture. They praise Gloria Anzaldua's work on approaching difference as *mestizaje*—a state of being beyond all essentialized territorial binaries of identity in order to voice differences from contesting, in-between and meshing identities.[53] In *Affirming Diversity*, Sonia Nieto tells us that "an exploration of hybridity, [is] a useful way to understand culture with an increasingly diverse and complex student body." [54] However, Nieto misreads Anzaldua's work on hybridity as an anticolonial text that only rejects Western Eurocentric identifications of oppressed marginalized people. Anzaldua seeks to abandon conventions of identity to foster social relations without figurative territories. Anzaldua's mestizaje is a call for people to embrace individual differences for inclusive relationships that tolerance contradictions and ambiguity. Mestiza work emphasizes the need to abandon dichotomies and separatism propagated by territorial political identifications "to break down the subject-object duality…healing the split that originates in the very foundation of our lives, our culture our languages, our thoughts."[55]

On the contrary, Anzaldua's call for blending differences in order to abandon territorial approaches to social justice is overshadowed by territorial MCE discourses. Nieto for instance continues to use territorial understanding of culture by claiming that it is essential and that "culture matters." Adding that "learning cannot take place in settings where students' cultures—broadly defined to include race, ethnicity, social class, language, and other elements such as urban and adolescent identity—are devalued and rejected."[56] My work does not disregard 'culture' and diversity of experiences students bring into educational settings. But I believe that MCE discourses that encapsulate culture and student experiences as fixed ontological reference points to understand power relations and individual differences neglect to critically engage hybridity as a fruitful dialogue where territorial differences shrink and become ambiguous.

There is MCE literature that considers hybridity as a starting point for transformative education. For example Geneva Gay's recent essay, *Teaching To and Through Cultural Diversity*, addresses the notion of positive potentiality in a CPR approach to MCE:

> There is something positive and constructive among people and communities most disadvantaged in mainstream society; and that teachers genuinely committed to transforming learning opportunities for students from these communities must identify, honor, and engage these resources or funds of knowledge in their reform efforts. There is, indeed, power, potential, creativity, imagination, ingenuity, resourcefulness, accomplishment, and resilience among marginalized populations. Thus, no individual or group is perpetually powerless in all circumstances. These orientations represent a significant shift in perceptions of poor, underachieving ethnically diverse students, and can revolutionize educational interventions designed for them.[57]

Gay states a critical point in how we may rethink social justice discourse. Rather than encapsulating activism to binaries that depict marginality as powerless, Gay opens an antifoundational approach to individual difference, urging social justice education research and praxis to refuse to depicting certain cultures in essentialized territories. This enables us to shift our theorizing from dichotomizing social relations and begin a cultural work of finding multiplicities of inclusive platforms previously silenced in a mainstream approach to transformative education. Echoing Gay's investigation of culture, my study does not advocate an abandonment or abolition of 'culture' but a reconceptualization which suggests distancing our assumptions from territorial definitions of the location of power and what it is or ought to be. In struggling against social repression, racism and violence, MCE has influenced and helped many educators and students in U.S. schools to find theoretical and practical tools to challenge inequality. I acknowledge that there is a vibrant discourse as well as scholarly and practical work instantiated for democratic and transformative education carried out by MCE scholars and educators. I'd like to contribute to MCE dialogue and point out that the discourse of social justice education is a valuable starting point for beginning a discussion for change. But as long as these points of discussion remain unquestioned and used as static harbors for perpetually deploying the same political message—without ontological and epistemological re-evaluation— the courageous dialogue alone will not be enough to foster transformative change. Territorial discourses that continually strive to capture MCE conceptualizations and assumptions about power relations and difference will remain as conceptual and practical obstacles unless they are critically theorized. My work is then an effort to invite MCE educators to reevaluate their theoretical premises and political conceptions in order to instantiate creative and effective approaches to social justice. I find multicultural education dialogues that challenge repression head-on extremely rich and useful in creating the much needed energy and critical discourse to engage dynamics of repression and power relations in education. However, the conceptual frameworks informed by territorial MCE discourses to talk about individual differences and power relations are often limited.

By adhering to territorial conceptions of power—which inherently decipher formulizations of power relations and social justice into rigid centers of power—multicultural education discourse understands democratic education and difference in essentialized terrains and its language for social justice remains trapped in limited territorial formulations. MCE discourses facilitate the assumption that issues of conflict, discrimination and violence take place between opposing territories, i.e., binaries of oppressed and oppressors, White vs. People of Color, Rich vs. Poor and so on. MCE texts then set out to formulize ways to resolve the inequality by influencing these locations of power defined through territorial conceptions of who has ‘power’ over, i.e., the state, curriculum, policy makers, people who lack critical consciousness and so forth. I am not denying the usefulness of a critical engagement with these territories. But our engagement with such territories must not simply stem from a theoretical stance which presumes them as fixed territories. My work encourages educators to pay attention to venues of power relations that are positive, often unspoken, unintended and playful.

CHAPTER 3

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST-CENTURY FLAT WORLD: NEOLIBERAL MULTICULTURALISM AND THE REPRESSION OF DIFFERENCE

> If one wants to analyze the genealogy of the subject in Western civilization, one must take into account not only techniques of domination but also techniques of the self. One must show the interaction between these types of techniques.
>
> (Foucault, 1998).

Introduction

My project of reconceptualizing the language and assumptions of multicultural education (MCE) involves a critical examination of the territorial assumptions about power relations and social difference—which was the focal point of the previous chapter. On the other hand, I am not only interested in illustrating limits of territorial epistemological conception of power relations and identity. I am also invested in questioning effects of territorial MCE discourses to become increasingly embedded in neoliberal economic discourses that aim at dictating the scope and goals of transformative education to mirror the competitive economic discourses of global capitalist markets. Additionally, I wish to examine the impact of these territorial formulizations on individual subjectivities. Largely because my research on neoliberal economic discourses has allowed me to argue that processes of subjectification are gaining significance for neoliberal reforms to effectively pursue and implement economic restructuring programs through institutions and individual practices.

In this chapter, without losing sight of the mitigating effect of territorial assumptions of MCE discourse, I will try to expand my problematization of territories to critically examine economistic discourses that have penetrated the meaning and purpose of education. Particularly, analyzing how territorial MCE assumptions about power relations are co-opted by neoliberal economic discourses to instantiate economistic models of social justice and subjectivity. I will try to pay close attention to how neoliberal economic discourses undermine social justice education by cultivating an economic social ontology, namely a ‘learning society’ of competitive ‘learners.’

In previous chapters, I have tried to illustrate that multicultural education’s insistence on territorial frameworks to identify its political terrain and location of power often results in essentializing individual differences and political praxis into fixed and rigid territories, such as binaries of oppressed versus oppressor, White-middle class versus poor minorities of color. Territorial MCE discourses about social justice tend to carve these territories to organize and theorize democratic education based on the assumption that ‘power’ has a central location and that it can be wielded and shared through equitable educational practices and experiences. Such territorial assumptions limit the transformative agenda of MCE by remaining embedded in the ‘repressive hypothesis’ of territorial assumptions, which depict power as a negativity, or a commodity that is used by certain groups to exert control and repress. While seeking to find equitable means to achieve social justice, territorial MCE discourses often diminish the scope and praxis of social justice education to presumed educational strategies such as power sharing, educational attainment and citizenship education. In this chapter, I will argue that these territorial assumptions also render MCE susceptible to a neoliberal economic educational discourse. By treating ‘power’ as a commodity, territorial MCE discourses about social justice get marketed by neoliberal economic processes as a commodity everyone and every society can strive to achieve (or purchase and consume) by following neoliberal economic remedies.

This chapter will first try to briefly sketch the economic and political processes that characterize neoliberal reforms in order to articulate how the institution and the practice of education is increasingly becoming an essential site of neoliberal discourse in “globalized” United States and its 21st-century national agenda. I will then try to reflect on MCE texts that critique the social consequences of neoliberal educational policies, emphasizing the social disparities created by neoliberal reforms. I will then try to demonstrate the inability of territorial MCE conceptualizations to recognize neoliberal economic discourses that are increasingly gaining ground in defining the scope and goal of multicultural education. My study will argue that by aligning MCE social justice discourse with economization, territorial MCE discourses become part and parcel of neoliberal processes of subjectification that target creating individual and social sensibilities cultivated to sustain a neoliberal society. I argue that this neoliberal social disposition threatens to erase individual differences within an administrative regime of citizenship and ‘neoliberal multiculturalism.’ I argue that social justice discourses that mirror ‘neoliberal multiculturalism’ overlook the socio-political difference of diverse cultures and individual sensibilities that cannot always be reconciled under an ideological framework, such as citizenship or neoliberal schooling. I specifically critique the human capital framework that has not only taken over as the dominant language for understanding education but try to show how it also functions as a measurement and sorting technique designed to control populations through laissez faire administrative mechanisms and processes of subjectification. I conclude with an effort to seek out alternative interstitial spaces for activism and ethical engagements with social difference, which will also be the focal theme of the next chapter. My attempt is to explore educational experiences that emphasize lived and experiential validations of knowledge as a fluid conception for the formation of a democratic collectivity. I try to invite insights from funds of knowledge approaches to social justice education, in order to suggest potential pedagogical tools MCE educators can facilitate to foster democratic educational experiences in classrooms.

Brief Note on Neoliberal Economy and Educational Reform

In our era of relentless commercialization of educational discourses carried out by neoliberal discourses, I find it useful to go back to Karl Marx's analytical breakdown of how capitalist economies strive to reduce socio-economic relations of production to capital. I acknowledge that capital accumulation is much more abstract in our neoliberal moment. But to begin to talk about the magnitude of challenges MCE scholars and educators are facing today, I want to stress the dynamics laid out by Marx as important elementary components of how economies that rely on capital operate. My brief emphasis on Marx is to illustrate how territorial discourses in MCE render social justice amenable to commodification thereby allowing neoliberal economic discourses to capitalize on MCE discourses that increasingly equate social justice with greater economic power and quality education (interpreted as a commercial asset/human capital). I believe Marx starts an important conversation about capital and his analysis may shed light on how and why neoliberal discourses operate as mechanisms that aim at reducing educational and individual sensibilities into economic variables.

Marx introduces the concept of circulation to identify two different scenarios to describe the metamorphosis of economies: Commodity to Money (C-M) and the Money to Commodity (M-C). For Marx the first scenario is characterized by a transformation from particular form of commodity to the universal form of money. Simply, you sell a particular commodity in exchange for money. This scenario entails several obstacles, one being the market. To exchange your commodity for money, you need to follow the fluctuations in the market, you need a buyer, and therefore the labor you put into your commodity must be socially necessary. M-C on the other hand is easier. Money allows you to escape from the struggles of C-M economy and thus the more money you accumulate the more influence you have in the economy. With capitalism, as Marx states, we face a situation in which “commodities are sold not in order to buy commodities, but in order to replace their commodity form by their money form.” [1] M-C-M allows for the accumulation of money and generates greater capital. Marx argues that the bourgeoisie buys a worker’s labor in return for wages to reduce life and individual vitality to capital. Capitalist economies strive to generate capital by commodifying material products as well as processes, relations, actions, sensibilities, cultural/racial identities and so forth.

Building on Marx’s description of capital, the socio-economic structure of neoliberal economies and the modes and relations of production that characterize them relies on a postindustrial organization of production which gives emphasis to labor processes that no longer only produce/commodify material goods but knowledge services and ‘know-how’ for generating greater capital. Sociopolitical systems within this new postindustrial technological economy invest in institutional transformations to facilitate the emergence and maintenance of new technologies of information/knowledge. Operating computers, data entry, communicative services, and technological technical support services characterize the immaterial labor that does not result in a material product but nevertheless accumulates capital and sustains the socio-political hegemony of postindustrial economies.

Thus, immaterial labor processes become increasingly significant, particularly scientific knowledge and skills that are appropriated, commodified and commercialized to generate capital. Knowledge and labor are transformed into mechanical factors of production “used with the intention of creating economic value…an item of capital.”[2] Production thus experiences a shift in the nature of labor input. Labor shifts from a highly blue collar oriented work to a highly technological and functional (continuously improved) operation, operated predominantly by white-collar workers organizing the knowledge and know-how skills that can apply, speculate and create informational and technological value. Knowledge is therefore the primary leading sector technology, replacing, cars, trains, steel, so forth. This new postindustrial organization of production necessitates and gives emphasis to individual subjects who perform productive tasks to participate in the commodification of knowledge and acquire skills to commercialize further knowledge into capital, i.e., individuals informationalize, become intelligent, and become effective.[3] Consequently, corporations and nations that aspire to capitalize on the profits attained in knowledge economy invest in institutional transformations that facilitate the emergence and maintenance of new technologies, information/knowledge and most importantly higher investments in human capital to produce workers capable of working and reproducing the postindustrial machine. Neoliberal economies are characterized by conditions and consequences associated with "learning" and a society that keeps on learning for the sake of valorizing capital. Indeed, considering the central role of 'learning' and 'knowledge' in the 21st-century knowledge economy, neoliberal discourses instantiate the development of a society that embraces a desire to continually learn: individuals that normalize the subjectivity of a life-long learner who needs less supervision and disciplining.

In that respect, the maintenance of the postindustrial economy and neoliberal governance is carried out by individuals who learn by doing, by using and by interacting, allowing them to become flexible learners and coordinate knowledge production through multiplicity of institutions and virtual learning communities. Thus, the will to craft a cultural economy of control premised on an economic subject who is a life-long learner and investor, i.e., a learning political economy, is part of a social discourse aimed at cultivating a culture in which people regard long formal education, repeated reeducation and retraining, and even life-long education, as necessary and normal aspects of life.[4] Therefore, neoliberal reforms tend to place greater emphasis on self-learning and life-long learning. Institutional as well as individual subjects begin to rely on their own investments and choices to facilitate the accumulation of capital under postindustrial capitalism. The increasing number of for-profit private and charter schools as well as individual performance assessment measures due to educational policies in the U.S. point to this neoliberal movement to develop autonomous competitive institutions and subjects. Mark Olssen's study of educational mechanisms of neoliberal control argues that:

> Such a model requires skills of self-management and record keeping so that demonstrations of established learning are rendered transparent through audit. Ultimately lifelong learning shifts responsibility from the system to the individual whereby individuals [and institutions] are responsible for self-emancipation and self-creation. It is the discourse of autonomous and independent individuals who are responsible for updating their skills in order to achieve their place in society.[5]

Neoliberal economies require human capital capable and flexible enough to be invested and reinvested into a highly technological global economy. The postindustrial economy "based on knowledge demands more human capital as a condition for informational creativity and the efficiency growth of the service economy."[6] As the quality of human capital gains significance, investing in educating/schooling and in the individual (the labor force of immaterial production) becomes a fundamental postindustrial economic project. The need for human capital and postindustrial reliance on technology and technical know-how of production increases the need for the establishment of schools as Research and Development (R&D) sites in order to facilitate the creation of learners (educational subjects) that continually learn, improve and consume economies of knowledge and information. As Michael Apple argues, schools that align their educational goals with the 21st-century market demands, can be "classified as part of the infrastructure supporting direct accumulation, an infrastructure"[7] of global capitalism. In economies that are highly dependent on information and technology, availability and the quality of technically skilled labor is a crucial factor of production, and education is increasingly marketed towards that end.

The United States is no exception, and the stagnating 21st-century U.S. economy is targeting to reform education in order to revive the glory days of 20th-century U.S. exceptionalism and ‘pax-Americana’ empire of the American Century. In 2007, National Academies’ congressionally requested report, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*[8] frames educational institutions as sites to re-develop U.S. scientific and technological leadership and a national workforce capable of competing in the global economy, especially in the areas of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education. These reforms mirror transnational organizations such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development that have also invested enormous amounts of effort and money to pressure educational reforms around the world to reflect market mechanisms and capital management discourses centered on education as the productive site for human capital investment and growth. Educational policies in the U.S. such as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) act of 2001 forced many schools and educators to follow models of business management through standardized tests.[9] States and school districts have set standards and aligned their curriculum to STEM education and teachers began to ‘teach to the test.’ Test results not only determined whether a student received a diploma but also subjected schools to be liable for their test scores. If scores did not rise, schools faced closure or enclosure by venture capitalists and charter schools that carry out business models for school improvement.

In 2012, the Obama administration launched the "Race to the Top" education policy initiative to increase STEM scores, mobilized $4.35 billion[10] in federal dollars to "reform" school systems and curriculum. Education is transformed into a private entrepreneurial enterprise, an investment individuals vis-à-vis nations make to "add value" to compete in the market to rise above others. This commercial neoliberal project is not isolated from the modern nationalistic discourses that facilitate the neoliberal economic discourse to manifest itself as the natural consequence of an altruistic communal nationalistic project. Schooling to meet 21st-century skills to ensure U.S. global competitiveness is promoted as a project that will raise the tide of prosperity: 'raise all boats' and provide economic opportunity, security and equity for "all" U.S. "citizens."

Schools within this neoliberal regime have significantly been influenced to facilitate the production of subjects who live, desire, learn and master the skills and knowledge necessary for the postindustrial global neoliberal economy. For example, students tend to and are often encouraged by school programs and teachers to choose majors that yield better employment opportunities when they graduate. In addition to students' choices, educational institutions, instead of thinking and operating in basic research terms, also begin to "think in terms of applied research funding and commercializable results."[11] Schools and teachers get *Taylorized* with utmost importance as schooling is increasing regarded as the key social institution that sustains the competitive edge for high-tech postindustrial societies in the global market. To view evidence of this economic logic prescribed for schools, one can glance at April 2012, U.S. Congressional legislation currently under consideration that would enhance economic competitiveness by supporting K-12 STEM education called, *STEM Education: Preparing for the Jobs of the Future*.[12] The legislation proposes to award state educational agencies to expand STEM, professional development for STEM teachers and materials used in the STEM curriculum, award grants to states, Indian tribes or tribal organizations, nonprofit organizations, or institutions of higher education to develop effective STEM networks that coordinate STEM education. The legislation also included tax credits for STEM teachers, grants for computer science education and curriculum for preparing students for success in the global economy.

Multicultural Education Against Neoliberal Reform

Multicultural education is not oblivious to the neoliberal reform movement in education and the economic pressures that impact education policy and practice. In *Facing Accountability in Education: Democracy and Equity at Risk*,[13] Christine E. Sleeter puts together a collection of essays in which MCE scholars are trying to raise awareness about how neoliberal policy and accountability standards exert more inequalities in educational settings by disadvantaging already poorly performing social groups, and mainly students of color. In Sleeter's more recent work she traces the processes that have led to the marginalization of MCE in educational contexts. Sleeter points attention to neoliberal education reforms that have dominated U.S. schools since the 1990s and argues that these reforms have been "deliberately context-blind. Although racial achievement gaps have been a focus of attention, solutions have emphasized offering all students the same curriculum, taught in the same way based on the language, worldview, and experiences of White English-speakers."[14]

Critical Race Theorists Jori N. Hall and Laurence Parker argue that neoliberal reforms benefit certain student populations while disinvesting others; they argue that "White students and their families have social and physical capital advantages…access to advantages that Blacks and other minority groups lack, regardless of class" in coping with neoliberal educational restructuring.[15] Similarly, social justice education researcher Pauline Lipman's work on neoliberal educational reforms has shown that neoliberal reforms call for opening education to market principles across school systems and endangers minority populations by fostering further disinvestments. Lipman argues that neoliberal educational policy "features mayoral control of school districts, closing "failing" public schools or handing them over to corporate-style "turnaround" organizations, expanding school "choice" and privately run but publicly funded charter schools, weakening teacher unions, and enforcing top-down accountability and incentivized performance targets on schools, classrooms, and teachers (e.g., merit pay based on students' standardized test scores)."[16] These policies eliminate schools that are deemed to be not performing in accordance with science and math demands of the U.S. economy. Moreover, students of these schools and their communities (mainly students of color and working-class) face further disinvestment and are deemed inefficient. Lipman further shows that "in the United States, the neoliberal restructuring of education is deeply racialized. It is centered particularly on urban African American, Latino, and other communities of color, where public schools, subject to being closed or privatized, are driven by a minimalist curriculum of preparing for standardized tests."[17] The resulting consequence is further disinvestment in these populations and portraying their "failure" as mere inability to compete, or a natural consequence of “objective” competitive market relations.

Carl A. Grant’s essay, *Cultivating Flourishing Lives: A Robust Social Justice Vision of Education*, grapples with the meaning and content of social justice education and particularly the aim and scope of transformative education within our neoliberal moment. Grant acknowledges that much of the debate in MCE is centered on ‘quality education for all’ and disregards to ask what education is and more importantly what purpose it serves. Grant argues that in the U.S. education is increasingly designed to accommodate 21st-century skills and jobs and represents economic motives in defining its service and goals. Grant states that “today, discussions of the purpose of education, while presenting in society’s mainstream discourse, are often isolated and/or reduced to employment and employability, consumerism, and voting.”[18] To counter this instrumental and economic role of education, Grant proposes that MCE can show commitment to students’ flourishing lives that “recognizes that there are variety of good lives, and not all of these lives are focused on the accumulation of wealth and status.”[19] Grant’s proposal stresses a very significant turning point in transformative education research and MCE literature. It signifies the realization of an emerging neoliberal economic discourse, urging scholars of education to acknowledge that education in our neoliberal moment is under siege by economic discourses.

In Christine Sleeter’s work we witness illustrative examples of how teachers who implement pedagogies that “use standards strategically” [20] to subvert neoliberal reforms and constraints. Sleeter shows how educators can work around the standards to create more collaborative and culturally responsive pedagogies than what the NCLB standards would usually permit. Even though Sleeter later argues that such an approach can create *college-going* cultures for historically marginalized identities—which equates access to college with attaining ‘power,’ and addresses individuals through a territory of marginality, she offers a critical lens to approach how economization impacts educational practice and policy. Sleeter’s approach thus welcomes the interplay of power relations to take place in order to invite students’ to engage power relations as experiential and open to compromises rather than react to ‘power’ as a fixed relation. Such MCE work as Grant proposes challenges “mainstream discourse about the purpose of education”[21] and neoliberal economic discourses that threaten to capture the desire for transformative social justice education. My study is therefore an attempt to offer MCE educators another critical lens to reexamine its own conceptual premises to analyze neoliberal economic discourses that are increasingly becoming all too common in educational settings.

A Global Flat-World, Neoliberal Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education

In this section, I set out to illustrate emerging neoliberal discourses and educational reforms, which increasingly operate to restructure education according to market principles. These reforms are carried out either in the name of closing the “achievement gap” as with NCLB or for the purposes of increasing U.S. global hegemony and hence her social welfare through “Race to the Top.” As I’ve tried to briefly show, MCE scholars have critiqued these neoliberal policies that have resulted in further social polarization by neglecting to target historical social inequalities that are already in motion. What is significant for my research is that these neoliberal economic educational discourses are often carried out as part of social projects that strive to promote multiculturalism, pluralism and equity. Consequently, certain MCE texts are buying into this emerging present and are increasingly at risk of being highly influenced by these economic trends and social sensibilities associated with them.

The Bush administration's 2002 *National Security Strategy*,[22] suggests a multicultural movement in which the U.S. takes lead in opening markets as well as minds to accept greater intereconomic and cultural exchange. In this regime of freedom, multiculturalism provides the inclusive doctrine that will "include all the world's poor in the expanding circle of development." The document outlines an economic restructuring of the U.S. schools as well as schools around the world in accordance with principles of social "freedom" and "opening" of local economies to investment. Jodi Melamed's essay titled *The Spirit of Neoliberalism: From Racial Liberalism to Multicultural Neoliberalism*, suggests these neoliberal discourses that preach 'inclusive pluralism' revise a racial logic. Melamed suggests:

> Like racial liberalism, contemporary neoliberal multiculturalism sutures official antiracism to state policy in a manner that prevents the calling into question of global capitalism. However, it deracializes official antiracism to an unprecedented degree, turning (deracialized) racial reference into a series of rhetorical gestures of ethical right and certainty. Concepts previously associated with 1980s and 1990s liberal multiculturalism— "openness," "diversity," and "freedom" — are recycled such that "open societies" and "economic freedoms" (shibboleths for neoliberal measures) come to signify human rights that the United States has a duty to secure for the world.[23]

The restructuring proposals designed to "unleash" and capture the productive potential of all individuals, stressing the social freedoms associated with transforming their economies, needless to say, are not merely altruistic attempts to foster experiential education. The educational freedoms are acceptable only if the learning coincides with the demands of the neoliberal market. MCE scholars I've outlined in the previous section have already placed attention on this emerging economic discourse which threatens to create greater social disparities based on social membership/capital. However, I argue, certain MCE texts fail to offer reconceptualizations of how we may define democratic education that is not co-opted by the neoliberal discourse that is so prevalent. Charles R. Hale uses the term "neoliberal multiculturalism" to address this market driven multicultural movement, that works as a constraining veil which operates as 'wolf cloaked in sheep's clothing' so to speak. Hale argues that neoliberal governance includes the limited recognition of cultural rights, the strengthening of civil society, and endorsement of the principle of intercultural equality, which makes it appealing to social justice concerns MCE scholars advocate for. Hale asserts:

> It is often assumed that the central tenet of neoliberalism, like the unadorned cognate from which it derives, is the triumph of an aggressively individualist ideology of "economic man." In contrast, I suggest that collective rights, granted as compensatory measures to "disadvantaged" cultural groups, are an integral part of neoliberal ideology. These distinctive cultural policies (along with their sociopolitical counterparts), rather than simply the temporal lapse between classic liberalism and its latter day incarnation, are what give the "neo" its real meaning. To emphasize the integral relationship between these new cultural rights and neoliberal political economic reforms, I use the term "neoliberal multiculturalism.[24]

Although MCE texts are critical of neoliberal educational reforms that result in further disinvestments in historically marginalized students, the territorial conceptions about power relations MCE texts use to identify its social justice goals render MCE vulnerable to neoliberal economic discourses that try to encapsulate individual into nationalistic and competitive mechanisms. Territorial MCE discourses that mirror neoliberal economic discourses about social justice run the risk of reducing social justice discourse to mechanism of capital or commodification. By equating ‘justice’ as something that can be bought and consumed, territorial MCE discourses are inclined to equate ‘justice’ with economic opportunity and freedom and thus become less critical of neoliberal economic educational restructuring. The aim of social justice education, then, becomes limited to a neoliberal multiculturalism, i.e., generating more opportunity and capital for under-represented groups in order for them to buy their way into justice and social membership.

Social justice discourses in territorial MCE discourses often stress the importance of increasing educational attainment of under-represented students and providing them equitable educational experiences and economic opportunity structures. These presumptions stem from assumed territorial location and function of power relations in society. Social justice discourses MCE texts use to strategize social justice are based on providing individuals with meaningful educational experiences and opportunity structures that help them become successful in schools and be effective participants in society. However, the notion of success and effective participation in MCE texts run the risk of being captured by neoliberal economic discourses which embark on reforming educational policy and practice based on the basic liberal principle that there is a positive and direct correlation between investment in education (particularly Science and Math) and economic growth. The neoliberal economic reforms carried out in schools are often justified under the umbrella of advancing the economic productivity, which ultimately increases opportunities for “all” factions of U.S. society. Hence, economic reforms are justified as a means to generate more capital for the poor and allowing them to become effective members/consumers of society. Katharyne Mitchell’s[25] essay, *Educating the*

National Citizen in Neoliberal Times, raises attention to how this neoliberal discourse is co-opted in multicultural educational discourses. Mitchell argues that the spirit of multiculturalism in education has shifted from a concern with the formation of tolerant and democratic national citizens who can work with and through difference, to a more strategic use of citizenship and diversity for competitive advantage in the global marketplace. This shift is directly linked with and helps to facilitate the entrenchment of neoliberalism as it supports a privatization agenda, reduces the costs of social reproduction for the government, and aids in the constitution of subjects oriented to individual survival and/or success in the global economy.

From the vantage point of a highly competitive knowledge oriented global economy, certain multicultural education discourses begin to equate effective social membership or 'citizenship' with social justice. Consequently, exhibiting support for neoliberal reforms that aim at restructuring schools and curriculum based on competitive principles of a global market. In *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, James Banks argues that "effective citizens in the 21st-century must have the knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to compete in a global world economy that is primarily service and knowledge oriented…if the current levels of educational attainment among most US youths of color continue, the nation will be hard-pressed to meet its labor needs with its own citizens" [26] Banks' multiculturalism serves to depict students as factors of production that need to be improved. This is largely because Banks' imagination of multiculturalism is captured by the economic and nationalistic neoliberal discourses that promise jobs, skills and prosperity for marginalized populations. For Banks, community or individual "empowerment" through multicultural education is quality education for "all" students to become effective in a global economy. This discourse—articulated within a consumer regime of competition—advocates that the economic dynamics that condition our social world in our so-called "Flat World" necessitates an educational commitment to science and math education, in order to increase social welfare, intercultural openness, and tolerance.

James Banks' work consistently emphasizes that the goal of MCE in "helping students develop democratic racial attitudes is essential if the United States is to compete successfully in an interdependent global society and to help all students become caring, committed and active citizens."[27] The underlying MCE assumption in Banks' statement—which hastily surrenders MCE to a human capital model of education and accepting it as a necessary discourse for social justice education—is rooted in MCE's territorial assumptions of power and social justice. Banks assumes that by becoming economically valuable to the nation, students gain recognition and justice. Banks further states that "multicultural education is to help students to acquire the reading, writing and math skills needed to function effectively in global and "flat" technological world—that is, one in which students in New York City, London, Paris, and Berlin must compete for jobs with students educated in developing nations such as India and Pakistan."[28] Banks openly provides a multicultural justification for the domination of curriculum and teaching practices by Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) programs and efficiency.

Moreover, Banks statement suggests that MCE must play its role as an economically viable pedagogy in the competitive race for global hegemony and in essence, purchase social justice. In other words, by improving STEM education, MCE justifies its own existence and generates the necessary attention to be a viable economic learning tool. However, this tendency merely commodifies MCE's social justice aim and scope. The competitive rush to purchase justice through enhancing national economy is further emphasized in James A. Banks' 'series forward' to Linda Darling-Hammond's book, *The Flat World and Education*. Banks argues that the "United States faces a national crisis because students in other nations such as South Korea, Finland, Japan, and the United Kingdom are outperforming U.S. students in math and science achievement."[29] Banks' statement is a stark example of the mainstream discourse that is haunting education research and policy, reforming schools, curriculum and practice in accordance with a global economic vision. Thus, Banks strategy for MCE to become feasible often asserts the role of a mediator to guarantee that domestic social tensions over race, class, gender and culture do not disrupt the process of creating STEM educational projects and subjects that embrace neoliberal citizenship identities, i.e., loyalty to support U.S. economic hegemony and committed to schooling for information technology.

Although, multicultural education scholars—such as Nieto—affirm that the goals of multicultural education involve "tackling inequality" and promoting access to an equal education, raising the achievement of all students and provide them with an equitable and high-quality education.[30] Nieto tries to stress the negative impact of the lack of native and foreign language instruction in the U.S. schools, she embeds multiculturalism and multilingualism as an economic resource when she states that MCE has "implications for everything from national security to our role as a global leader."[31] By multiculturalizing educational content useful to a neoliberal global world, Nieto proposes that MCE can police global cultural tensions and foster economic growth for U.S. capital, which eventually will benefit all factions of society.

Another statement by James Banks clearly illustrates this neoliberal welfare discourse. Banks claims that “because of the negative ways in which students of color and their cultures are often viewed by educators and the negative experiences of these students in their communities and in the schools, many of them do not attain the skills needed to function successfully in a highly technological, knowledge-oriented society.”[32] Concern for cultural caring is once again situated within a global neoliberal economic discourse of competiveness and 21st-century skills. As a result, MCE risks being trivialized by a neoliberal economic discourse which *multiculturalizes* economic mechanisms that target to take over educational discourse. Hence, cultural competence and sensitivity is reduced to a factor of productivity and a skill set to promote efficient, culturally competent investments and workers.

MCE texts that have been trivialized by neoliberal economic discourses often resort to ‘high-quality education’ not only as meaningful and culturally sensitive learning but also as an enabling tool for marginalized students to obtain STEM education or access to power, i.e., schooling and economic opportunities presented by 21st-century market and society. Sonia Nieto’s work once again exemplifies this discourse. Nieto states that “too many young people will continue to face harrowing life choices because they are not receiving a high-quality education.” Nieto’s instrumental view of learning and education as a gateway to power and higher social status, not only represents a territorial political framework of democracy and desire that over-generalizes difference, but also justifies an economic neoliberal educational discourse that defines what is valuable in education. As a result, the discourse of ‘social justice through educational attainment’ has become synonymous with postindustrial economy and as a meta-narrative it describes educational attainment as a given entitlement to power, status and opportunities. Sonia Nieto believes that ‘educational attainment’ and ‘increased economic opportunities’ are the “democratic equalizer”[33] of U.S. society. Nieto’s argument associates investing in education with social capital and democracy. Associating economic opportunity and productivity with attaining ‘power,’ MCE carves a territorial location of power residing in increasing income and social status of historically under-represented populations. This assumption renders MCE amenable to neoliberal emphasis on educational attainment and scientific literacy as profitable investments in human capital and social welfare.

The neoliberal economic discourses that target the production of human capital through STEM skills and capital attitudes is therefore merely *multiculturalized* by MCE’s approach to how economic and nationalistic demands require MCE. This MCE discourse is enunciated and gets woven into a desire for social justice to “empower” marginalized groups through ‘access’ to a so-called “quality education,” economic “prosperity” and “democratic” representation. However, it neglects to question the socio-political cost of “prosperity” and “justice” defined solely by neoliberal discourses, which result in the eradication of social difference and subjecting individuals to a neoliberal economic learning regime.

Multiculturalized Neoliberal Education and the Repression of Social Difference

Neoliberal educational reforms that manifest repressive and exclusive social processes are linked to a particular type of society; in Foucault's terms a *dispositif*[34] in which knowledge-power-subjectivity (nation, economy, citizen) aim at controlling and administering educational populations in which individuals are produced as objects who are subjected to economic rationalities. My aim in this section and the next is to show how such dispositions hinder MCE attempts to address individual differences—reducing them to a neoliberal economic dispositive or social order that places economistic goals for individuals—which target the territorialization and transformation of their sensibilities in accordance with neoliberal economic processes.

As I've noted earlier, MCE texts are not blind to the racial dynamics associated with neoliberal educational reforms and have raised concern and critiqued the racial dynamics of economization of schools and learning. However, territorial MCE texts that rely on notions of citizenship to advocate for social empowerment neglect to see that neoliberal reforms pursue doctrines of multiculturalism, which are seemingly cosmopolitan and advocate for a citizenship rationale to justify the neoliberal changes in educational and social life. Neoliberal economic discourses that aim at constructing an acceptable political territory for individual differences resort to citizenship and multiculturalism to justify economic reforms. Slavoj Žižek's examination of multicultural capitalism points attention to this discourse:

> The ideal form of ideology of this global capitalism is multiculturalism, the attitude which, from a kind of empty global position, treats *each* local culture the way the colonizer treats colonized people—as 'natives' whose mores are to be carefully studied and 'respected'…multiculturalism

> involves patronizing Eurocentrist distance and/or respect for local cultures without roots in one's own particular culture. In other words, multiculturalism is a disavowed, inverted, self-referential form of racism, a 'racism with a distance'—it 'respects' the Other's identity, conceiving the Other as a self-enclosed 'authentic' community towards which he, the multiculturalist, maintains a distance rendered possible by his privileged universal position. [35]

Based on Žižek's emphasis, when we reflect a critical lens on James Banks' work, it reveals that Banks' assumptions about individuals often situates them as self-enclosed and explicitly outlines a global cross-cultural task for multicultural education in the 21st-century. Namely, exerting MCE as a tool to help teachers and students to navigate the global and culturally diverse world. Hence, Banks exerts a "privileged universal position" for democracy when he states:

> Cultural, national, and global identifications are interrelated in a developmental way, and that students cannot develop thoughtful and clarified national identifications until they have reflective and clarified cultural identifications, and that they cannot develop a global or cosmopolitan identification until they have acquired a reflective national identification. We cannot expect Mexican-American students who do not value their own cultural identity and who have negative attitudes toward Mexican-American culture to embrace and fully accept Anglo or African-American students.[36]

Banks' assumption on how to navigate difference is limited to a multiculturalism that relies on "multiculturalist" visions of democracy and cosmopolitanism. It rejects homogenous citizenship and yet embraces a differentiated form of social membership under a governing citizenship. Banks territorializes cultural identities (making them feasible) by situating them into three interrelated categories which work for developing cosmopolitan identity. Banks' assumption continues on the Eurocentric Enlightenment cosmology that depicts the territory of the 'self' unified under his/her culture which is protected and recognized by belonging to a civil general will (e.g., a nation) in order for democratic government to emerge.

Focusing on Native American peoples in particular, Troy A. Richardson argues that such multiculturalist emphasis on cultural diplomacy and cosmopolitanism in a global world overlooks the political difference of First Nations peoples. Richardson argues that Banks chooses a colonial perspective that adopts a developmental cosmopolitan and national identification. Richardson further claims MCE texts:

> Provide for both as acknowledgement of Indigenous socio-political difference, establishing a legal framework to recognize and address it, and a dismissal of such difference as based on primitiveness. This conflicted colonial perspective creates contemporary situation in which the sovereignty and self determining powers of Native peoples might be acknowledged, but only as part of an earlier historical era. Yet, because this earlier era is perceived through a lens of primitiveness, contemporary claims of sovereign and self-determination by Native peoples are regularly considered as past their time.[37]

Indeed, the earlier statement made by Banks gives political recognition to cultural identifications and individual differences only as a ‘past’ or a ‘self-enclosed authentic territory’ that needs to develop into a new cosmopolitan reflective national identity. Eva Marie Garroutte’s work on “Indians” illustrates the limitations of how national discourses in the U.S. construct such territorial depictions of social difference. Garroutte shows the paradox of national discourses that try to locate identity and individual differences in "culture," which results in fixed and constraining territorial descriptions of biology or legal status. Political territory of culture in the U.S. produces cultural difference as "a mysterious something that only exists apart from intentional human activity. It can never *come into being*; it must forever *be preexistent*. It cannot be *chosen*; it can only be *given*—at the time of birth, or very close to it." [38]

Territorial descriptions of the development of cultural identity thus facilitate the loss of traditional forms of social membership. Community based methods of recognizing social membership have been superseded by an externally imposed neoliberal nationalist discourse. Moreover, the identifications and signs to locate individual differences remain culturally incompatible methods of acknowledging difference. For instance, Michael Yellow Bird's research on indigenous "identity" in the U.S. suggests that the language of citizenship functions as a national identification of individual differences is oppressive and represents counterfeit identities that are misleading, inaccurate, and used to control and subjugate the identities of Indigenous Peoples, ultimately undermining the right to use tribal affiliation as a preeminent national identity.[39] His analysis asserts that these labels are highly erroneous for social groups and individuals who continue to resist European American colonization and that Indigenous scholarship must be decolonized through the use of more empowering descriptors.[40] Similarly, Gomez-Pena's work on border identities problematizes the language we use to signify difference and asserts that "Latino" is a colonial category, and its use affirms not diversity but the ethnic and racial divisions created by the power of colonialism.[41]

Indeed, neoliberal multiculturalism contributes to a colonial discourse about social difference through its emphasis on cosmopolitanism and blatant belief in the economic merits of restructuring education based on 21st-century neoliberal economy. For example, in *The Flat World and Education: How America's Commitment to Equity Will Determine Our Future*, Darling-Hammond treats neoliberal economic reforms as neutral economic tasks isolated from their socio-political context. She urges that U.S. schools and educational policies need to learn from other successful developing nations such as Singapore, which she identifies as a “learning nation,” which promotes so-called “autonomous” schools. Darling-Hammond later describes these schools as part of a governmental project that resulted in “expanding investments during the 1990s, improved school conditions and curriculum, allowed greater access to the private schools established in the colonial era”[42] While her suggestion sympathizes with privatization of education, which in our earlier discussion has proven to create greater educational disparities and exclusions in the U.S. and around the world. Darling-Hammond’s analysis is also detached from the social context of these societies as she overlooks the historical socio-political context of how these former “colonial era” schools have functioned and continues to serve and represent particular oppressive political discourses in those countries that have experienced historical exploitation. By suggesting increasing access to colonial private schools, Darling-Hammond dismisses that historical experience, which is highly problematic for social groups and individuals that do not agree with the mission of ‘autonomous private schools’ in a ‘learning nation.’ This is why I urge that MCE texts begin to read neoliberal discourses as a dispositif in which knowledge-power-subjectivity collide to engender discourses and mechanisms of controlling and administering educational populations in which individuals are produced as objects who are subjected to economic rationalities.

Because of her lack of investigating processes of subjectification, Darling-Hammond’s depiction of private schools as venues for individuals to access an “improved” education, carries on a colonial discourse which assigns colonial schools the authority to structure the passage to prosperity and establish their *right to know* the needs and desires of individuals they target. The ‘colonial schools’ that were set up to sustain an exploitive relationship perpetuate their colonial agenda in our neoliberal moment by instantiating what John Willinsky's[43] work refers to as colonial "mythologies." Willinsky illustrates how historically colonial era schools that were set up at and about colonies institutionalized the knowledge about the colony, setting up 'imperial archives', literature that produces a 'colonial nostalgia' and other forms of textual signs that seek to create a dichotomy between primitive and civilized, East and West, and so on. Colonial schools extend and perpetuate colonial relationships, largely because the foundational mission of these educational settings is directed at schooling appropriate colonial subjects. In 1835 Thomas Babington Macaulay's analysis of British colonial education in subcontinental Asia, and particularly on Indian Education, dictates an explicit declaration that the ultimate goal of colonial education is to: "form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect."[44] Hence, many postcolonial texts that investigate the constraining mechanisms of colonial discourses on subjectivity and political membership argue that education carried out through colonizers' knowledge "annihilate[s] a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves."[45]

The colonial project is clearly much more than just economics and unlike what Darling-Hammond's argument suggests, colonial schools are not merely instrumental institutions to create economic incentives or infrastructures. These educational experiences involve the processes of subjectification which target the creation of individuals who embrace and begin to embody certain characteristics that facilitate colonial economic relationships. An investigation of colonial relationships therefore as Frantz Fanon's later work on colonial subjectification processes suggests that we need to approach education as institutional mechanism that operate within a dispositif that "includes not only the interrelations of objective historical conditions but also human attitudes toward these conditions."[46] Today we are witnessing similar discourses that target reforming individual attitudes towards 'learning 21st-century skills' required to be granted citizenship. So far, I've tried to demonstrate how social justice education is trivialized in James Banks' and Darling-Hammond's arguments for a multicultural citizenship education and how their conceptions of social justice education operate under a political territory that undermines individual differences and social justice education by co-signing MCE to neoliberal multicultural citizenry. In the next section, I argue that the eradication of individual differences through discourses of citizenship is tied to neoliberal processes of subjectification, which target fostering individuals who embody neoliberal economic sensibilities.

Multicultural Education and Neoliberal Subjectivity

The nationalistic neoliberal multiculturalism discourse in the U.S. not only silences and overlooks the individual differences that do not identify with the nation, but also targets the ontological transformation of subjectivity through economic discourses. MCE texts influenced by this discourse tend to rely on a 'human capital model' of education and society while defining the pursuit and desire for learning, social justice and caring. Specifically, the human capital framework not only has taken over as the dominant language for understanding education but also functions as a measurement and sorting technique designed to control populations through laissez faire administrative mechanisms. Neoliberal economic discourses, as Ivan Illich suggests, foster movements to contribute to the production of an understanding of self as an industrial 'tool' in need of continuous optimization through types of educational investment.[47]

I would like to reflect on Darling-Hammond once again. Largely because her work, which advocates for economic prosperity and social equity on the basis of a neoliberal discourse, allows me to *argue that the neoliberal economic discourses not only aim to re-structure educational institutions or the language about diversity and equity, but also instantiate processes for reforming individual sensibilities.* Linda Darling-Hammond's *The Flat World and Education*[48] mirrors a neoliberal economic discourse which suggests social justice, multicultural caring and equity in U.S. society and educational settings are only possible if schools are committed to providing competitive quality [STEM] education to diverse and marginalized populations. Darling-Hammond claims that empowering disadvantaged social groups occurs within the framework of economic opportunity, particularly through attaining knowledge skills that are profitable and economically desirable in a competitive 'Flat World.' Darling-Hammond argues that public schools where the majority of students will be of color by 2025, remain "inadequate to meet today's demands for the kinds of learning needed in the labor market."[49] She proposes that these schools and students should be transformed by "standards, curriculum, and assessments focused on 21st-century learning goals."[50] By comparing U.S. test scores with other developing or developed countries, Darling-

Hammond stresses the difficult task accountability measures, such as No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top, have grappled with over the last decade to bring up U.S. educational standards for better STEM education. Her work acknowledges that these accountability measures exert enormous pressures on schools, especially those that belong to marginalized sectors of society. However, Darling-Hammond also regards these reforms as consequences of a 21st-century “reality” and efforts to close the achievement gap between low achieving marginalized students and the mainstream groups, which she believes relies on a national educational awareness that “recognizes that its human capital will determine its future.”[51] Darling-Hammond offers her readers a glimpse of what she calls “high-achieving nations” such as Singapore and Japan. She exemplifies how successful developing countries manage economic programs that invite ‘citizens’ to be part of a “learning nation,” which promotes competitiveness, better human capital investments and strengthens the knowledge economy. She argues that the U.S. can learn from these experiences to compete in the global economy.

Education scholars that critique neoliberal discourses in education and the instrumental role of learning as investment, argue that within this competitive territory “it becomes necessity to compare oneself with others and to ask whether one has a better portfolio. The submission to a permanent economic tribunal therefore not only condemns the entrepreneurial self to productive learning but also to a competitive process of lifelong learning.”[52] These educational initiatives based on competition calls individuals, schools and governments to reformulize their practices through what Darling-Hammond stresses as a “teach less, learn more”[53] educational strategies that encourage innovation and higher educational attainment. Unfortunately, Darling-Hammond’s work fails to see that the norms of a ‘learning society ‘reflect the competitive ethics of human capital model of education that act as exclusionary administrative mechanisms to enforce economic discourses to shape the ethics of social caring and multiculturalism.

My research suggests that individuals in territorial MCE texts are envisioned as subjects who respond to and organize their world and agency through these competitive economic discourses. Individuals are depicted as conducting action and thought embedded in competitive economic principles, which only value capital as their foundational principle of society and individual desire. This subjectivity entails the construction of a consciousness about an external rule or norm. In our case, the norm Linda Darling-Hammond is embedded in is administered by the competitive rule of neoliberal political economy which places ‘learning’ 21st-century skills (STEM knowledge, optimization of human capital) as the norm of a ‘learning society.’ Michel Foucault’s reading of neoliberal governmentality stresses that it is against this external world or territory, the individual learns how to live and ultimately becomes a subject subjugated through his/her actions. Foucault argues that in neoliberal governmentality, ‘technologies of the self’ or “voluntary self-control”[54] of individuals entails a normalized sense of investing in their human capital to treat their knowledge as commodity and actions as profitable market oriented arrangements. The economic autonomous individual, Darling-Hammond encourages to ‘learn’ therefore sustains and establishes the authority of neoliberal governance by embodying the neoliberal multicultural citizen who uses his/her ‘rational choices’ to obtain a better life and “becomes the correlate of governmentality”[55] as an element that may be placed, moved, articulated for financial optimization and governance. Largely because as Foucault describes “governing people is not a way to force people to do what the governor wants; it is always a versatile equilibrium, with complementarity and conflicts between techniques which assure coercion and processes through which the self is constructed or modified by himself."[56] The emergence of postindustrial production and the neoliberal political economy around human capital introduces a new set of 'technologies of self' as techniques of power which allows governments to rule *with* the subjects rather than *over* them. In other words, power in postindustrial societies administers subjects through their active participation into production by investing in skills and habits for optimizing their capital—treating the "body as a machine"[57] to work, to reform and 'continuously improve' (a typical charter school motto) for the expansion of capital. Subjects conceive themselves as unfinished economic projects for fulfilling the needs of economic production by continual optimization of human capital.

The 'learning society' described by Darling-Hammond describes for us the "distinctions and differentiations that distinguish between the characteristics of those who embody a cosmopolitan reason that brings social progress and personal fulfillment and those who do not embody the cosmopolitan principles of civility and normalcy."[58] In James Banks' work for instance, we see more clearly how this neoliberal technology of self operates to hierarchize society by bringing forth an ethics of 'voluntary self control and investment.' Banks argues that in order for marginalized groups to find their place in society and to succeed in education, they must subject themselves to "attain the skills needed to function successfully in a highly technological, knowledge-oriented society."[59] Banks' statement assumes a social territory in which successful social members need to make 'rational' choices as individuals who must act as capital driven investors.

In Sonia Nieto, this neoliberal cosmological (territorial) inscription of self care is also apparent when she claims that “our world is increasingly interdependent, and all students need to understand their role in a global society, not simply in their small town, city or nation. Multicultural education is a process that goes beyond the changing demographics in a particular country. It is more effective education for a changing world.”[60] Consequently, Nieto aligns MCE with neoliberal economic ethical universalism, which associates low quality of life with the lack of economic incentive (ethics) and investment (self-care) on behalf of the individual, community and the state. As a result, in MCE discourses privatized economic neoliberal solutions appear practical, objective and ethical and the disparities between social groups materialize as objective disinvestments that require more “learning” or neoliberal intervention.

The prevalence of these neoliberal norms in MCE texts not only stems from the territorial assumptions about the location of power, i.e., money, status, education, but also from essentializing the viability and vitality of “all” individual desire and difference to given roles appointed by a global neoliberal economic discourse. Nieto’s vision of the “world” resorts to a ‘repressive hypothesis’ about a perceived “reality,” constructed by neoliberal discourses which assigns a territory for the subject, whose investments in capital determines his/her success or failure. This capitalist cosmology ultimately diminishes individual agency to repressive discourses constructed merely by the pursuit of capital and render MCE discourse amenable to neoliberal agendas. Human capital model of identity formation, learning and social membership that inhibit a territorial cosmopolitan location in the 21st-century are granted civility and normalcy through MCE discourses that neglect to question neoliberal economic discourses.

Technology and science education, educational attainment and meeting the demands of a competitive neoliberal world-order, increasingly condition how MCE discourses understand empowerment and social justice. Social justice education—in Darling-Hammond's words—rests in "reconceptualizations of the content and skill needed for success in the 21st century."[61] This neoliberal lens of empowering students as they learn 21st-century skills and become competitive and affluent consumers and investors, trivializes multicultural education discourses that are co-opted by the economic vision of neoliberal policies and reforms. Linda Darling-Hammond argues that 'cultural deficit theories' about underrepresented populations fail to see "the rate of success when marginalized populations as given the same opportunity structures and economic incentives as their White counter parts."[62] I am not trying to defend 'cultural deficit' theories, and I do agree that poor learning settings and poor school conditions do hamper "success" but to define success and the means to achieve equity in purely economic terms as posited by Darling-Hammond, legitimizes neoliberal reforms in education.

For Foucault, this form of conceptualizing power and individual agency "categorizes the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognize…It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects."[63] By embracing the neoliberal call for stressing the importance of preparing students to live and succeed in a global economy with a presumption that it will lead to a social justice, multicultural education collaborates with neoliberal discourses to constraining individual desire and difference to a mere economic race or war between 'haves' and 'have nots.' MCE's language for advocating social justice and individual empowerment is thus a part of a neoliberal discourse that promises to empower subjects through life-long learning and investing in human capital. The territorial conceptions of MCE about power, economy and politics result in its misinterpretation of empowered and allow for neoliberal economic discourses to administer the aim and scope social justice. Consequently, MCE texts end up normalizing (multiculturalizing) neoliberal mode of empowering subjects, which necessitates a continual venture to improve and customize self-entrepreneurial skills. This dictates and conditions individual perceptions on social justice and aligns equity with a national concern for what is needed and desired to increase [human] capital.

Multicultural education cosigns to a neoliberal discourse that persuades social justice debates to construct a form of social fetishism in which learning, quality education and 21st-century learning-citizenry are transformed into objects of power. Multicultural education scholar Christine Sleeter recommends that teachers use MCE content which is highly motivating to students when it focuses on their own historical and cultural experience in order to make content meaningful, accessible and "to help students from diverse groups attain the knowledge and skills needed to reach high levels of achievement on standardized tests."[64] For MCE to work, it must submit to a political economy of learning that grants a "better" life to the margins that do not have access to the White mainstream privileges of quality education, job opportunity and capital. As a result, MCE literature appoints neoliberal goals for its audience and practitioners. The only conceivable and enduring desire within a competitive neoliberal reasoning demands that individuals transform their ontologies to be "flexible, to be in continuous training, life-long learning, to undergo perpetual assessment, continual incitement to buy, constantly to improve oneself to monitor our health, to manage risk."[65] By co-opting to neoliberal economic discourses about empowering individuals, racing the nation to the top and prosperity for all citizens, MCE instrumentalizes its ontological assumptions about identity, race, culture and individual differences. “Essentially the learner becomes the entrepreneurs of their own development…Not only must the individual learn, but they must learn to recognize what to learn, and what and when to forget what to learn when circumstances demand it.”[66] Solving social disparities and challenging stereotypes are thus treated as an economic issue that can be solved by increasing economic investments, achievement and opportunity structures.

Funds of Knowledge Approach to Multiculturalism

In staying faithful to the Foucaultian tenor of my research, I would like argue that the challenge for MCE is to establish a genealogy of the emerging “present” of neoliberal multiculturalism in education in relation to history, political economy and subjectivity in a wide network of discourses. Foucault argues that this involves an investigative attitude about our present moment that strives “to try to detect those things which have not yet been talked about, those things that, at the present time, introduce, show, give some more or less vague indications of the fragility of our system of thought, in our way of reflecting, in our practices.”[67] This calls for generating a new conversation about the past and emerging ‘present’ limitations of multicultural education. Namely, MCE discourses that are embedded in territorial and neoliberal economic discourses must be theorized and reworked to imagine a different alternative future, language and conceptualizations for multicultural social justice education.

Echoing Jim Cummins' emphasis on dealing with complex power relations involved in multilingual education, I too would like argue that in order to "create a future we need to rupture the past." Change is feasible if educators are "burdened not by the anger of the past and the disdain of the present, but with their own identities focused on transforming the social futures towards which their students are travelling."[68] This requires us to see that processes of subjectification are open-ended. I do not wish to portray neoliberal subjectivity as a 'finished project.' Educators and learners are not merely passive receptors of neoliberal and nationalist discourses as machines working for the optimization of capital. Subjectification processes are as dispersed as are the characteristics of power relations and discourses. As Foucault argues, subjects enable power and in doing so, subjectivity and the processes of subjectification gain a transformative potential. Foucault states:

> The exercise of power is not violence; nor is it a consent which, implicitly, is renewable. It is a total structure of actions brought to bear upon possible actions; it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult; in the extreme it constrains or forbids absolutely; it is nevertheless always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action. A set of actions upon other actions…a way of behaving within a more or less open field of possibilities.[69]

Subjectification therefore involves the conduct of individual as they intersect with power and discourses that produce meaning and action. Subjectification is thus more than the mere positioning of the individual as passive receivers of discourse but also entails active subjective recognition, reorganization of practices, habits and desires. For example Nancy Grey Postero's work in Bolivia shows how local people respond to the opportunities and limitations of neoliberal multiculturalism. Postero exemplifies the complexities associated with individual praxis which challenge totalizing terrains of discourse and offer new opportunities for improvising democratic movements. Her work illustrates how indigenous peoples responded to neoliberal reforms by using the language of citizenship that had been provided by the neoliberal multicultural state. For Postero, neoliberal multiculturalism's emphasis on citizenship allowed for indigenous Bolivian's a new language to create more inclusive dialogues. Allowing "today's poor and indigenous Bolivian public demands a democratic government designed by the people themselves, which will go beyond the limited notions of citizenship found in neoliberal multiculturalism."[70] Similarly, an experiential approach to multiculturalism may allow educators to begin to practice new languages for challenging dominant territorial and neoliberal discourses of social justice education.

Funds of Knowledge (FoK) is centered on that principle and suggests that the best way to engage multiplicities of difference and learners is through a emphasis on households or everyday life practices of learners. By investigating "what people do and what they say about what they do."[71] FoK instantiates a potentiality of approaching learning from a positive lens that lies identifies what is in abundance, rather than what is lacking. It validates knowledge as a fluid conception rather than a fixed territory to be transmitted by voicing individuals, rather than territorial assumptions about power, identity stereotypes or institutionally defined goals for students. It thus brings a post-modern perspective to multicultural education for educators to build conceptions of learning based on students' experiences and desires in schooling. It validates students' funds of knowledge and life as positive and enabling and familiar, embracing the belief that "equality is not given, nor is it claimed; it is practiced, it is *verified*."[72] Through a

FoK approach, voicing a desire to learn therefore no longer means that ‘teacher’ or the institution tells the learners what they must be desiring, learning, thinking and acting.

Overall, FoK offers students venues to perform their differences, gives them the stage for self-expression and exploration to create and dialogue rather than staging it for them. Such settings often generate high student engagement with content as well as communal interrelationships with others. Students find knowledge production relevant as it allows for “conversations about their concerns and questions.”[73] Thus pedagogy and content contextualizations become familiar, relevant, and meaningful. FoK is therefore committed to emancipating schools from being indoctrinating institutional apparatuses that mirror mainstream discourses. It perceives schools as “learning institutions”[74] in which educators learn from their students. For instance Luis C. Moll describes the work of a FoK teacher as someone who invites and includes “parents and others in the community to contribute intellectually to the development of lessons, developing a social network to access FoK for academic purposes.”[75] The teacher facilitates not merely the transfer of pregiven content but the intersection play of social relationships, cultural identities and multiplicities of individual differences while engaging students in knowledge production.

These learning settings and experiences are then not simply relevant to the students’ differences and hybridity of experiences but also serve as spaces of contesting dominant discourses about politics, social difference and social change. By reaching out to students’ everydayness and desires and contesting the scope of mainstream institutional detections, FoK supports different ways of being not only in the classroom, but in society in general. It steers away from inscribing students’ knowledge, experience and identities. For instance, FoK will have a harder time in advocating that students must be equipped with the knowledge and skills required to be effective citizens in a global flat world, largely because validation and the significance of content and praxis stems from students desires and imaginations. As Patterson and Baldwin claim in their quest for new perspectives for MCE, FoK research allows educators to reflect on their knowledge and practice by bringing them “face to face with our ignorance, and our arrogance.”[76] FoK instantiates educational processes in which the condition of emancipation of knowledge and equality of intelligence is verified through students’ practices and experiences. Approaches to MCE, such as ‘Funds of Knowledge’ that treat individual differences, teaching and learning as sites for hybridity of lived experiences to flourish, negotiate and challenge dominant discourses may offer us practical and conceptual tools to begin to imagine how MCE. I further develop this approach in the next chapter, which is dedicated to acknowledging that students’ experiences exceed their presence in schools and their expectations from education cannot be contained within a single economic or political project. I argue that educators who do not rely on territorial conceptions about knowledge, power relations and individual difference have the potential to create educational settings that invite multiplicities of experiences into the classroom. These experiential settings offer us opportunities to become co-narrators and translators of territorial conceptions, while exploding our normative acceptance of the present to begin a cultural work of progressive tomorrows. I propose futures of MCE work that are not confined in territorial ideals and conventions that stem from fixed locations of power or from the economic principles dictated by neoliberal discourses: educational futures that highlight experimentation and improvisation in engaging and addressing individual differences and power relations.

CHAPTER 4

DETERRITORIALIZING MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: AN IMAGINATIVE AND COLLECTIVE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENT

> Not roots, never plant! Don't sow, grow offshoots! Don't be one or multiple, be multiplicities! Run lines, never plot a point! Speed turns the point into a line!
> (Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia)

Introduction

Previous chapters strived to map out the *present* territory of multicultural education (MCE) constrained by territorial and neoliberal discourses. I've tried to illustrate how the practice and conception of 'diversity' and 'equity' in education have become amenable to territorial discourses about the location power. I argued that the approach and knowledge *about*, and for democracy is increasingly at risk of being embedded in descriptive definitions of 'who' has power and 'where' it is located. These discourses that treat power as a tool to be wielded result in constraining our epistemological and ontological perceptions about how power relations function by confining them into already prescribed territories. The first chapter tried to illustrate how these assumptions result in political formulizations that essentialize the field of activism and encapsulate social difference into prescriptive agendas and rigid definitions of difference. In Chapter 2, by drawing upon 'citizenship education,' 'educational attainment for all' and 'equal educational opportunity' discourses proposed by multicultural education scholars such as James Banks, Sonia Nieto and Linda Darling-Hammond,[1] my investigation began mapping out global neoliberal economic discourses about knowledge, power relations and subjectivity (nation, economy, citizenship) and how they have increasingly influenced MCE debates. I tried demonstrating and critically examining how territorial conceptions hinder MCE attempts to pose a subversive, progressive and transformative educational experience and practice by being encapsulated in descriptive political strategies that are easily co-opted by 'neoliberal multiculturalism.'[2] Particularly, I questioned the dynamics of how social justice education discourses begin to signify neoliberal economic discourses which consequent result in repression of individual differences. My research in Chapter 2 enabled me to argue that social justice discourses that mirror 'neoliberal multiculturalism' overlook the socio-political difference of diverse cultures and individual sensibilities that cannot always be reconciled under an ideological framework, such as citizenship.[3] I specifically critique the human capital framework that has not only taken over as the dominant language for understanding democratic education but also functions as a measurement and sorting technique designed to control populations through neoliberal economic administrative mechanisms and processes of subjectification.[4]

In this chapter, I try to explore a deterritorial language for MCE to address educational practice, particularly transformative social justice education. I am particularly invested in exploring an alternative to the effect of the phrase “doing” used to designate the “correct” way of implementing social justice pedagogy. I argue that prescribed notions of ‘doing’ and ‘knowing’ hinder the explorative potential of transformative education by assigning particular scenarios and individual practices as ‘capable’ without considering the experiential potentiality of other multiplicities of approaches to MCE. Jacques Rancière points to a similar critique in its most elemental form when he suggests that “to explain something to someone is first of all to show him he cannot understand it by himself.”[5] I therefore will argue that failing to explain correct methods of doing is actually the first step in creating deterritorial approaches to MCE. My study is also driven by a second assumption, which is derived from Foucault’s conception of power relations and individuals who conduct them. For Foucault, power relations we take part in supervise “every instant in the disciplinary institution, compares, differentiates, hierarchizes, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it *normalizes.*”[6] In educational settings, I argue that a territorial address to knowledge and identity remain within normalized discourses and end up perpetuating exclusions. Therefore, alternatively I propose processes of failure, unknowing and being a continual stranger to knowledge, to self and others as potential deterritorializations of territorial discourses in MCE. I argue that deterritorial processes may allow educators to detach their practices from normalized preconceived territories of the “capable” educational learner/self and “correct” practices. Ultimately my goal is to instantiate educational tantrums—multiplicities of transformative possibilities for multicultural education— that explore experiential validations of knowledge and individual differences as fluid conceptions for the formation of a democratic collectivity. I use observational vignettes from classroom observations and try to merge theoretical insights from performance and queer theory with ‘funds of knowledge’ and ‘culturally relevant pedagogy’ approaches to explore a different address to social justice education.

I begin this chapter with an attempt to build a ground-work of a reading-lens, or a perspective on how educators may approach and engage with deterritorializations. For that purpose, I utilize ‘utopia’ as a future dawning approach to learning, which tries to establish rootless and hybrid conceptualizations of education experiences and individuals. I juxtapose traditional notions of utopia with utopias that enable deterritorializations. Contrary to traditional utopias—which are confined in ideal territorial promises and end-products it promises—the utopian approach I propose for deterritorializing MCE is not limited to a meta-narrative about a calculable and foreseen ideal end-goal. Later, I briefly examine how ‘border pedagogy’ approach to MCE has grappled with utopias and deterritorialization. I illustrate the strengths of border pedagogy in conceptualizing hybridity as a pedagogical engagement with individual differences and deterritorializing MCE. However, I point out its shortcomings by pointing attention to its territorial approach to power relations. I argue that border pedagogy approach to MCE adopts a territorial approach to power relations as it seeks to strategize social justice education based on essentialized assumptions about ‘power’ and allocates prescribed territorial political terrains. Using Foucault’s reading of power relations, I then try to articulate that a deterritorial approach involves not only a decentered reading of individual differences but also a positive engagement with power relations. This positivity requires educators to treat discourses as fields of contestation and compromise rather than totalizing absolutes, which may enable us to escape the limitations of territorial conceptions of difference and power binaries in formulizing transformative educational experiences. Thus, the second half of the chapter outlines how we may begin to implement this utopian and positive theoretical framework for deterritorializing MCE and educational settings. I propose a shift from merely ‘doing’ MCE to *tantruming*, which instantiates performative instances for improvising experiential educational experiences. I suggest that tantrums enable us to be comfortable with *failure* and *self-estrangement* by escaping and rupturing preconceived notions of ‘acceptable’ and ‘correct’ forms of learning, approaching individual differences and power relations. I conclude with an argument that suggests that tantrums occur and foster performative and *collective* educational experiences. Particularly I emphasize a ‘Funds of Knowledge’ approach to MCE as a potentially rich in creating tantruming and collective engagements in MCE research and practice.

Deterritorialization: Utopian Imaginative Futures

How can we begin to depart from the ‘present’ territorial and neoliberal discourses of MCE that have been constructed for us? I argue that it simply starts by failing our assumptions and ‘theorizations’ of an ‘ideal future’ and therefore it begins with a perspective change in why and for what purpose MCE educators pursue social justice. Deterritorializing MCE calls for an abandonment of an ideal future to be obtained, such as diverse citizens, learners with a critical consciousness who also have attained 21st-century STEM skills. Because these ‘ideal futures’ are projections of territorial and neoliberal economic assumptions about individuals and their desires. As the previous chapters have tried to illustrate, based on a presumed location of power and means to attain it, territorial MCE discourses reinscribe who, how and what people should learn and strive for. I propose that we need to refrain from territorial theories that aim at dictating our desires for progressive change and reducing it to a competitive pursuit of 'power.' This flight from the present may occur through a reconceptualization study of how MCE educators can begin to imagine a *future* which improvises a language for multicultural education's future—a then and there—that takes ambiguity as a starting point for engaging difference, power relations and action. This approach focuses on a potentiality which suggests that a deterritorial MCE is not yet here and may never be here and that's fine. I want to argue that such an approach should always be on the move and never be settled in one territory or be known by remaining a progressive imaginative challenge.

The idea of being utopian about a conceptual approach to multiculturalism stems from Deleuze and Guattari's work that grapples with utopia as an immanent, nomadic movement, which opens up spaces for active and experiential life. Their conception of utopia is very different from a traditional understanding of utopia which is often stuck in outlining and describing what constitutes or leads to a utopia. For instance, James Banks' study of *Cultural Diversity and Education* affirms a traditional ideal utopia, which situates how MCE can engage power relations and praxis. Banks outlines an ideal utopia when he claims that:

> Multicultural education also seeks to create and perpetuate a unified nation-state and culture. While respecting and recognizing diversity, it seeks to create a nation-state in which the values of diverse groups and cultures are reflected…to create a society of diverse people united within a framework of overarching democratic values…to structurally include them into the nation-state and the society. [7]

When Banks argues MCE as an educational tool to foster *pluribus unum* utopian doctrine (out of many one), Banks imposes an ideal territorial utopian image of what needs to be transcended, i.e., social balkanization, social stratification—by learning and replacing structures that do not reconcile or merge in the mosaic of a nation-state of diverse cultures. These territorial depictions of utopia are confined by the territorial discourses they represent, mainly by being made possible within the limited political territory of nationalism. Deleuze and Guattari on the other hand offer utopia as a philosophical tool box that allows the continual creation of new concepts without reference to a transcendent 'ideal,' territory or lack. In other words, unlike a traditional utopia, their work does not assume an external world that needs to be transcended or cultivate a unified political 'will' which dictates locations of power and territorializes knowledge and agency. Utopian thought therefore accommodates processes that abandon territorial assumptions, and refrains from representation theories about a "present" or an "externality" to overcome or achieve, e.g., oppression, alienation, state apparatuses, 'power.'

My attempt in arguing for deterritorializing MCE thus asks educators to avoid being governed by such promissory utopias. Unlike "idealist philosophy which argues that change comes from a transcendent ideal posited in a place beyond the present…for Deleuze and Guattari, the only way philosophy can stay true to life is to proceed immanently – the potential to go beyond the present is to be found within the present itself."[8] Utopia then becomes primarily a way of escaping territorializations and allows us to imagine venues for social justice that are not located in an ideal future or forms of democracy. David Bell's study of the utopian revolutionary ties this philosophical movement to how Deleuze and Guattari perceive desire as a "process of production without reference to any exterior agency"[9] Desire is deterritorialization that does not cease with the realization of a 'a single, rational 'being,' identity or political territory for thinking about and pursuing progressive action. A deterritorial approach, Darko Suvin asserts "appears not as a finished object but rather as an open project: not a utopia as *terminus ad quem*, i.e. a state of perfection to be reached, but a utopia as a regulating idea, as a *project ante quem*, whose force stems precisely from the fact that it *cannot* and *should not* be realized in any definitive form."[10] Deleuze and Guattari offer us utopian ways in which we may begin to see desire and territorial locations of power as instruments of possibilities, processes and new modes of existence, which are not merely totalized by static territorial definitions. In the very beginning of *Anti-Oedipus*, Deleuze and Guattari assert a deterritorial claim on how we can begin to view individuals and power relationships:

> Everywhere *it* is machines—real ones, not figurative ones: machines driving other machines, machines being driven by other machines, with all the necessary couplings and connections. An organ machine is plugged into an energy source machine: the one produces a flow that the other interrupts…we are all handymen: each with his little machine.[11]

It is within this conception of the processes and relationships of flows (interruptions, consistencies and breaks), utopia begins to function as what Ben Anderson refers to as an "ethos of hope." Ben Anderson evokes Ernst Bloch, *The Principle of Hope,* to highlight that the images of the end point of utopia point to nothing but the inevitable *failure* of a single vision of "The Good":

> Happiness, freedom, non-alienation, Golden age, Land of Milk and Honey,
> the Eternally female, the trumpet signal in Fidelio and the Christ-likeness

> of the Day of Resurrection which follows it: these are so many witnesses and images of such differing value, but all are set up around that which speaks for itself by remaining silent…Utopic processes are exceeded by the not-yet and thus cannot be resolved into "a Fixum, a Definitum, indeed a Realissimum without parallel . . . as if all process were merely pedagogics towards this fixum or from it.[12]

Thus, as Ian Buchanan suggests, utopian thought "succeeds by *failure*,"[13] utopia is more a matter of its failures, of its encounters with the very resistance to it. In other words, utopian thought does not rely on an ideal territory to be obtained or achieved, it rather fails those visions and emphasizes the fluidity of processes that influence desire. Rather than settling on an 'acceptable' ideal, utopian thought fails those ideals. Buchanan suggests this failure enables utopia to remain inquisitive and searching for always new notions of multiculturalism, learning and approaching power relations. Reflecting on Fredric Jameson's[14] understanding of utopia, Buchanan describes failure as a forward dawning, open-ended immanent political desire:

> Its failure we are returned all the more intensely to the real. This is what it means to succeed by failure; but, what is important for our purposes, however, is the fact that it is an immanent dimension-immanent because it is a failure, because it never rises above the realm in which it is and can be thought…. Utopia…takes the form of a promise, or better a promising-machine. In this way we are able to say what it is by telling what it does, thus relieving ourselves of the burden of having to describe its peculiarly unpresentable content. More importantly, it provides a structural means of binding us to Utopian thought in a way that definitions of it as anticipatory fatally do not. Utopia is to us the promise of a better future.[15]

I am proposing that failure can be the beginning of utopian conceptual rethinking of MCE that enables it to refrain from being cemented in representational or idealist territories of the present. Thus, my work further argues that 'failure' is a discourse of "active political refusal"[16] to be captured by normative assumptions, mainstream identifications and territorial locations of power. It offers educators deterritorial terrains to engage transformative education by not conforming to what is already known and correct.

My research tries to tie utopian approach to creativity with possible ways we may begin to deterritorialize multicultural education as an unknown potentiality of utopian proposals. I do not intend to construct a theoretical argument of a ‘possible’ or mysteriously ambiguous approach to MCE. Echoing a Nietzscheian calling for philosophers to inquire about new potentialities and concepts, I wish to inquire into illustrating deterritorializing multicultural education, one that portrays philosophical work on MCE as an art project of doing, creation and praxis. Praxis as doing that doesn’t only involve the pragmatic present but a doing that anticipates change. I wish to highlight the *potential in anticipating and desiring something that is not here and now*. I am suggesting utopian desire for a transformative philosophy that does not settle for the normative ethics of the present political. However, this is not a pure discursive and abstract understanding of politics that does not involve action. Nor an *a*political approach to MCE social justice work. Utopianism is rooted in a political project that maps a present in order to imagine a different future. Deleuze and Guattari argue that:

> In utopia (as in philosophy), there is always the risk of restoration, and sometimes a proud affirmation, of transcendence, so that we need to distinguish between authoritarian utopias, or utopias of transcendence, and immanent, revolutionary, libertarian utopias. But to say that revolution is itself utopia of immanence is not to say that it is a dream, something that is not realized or that is only realized by betraying itself. On the contrary, it is to posit revolution as plane of immanence, infinite movement and absolute survey but to the extent that these features connect up with what is real here and now… relaunching new struggles whenever the earlier one is betrayed. The word utopia therefore designates that conjunction of philosophy, or of the concept, with the present milieu- political philosophy. [17]

The utopian perspective I wish to improvise for MCE addresses our present as a process of exploration that rests in multiplicity of terrains, hence it is a deterritorialization that "asks us to recognize that the future is in our hands, which is to say, the future is now unfolding because of us, or else in spite of us. This is what the slogan 'always historicize' means when it is turned around and made to look forwards, not backwards."[18] A deterritorial approach to MCE is therefore nonrepresentational and has no essential subject or consciousness to cultivate and yet deals with questions of democracy and transformative education as open ended processes rather than ideal utopias. A deterritorial approach assumes no location of power and therefore does not strategize social justice based on descriptive politics of egalitarianism. It is not burdened with defining an end-result or product and consequently does not define what justice or democracy is but treats them as processes.

Border Utopia: Deterritorialization Attempts in Social Justice Education

Education theorists have experimented with deterritorial notions of identity to improvise new means to address social justice education. Several education theorists have imagined utopias and directed their attention and efforts towards forms of pedagogical deterritorializations. I wish to briefly highlight their theorizing efforts to help us begin to talk about deterritorialization within the context of social justice education and to examine their shortcomings. Henry Giroux's earlier work on "border pedagogy" provides a conversation about classroom settings where deterritorial experiences could be used in multicultural education. Giroux' work theorizes the "border" as an ambiguous positionality for understanding identities and knowledge in educational settings, in which dispersed and expansive remappings of mainstream conceptions of identity, power and culture contest mainstream notions of difference and learning. Giroux's work reflects on Homi Bhabha's postcolonial reading of culture, which argues that such ambiguity appears *in-between* moments of perceptive and conceptual remarking of the boundaries set by mainstream discourses which expose "the limits of any claim to a singular autonomous sign of difference – be it class, gender or race."[19] Similarly, Giroux states that he uses border pedagogy as a means to speak "to the need to create pedagogical conditions in which students become border crossers in order to understand otherness in its own terms, and to further create borderlands in which diverse cultural resources allow for the fashioning of new identities."[20] These "in-between" border categories of competing cultural differences for are signs of new cultural identities that emerge across differences of racial, ethnic, gender, and class identities.

Border pedagogy thus suggests that cultural identities cannot be accounted for by pregiven cultural traits that define the conventions of difference. Instead, the 'border' problematizes these territorial claims and begin what Homi Bhabha calls a "borderline work of culture," which demands an encounter with 'newness,'[21] The terms of this continual encounter with newness are performative, meaning that the representation of difference and culture in these settings are in a state of on-going negotiation that prioritizes cultural hybridities and contestation of fixed ontologies. Bhabha emphasizes the deterritorializing potential of borderline work in the performative nature of different identities:

> Performative nature of different identities: the regulation and negotiation of those spaces that are continually, *contingently*, 'opening out', remarking the boundaries, exposing the limits of any claim to a singular autonomous sign of difference – be it class, gender or race. Such assignations of social differences – where difference is neither One nor the Other but *something else besides*, *in-between* – find their agency in a form of the 'future' where that past is not originary, where the present is not simply transitory…an interstitial future, that emerges *in-between* the claims of the past and the needs of the present.[22]

In a later collaborative work, Henry Giroux and Patrick Shannon, as editors of a series of essays in *Education and Cultural Studies: Toward a Performative Practice,* discuss how cultural studies and performance studies has impacted education and examine ways for educators to articulate pedagogy through performative practice:

> The concept of the performative in this text provides an articulating principle that signals the importance of translating theory into practice while reclaiming cultural texts as an important site in which theory is used to 'think' politics in the face of a pedagogy of representation that has implications for how to strategize and engage broader public issues. Pedagogy in this context becomes performative through the ways in which various authors engage diverse cultural texts as a context for theorizing about social issues and wider political considerations. [23]

Giroux's work yet again offers valuable investigative insights into how educator may utilize performance to theorize nonrepresentational educational experiences. However, much of Giroux's work remains merely theoretical and abstract and offers very little as to how educators may begin to carry out performance pedagogy. This is one of the reasons why I turn to Funds of Knowledge approach to MCE as a viable educational practice that may cultivate deterritorial approaches to social justice education.

Nevertheless, I find social justice texts that insist on improvising learning experiences that do not essentialize knowledge and representations to be explorative in expanding the scope of deterritorial approaches to MCE. For example, in *Transforming*

Borders: Chicana/o Popular Culture and Pedagogy,[24] C. Alejandra Elenes puts Anzaldua's borderland framework into practical 'doing', and emphasizes the role of ambiguities and uncertainties in pedagogical engagements with content and identities in classrooms. True to an Anzalduan tradition of cultural-work—insisting on notions of hybriditization and ambiguity while approaching culture and difference—Elenes argues that "we can try to become nepantleras/os who seek to bridge what might seem to be theoretical impasses"[25] by creating pedagogies informed by "everyday ways of learning" that establishes multiple signs of difference. For example, by drawing on cultural figures such as La Virgen de Guadalupe, her work illustrates how we may begin to place narratives about knowledge and identities into socio-historical contexts in order to challenge normative interpretations of race, ethnicity and culture. Showing how La Virgen de Guadalupe represents not only feminine ideals but also the strength of the indigenous community against colonialism, Elenes stresses the role of ambiguous identities as active producers of various counter-narratives of themselves. She locates individual differences in local stories and their rearticulation and abandons the rule-governed traits of territorial discourses.

Although Giroux and Elenes offer us deterritorial conceptualizations to address individual differences, their borderline work on hybridity remains an ontological quest. It neglects to utilize ambiguity and hybridity as an epistemological approach to knowledge and power relations in society. For instance in Giroux's work, hybridity is treated merely as a "cultural remapping" of a territorial terrain of resistance/social justice education. Although Giroux acknowledges the multiplicity of conditions that shape individual differences, he resorts to territorial conceptualization of power relations and politics when he asserts territorial depictions of students, knowledge and an ideal utopia. Giroux states:

> Students need to analyze the conditions that have disabled others to speak in the places where those who have power exercise authority. Thus, critical educators must give though to how experience of marginality…to reclaim and remake their histories, voices and visions as part of a wider struggle to change those material and social relations that deny radical pluralism as the basis of democratic political community.[26]

Giroux clearly advocates that although students are 'border crossers' they do so in order to wield the territorial location of power. This assumption forces Giroux to accept marginality as the only political territory to reclaim 'power' as a commodity to be redistributed in a democracy. For a deterritorial approach to MCE, hybridity is not only about reconceptualizing identity formations from a fluid deterritorialized perspective, nor is it a political strategy to come to terms with individual differences. *Hybridity is a deterritorializing lens to read into power relations*. It is a deterritorializing concept that allows us to read power relations through processes of subjectification which are as diverse and dispersed as the power relations they are involved in. I feel the need to quote Bhabha at some length at this point; Bhabha refers to hybridity as a subversive concept about subjectivity and power relations:

> Hybridity is the sign of the productivity of colonial power, its shifting forces and fixities; it is the name for the strategic reversal of the process of domination through disavowal (that is the production of discriminatory identities that secure the 'pure' and original identity of authority). Hybridity is the revaluation of the assumption of colonial identity through the repetition of discriminatory identity effects. It displays the necessary deformation and displacement of all sites of discrimination and domination. It unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but reimplicates its identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power. For the colonial hybrid is the articulation of the ambivalent space where the rite of power is enacted on the site of desire, making its objects at once disciplinary and disseminatory.[27]

Deterritorializing MCE is therefore characterized as educational processes in which the engagement with territorial assumptions expands our conception of culture, knowledge and identities to bring forth multiplicities of meaning and representation of subversive praxis. Hybridity is an illustration of the uncertainty of not just territorial assumptions about individual differences but power relations as well, and thus it is counter-narrative and subversive, exposing the limits of territorial discourses. Deterritorial MCE treats impermanence of narratives as experiential pedagogical possibilities for substantial moments for dismantling metanarratives about not only individual differences but also power relations and knowledge.

The efforts of border pedagogy approach to MCE in introducing hybridity into conceptualizations of culture and learning however remain solely an ontological questioning of how we may begin to address individual difference and hope that it lends itself to a social change or rethinking of our epistemological take on MCE scholarship. This is a crucial shortcoming in MCE and border/hybridity pedagogy scholarship which struggles to acknowledge the complexity of processes associated with approaching and addressing politics and power relations. Regrettably, much of their epistemological assumptions remain loyal to territorial projections of 'power' which are concerned with where 'power' is, who has it and how 'power' may be redeemed. In *Affirming Diversity*, Sonia Nieto describes how MCE is also a process:

> Curriculum and materials represent the *content* of multicultural education, but multicultural education is above all a *process*. First, it is ongoing and dynamic. No one ever stops becoming a multicultural person, and knowledge is never complete. This means that there is no established canon that is frozen in cement. Second, multicultural education is a process because it involves primarily relationships among people. The sensitivity

> and understanding teachers show their students are more crucial in promoting student learning than the facts and figures they may know about different ethnic and cultural groups.[28]

Nieto's argument clearly strives to establish a fluid conception to try to address individual difference, which as Nieto asserts is not frozen in cement. However, Nieto's deterritorialization is limited because she utilizes deterritorialization as a deconstruction tool to expose presumed territorial locations of power, which are presumed to be frozen in cement. Nieto does not expand her analysis to how we may begin to understand power relations as dispersed relations but rather situates 'power' within the territorial political terrain of a negative and limited relationship. In Affirming Diversity, Nieto continues to treat 'power' as a product owned by "dominant groups" in society to suppress "dominated students." [29]

My study is therefore also committed to deterritorializing MCE epistemological conceptualizations about power relations. Geneva Gay provides us with a potentially deterritorial MCE conceptualization of power relations in educational settings. Gay states culturally responsive teaching is:

> Marginality is contextual and relative…There is, indeed, power, potential, creativity, imagination, ingenuity, resourcefulness, accomplishment, and resilience among marginalized populations. Thus, no individual or group is perpetually powerless in all circumstances. These orientations represent a significant shift in perceptions of poor, underachieving ethnically diverse students, and can revolutionize educational interventions designed for them.[30]

Gay offers us valuable points to start engaging how educators may begin to co-sign the classroom community as co-producers and translators of knowledge and relationships with social difference. First and foremost, Gay treats differences as assets, rather than barriers or locations of power to be reconciled into a political territory. Nevertheless, just as in Nieto, Gay's proposal for using culturally responsiveness as a deterritorial approach to MCE remains tied to a territorial discourse about the location of power, largely because Gay proposes using culturally responsive teaching to challenge positions of "oppression" and "power imbalances based on race, culture, ethnicity, and class." Her analysis highlights the differences associated with cultural identities and yet adopts difference as a fixed political inscription or positionality of how these locations are influenced by 'power.' To put it short, her attempts to deterritorialize MCE approach are limited because they simply do not expand to an analysis of power as a positive relationship.

Deterritorialization: A Positive Engagement with Power Relations

As noted earlier in the previous section, using hybridity as a conceptual approach to MCE involves an engagement with individual differences as dispersed ambivalent processes. In this section, I wish to illustrate that a deterritorial approach to MCE addresses power relations in dispersed locations, which I argue (using Foucault) is a positive and fragmented mapping of subjectivity and power relations. By deforming and displacing all identities into hybridity, deterritorial approaches to MCE may also instantiate re-implications of the political territory social justice discourse and conceptions are embedded in. A decentered approach to power relations requires educators to carry out positive readings of how power relations work. This approach requires educators to expand their investigation of power relations from fixed territorial locations, such as essentialized identities and political action, to broader terrains that escape the normalizing gaze of territories. Foucault’s study of ‘power’ suggests that an analysis of power relations “should not concern itself with the regulated and legitimate forms of power in their central locations…On the contrary it should be concerned with power at its extremities, in its ultimate destinations, with those points where it becomes capillary, that is, in its more regional and local forms and institutions.”[31] To overturn territorial definitions of the location of power, Foucault argues that power cannot be defined by representational descriptions of its territory, aim or scope because it is fluid, influx and has a partial presence in immanent force relations. Foucault emphasizes that "power is not something that is acquired, seized, or shared, something that one holds on to or allows to slip away; power is exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations."[32] It takes place in relations that stem from multiplicities of sources and so the "relations of power are not in a position of exteriority with respect to other types of relations (economic, knowledge, sexual), but are immanent in the latter."[33] Power relations thus have no interiority or exteriority (do not signify an ‘ideal’ location), but are everywhere and in everything.

Deterritorializing power relations is a positive approach to how discourse and power relations work. In other words it exposes the fissures in discourse for hybrid notions of individual differences to find subversive processes. Foucault further elaborates this positivity and argues that "where there is power, there is resistance and yet this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power…these points of resistance are present everywhere in the power network.”[34] If resistance is already a future potentiality that is embedded in our present, territorial assumptions are not merely constraining narrow definitions but can also be splintered, decentered and deterritorialized. Geneva Gay's premise for culturally relevant pedagogy, which suggests that "no individual or group is perpetually powerless in all circumstances"[35] echoes the positive potentiality a deterritorial approach to MCE offers. In the same way, Gert Biesta characterizes "emancipatory education" as "education that starts from the assumption that all students can speak—or to be more precise: that all students can *already* speak. It starts from the assumption that students neither lack a capacity for speech, nor that they are producing noise. It starts from the assumption, in other words, that students already are *speakers*."[36] This is not a naïve assumption that equity already exists but a call for social justice education discourse that is not merely reactionary but positively creative and explorative of the potential subversive character of MCE's positive engagement with power relations. A deterritorial approach to social justice and transformative education therefore follows what Foucault calls a "rule of immanence" which makes visible how power/knowledge relationships produce correlative constitution of territories. What we know about a territory and its conduct is conditioned by the discourses that these territories mobilize. But "discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it…We must make allowances for the complex and unstable process whereby a discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart."[37]

According to Foucault, a positive reading of power relations is therefore concerned with reading discourse as it is acting against itself, which Foucault calls is the *rule of tactical polyvalence of discourses*. To find venues for transformative action, Foucault suggests that we must see discourse as "a series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable." [38] Power relations then do not function in homogeneity but are partially present and can be defined only in terms of the points (territories) power passes through. This calls for a deterritorial approach to learning and social difference in education that is much more careful not to treat learning, content and subjectivity as objects of knowledge, but rather always expanding deterritorializations. The next section will try to juxtapose “doing” and “tantruming” to illustrate how we may begin to deterritorialize MCE, not merely as a conceptual re-thinking but also as a learning experience, which I propose will occur through collective performances that stem from—as well as instantiate—tantrums.

From ‘Doing’ to Tantruming: Deterritorializing Multicultural Education Through Failure and Self-Estrangement

Social justice education has, in many cases, settled into all-too-familiar designations of roles for teachers and students as well as a specified set of knowledge to be covered. It has, in brief, become scripted in ways that can easily reproduce the normative relations of the society, rather than challenging them. For example, in *Doing Multicultural Education for Achievement and Equity*, Grant and Sleeter explain ‘doing’ as a method that is designed for the pedagogical training of teachers to engage education students in critical reflection and self-examination as they prepare to teach in increasingly diverse classrooms. [39] The aim of such preparatory ‘doing’ is simply to help preservice teachers develop the tools they will need to learn ‘about’ their diverse students and their communities and sociopolitical contexts. Doing is then referred to as a territorial guide that directs teachers to become highly qualified presenters who have the political knowledge about their students and what and how they need to teach to them. Such multicultural doing embodies the territorial discourse of acceptable and capable, which for Jacques Ranciere represents “policing”[40] of difference forms of knowledge and ‘Truths’ about individuals. It obligates teachers to teach according to already prescribed locations of power, social difference and transformative goals of social justice education.

In multicultural education classes for preservice teachers, culturally relevant pedagogy is presented as an awareness teacher candidates lack (a utopian ideal, which must be acquired as an end product). This scenario situates them as individuals who are in need of explanation in order to understand multiculturalism and eventually become allies. For instance in Ladson-Billings’ work, allies to African American students are created by learning distinctive racial experience of African American students in U.S. history and thus learn to *construct* “a positive white racial identity.”[41] The discourse constructs a racial categorization (White) based on a normalized assumption about the center of power as well as who is equipped to grapple with power centers. Consequently, multicultural educators approach their practice with the assumption of what needs to be ‘done’ and explained. Assigning ontological assumptions about the essentially “oppressed” actors—subjugated into a fixed location of power—and turn pedagogy into a *scenario* in which a repertoire of transformative pedagogy situates the educator as the *discoverer* or grantor of critical consciousness who ultimately “controls the scene”[42] by allocating *what* knowledge needs to be produced and *who* needs to take part in it.

These scenarios prepare students and teachers to accept their normalized roles in society, which prevents them from communication, critical engagement, and the development of collectivities. MCE reinscribes racial divisions and other layers of privilege. Such settings resemble the ritualistic scenario of a striptease, which for Ronald Barthes does not carry an erotic element. “Consisting of ritual gestures which have been seen a thousand times, acts on movements as a cosmetic, it hides nudity…professionals of striptease wrap themselves in the miraculous ease which constantly clothes them, makes them remote, gives them the icy indifference of skillful practitioners, haughtily taking refuge in the sureness of their technique: their science clothes them like a garment.”[43] Using Barthe’s analysis as a metaphor, territorial MCE classes begin with the teacher fully clothed with hierarchies of normalized doing, i.e., syllabuses, graduate assistants, readings, assignments, discussion rules, policies. The teacher shows them off one by one. Students know when and what to ask to indulge in the dance. Tipping the stripper with anticipated inquiries, they learn about what is to be done in order to produce outcomes the teacher and the institution desire of them. Then the stripper moves to the rhythm of that music, revealing a bit more skin, crafting a path of certainty, the audience knows where the next piece of clothing will come off and the stripper retains the seductive and yet never revealing dance. The audience now knows what to expect, which clothing is coming off next, when to tip the dancer and so on. The classroom only gets to know what the stripper wants them to learn.

As an example, I would like to offer a short vignette from one of my classroom observations where the MCE teacher is subjugated by territorial discourses about doing a social justice course. Each class begins with a glorified exchange of what to do for assignments and what is required for doing the required institutional work. Later, the Power-Point presentations reenforce the required syllabus “Truths” to be *learned* (not reflected, discussed or contested). The MCE presenter (teacher) merely presents what the students need in order to demonstrate that they have acquired the 'right' knowledge about MCE content. Periodically, the MCE presenter addresses the classroom with a question that is often preplanned to reinsert the presenter's authority and consequently the territories of institutional Expert knowledge. I've observed the following conversation after the classroom was shown a video about open discrimination that was observed in a classroom experiment:

Presenter: "How can you begin to talk about race and social difference in your classrooms?"

Spectator: "You can play a game to find 'similarities' to later talk about differences…"

Presenter: "How can you bring up 'difference' when you only focus on similarities?"

Spectator: "By bringing what they have in common to bring in differences."

The presenter-spectator exchange ends with a usual brief moment of silence and then the presenter resorts to covering content and moving on to the next topic. The presenter's emphasis on difference as a territorial distinction that can only be understood in terms of polarized categories of identity remains unchallenged. These rigid differences then become the conceptualizations the learner needs to be 'knowledgeable' about. The spectator on the other hand suggests approaching difference from a positive lens of similarities to address differences, hence improvising difference as a positive potentiality that can foster interpretations of commonality in order to begin an in-between work to talk about social difference and power. Nevertheless, the presenter clings on to steer the dialogue to focus on established certainties about differences. Although the presenter offers a seemingly deterritorial possibility by uttering ‘dialogical real life scenarios’ as an approach to differences, the presenter’s reply does not become a topic of dialogue. Territorialization is evident in the assumption that the presenter has the knowledge that is needed.

Multicultural education teacher education classes I’ve observed were overwhelmed by the territorialized scenario the teacher needed to teach and perhaps involuntarily situated their students as passive voyeurs. The ‘skillful’ teacher was inescapably obligated to rely on an expert position to exert/teach “Truths” about social difference and justice. Portraying an educational setting Paulo Freire[44] critiques as ‘banking’ model of education, in which the imposition of classroom structures such as syllabus, assignments, presentation of content position students in a way that constantly seeks new levels and ‘gaps of ignorance’ between ‘receiving’ and lacking students and the ‘providing’ all-knowing expert. The wider the gap of ignorance, the greater the fear of failure is demonstrated by the teacher.

Tantrums

In this chapter, from this point on, I turn my attention to rethinking of repressive territorial forms of ‘doing’ MCE, which limits social justice education to pregiven certainties. My study seeks to open new possibilities for deterritorializing MCE by proposing to replace doing with tantrums. In tantrums we find sources of spontaneous ‘speaking’ as opposed to planned ‘doing’ and thus tantrums may offer experiential, unstructured and unconstrained collisions between philosophical debates, praxis and classrooms discourses. Focusing attention to tantrums in transformative education—as I've noted earlier referring to Gert Biesta—"can be characterized as education which starts from the assumption that all students can speak"[45]without a governing reference of "correctness" or "idealism." During a tantrum the 'norm/al' is no longer accepted and all points of sustaining a conventionally 'correct' engagement with the *normalized* are breached. Consequently, social contracts and norms are problematized and through an emotional and pragmatic desire for change, the individual reaches for a 'line of flight' and improvises materials to express and explode desires. Tantrums are thus not predictable and yet highly creative processes as their intensities and consistencies signify resistance and aim at fostering transformations.

Tantrums may enable us to reimagine the aim of doing in collective performance art projects, which bring forth the in-between space where our own identities as "experts" become tenuous. Such educational practices are committed to engage multiplicities and often contradictory modes of experience and involve a willingness to question certainties about knowledge and identity, i.e., a mode of estrangement to all prescribed territorial claims to epistemology. In *Cruising Utopia*, Jose Esteban Munoz argue that, "such a hermeneutic would then be epistemologically and ontologically humble in that it would…strain to cultivate the no-longer conscious and to extend glance toward that which is forward-dawning, anticipatory illuminations of the not-yet-conscious."[46] This forward-dawning is indeed the creative energy that is embedded in tantrums. The applications of such settings appear in collective contexts, which we may argue are different approaches to people—one that privilege forms of engagement over self-contained knowing.

Such educational settings treat "all utterances as potentially aesthetic, all events as potentially theatrical and all audiences as potentially active participants who can authorize aesthetic experience."[47] Tantrums in educational settings utilize uncertainty and openness to fail and break down as catalyst for creativity, and the expansion of normative limits to knowledge, identities and content. Gomez-Pena describes a similar experiential setting as he describes *performance art* as a creative and continually renewed political encounter. Performance art:

> Present hybrid realities and colliding visions within coalition. We practice the epistemology of multiplicity and a border semiotics. We share certain thematic interests, like the continual clash with cultural otherness, the crisis of identity, or, better said, access to trans- and multiculturalism, and the destruction of borders therefrom; the creation of alternative cartographies; a ferocious critique of the dominant culture of countries; and, lastly, a proposal for new creative languages. [48]

Tantrum thus have the potential to reveal new figures and languages in the classroom that may challenge our normalized roles in society and instantiate the development of collectivities. Moreover, tantrums may enable us to avoid reinscribing correct and acceptable knowledge in MCE's conceptualizations of social justice. However, to bring forth such alternative political cartographies into transformative education classrooms is not a vividly organized task. In other words, it can neither be a method nor a planned assignment that has descriptive steps, learning goals or mission statements. Education as performance art rests in our willingness to fail mainstream epistemologies. Our ability to reconceptualize critical thinking as a philosophical art project of multiplicities as opposed to being a critique centered on acceptable locations of doing and learning. I propose that tantrums entail three processes that allow educator to deterritorialize MCE. First is the embrace of *failure* as a way to challenge and reject institutional and normative ways of defining success, and second is a commitment to ontological *self-estrangement* that seeks to blur the acceptable locations of individuals and knowledge in the classroom. Finally, tantrums lead to or take place within a *collective* body. Tantrums invite individuals involved in learning to become active participants, co-creators and translators of knowledge.

For instance, in MCE classrooms where future teachers engage socio-politics dynamics of racism and discrimination in schools often tend to resist content. The instructor may encounter tantrums such as essays, emails or after-class comments that are openly racist or discriminatory. These events are usually ‘dealt’ through administrative procedures or personal one-on-one conversation to lead the student into a consensual understanding of his/her previous openly racist and biased ideas. The administrational or instructional approach to the event is intended to pacify and police students’ learning. The question of ‘what would you do if a student is openly racist?’ in such situations is a question of interpellation, hailing students into the ideological framework of “hey, you there”[49] subjectivities. The engagement with learning and content then becomes part and parcel of an institutional apparatus of surveillance and discipline rather than a collective engagement that may open venues for dialogue. I find such tantrums (emotional remarks, personal beliefs and desires) to be rewarding as they stem from an emotional engagement with content. The student chooses to struggle with the content rather than provide descriptive representations of what would grant her/him a ‘good’ grade. However, tantrums such as an open racist comment must be offered as dispersed point of dialogue. Encountering tantrums, educators must not be concerned with controlling the scene or ‘what would you do(s),’ because their strategizing will assume preexisting subjectivities to be administered. Tantrums on the other hand, bring forth ‘what is becoming,’ by treating the openly racist remark as part of a discourse the classroom collectivity can dialogue. In a tantrum where a student expresses a racial comment can thus be used to question the normative conventions of how racial ideas emerge, as well as offer the classroom community the collective venue to engage in critical discussion by breaking the suppressed voice of dissent. This openness to failure and imperfection aims to close the ‘gap of ignorance’ while highlighting the rich potential of playful and fluid pedagogies that constantly seek out new possibilities for students to create spaces and pedagogical performances for constructing ‘new figures’ of struggle for diversity, multiculturalism and culturally responsive teaching. This, as Felix Guattari argues, is a ‘schizoanalytic’ cartography, focused on “desiring a collective generosity,” by its capability of “bringing into being new representations and proposals”[50] A tantrum approach to teaching culturally sensitive pedagogues can recognize that becomings, desires, bodies are part of a collective experience of learning. Rather than trying to teach to self-contained singular unified individual bodies, tantrums enable educators to establish relational classrooms tied into linkages, which Deleuze and Guattari[51] define as ‘assemblages,’ creating possible ‘becomings.’ In other words, affirming diversity as a set of assemblages allows MCE educators to be attentive to processes and be open to re-interpretations of individual differences and content.

A deterritorial engagement with a tantrum would therefore treat an openly racist remark as a ‘line of flight’ to both show the limits of existing discourses as well as spaces of beyond the limits of existing territories. A ‘tantrum’ that is utterly racist can be counter-narrative as it is irrational and refuses to be tied down to territorial definitions of the ‘acceptable’ forms of learning. It can thus be treated as an openness to experiment and explore, learn and grow. I propose that ethical and respectful conversations can start from the point of nonconsensual bodies by inviting emotions and desires to be expressed by communities who choose not to simply ‘fit in’ but desire a genuine dialogue about their presence and social relationships through processes of becoming.

Failure

Educational experiences can be constrained by the dominant institutional discourses that try to depict teacher identities in classrooms as experts, establishing anxieties and emotional barriers. Geneva Gay’s work on culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP) acknowledges that teachers often shy away (CRP) because they fear controversy or simply do not want to deal with it. Gay uses Hilda Taba’s assessment of how fear of failure causes teachers to be intimidated by:

> Risks of making mistakes, of discovering deficiencies, of not succeeding, of proceeding without sufficient skill. . . . These risks are a sufficient deterrent even for secure teachers. In some situations, making mistakes can be both personally and professionally threatening. . . . [Teachers’] whole training and experience [have] led them to expect answers from “qualified” persons and to depend on “competent” aid in suggesting materials and procedures . . . teachers want immediate answers and even show hostility when the questions are thrown back to them, because that suggests that the “experts” are shirking their responsibility. To be sure, this pressure for immediate answers is generated in part by the urgency of the practical situation. But equally responsible is the tendency of teachers to underestimate their own roles and abilities. [52]

Taba’s analysis stresses the mitigating effect of territorial certainties that engulfs educators. I argue that similar MCE educators experience similar fears that prevent them from allowing a deterritorial approach to MCE. Their fear of losing track of what they need to exhibit in order to foster ‘critical consciousness’ is mitigating their practice into a missionary role in which they embrace the role of a preacher who is obligated to carry out a calling to pass on “Truths.” I argue that it is this fear that we need to fail. Not the fear of failure but the fear of not being able to succeed needs to be abandoned.

Failure can be the beginning of utopian emancipatory conceptions that distance philosophy and politics from representational or idealist territories of the present. Thus, ‘failure’ is a discourse of “active political refusal,”[53] which offers educators new venues to engage transformative education. In educational settings failure may become an alternative that does not confirm to what is already known and correct—a subversive performance of approved methods of doing and knowing. Failure offers creative, cooperative, and surprising ways of being in the world. Judith Halberstam’s work *The Queer Art of Failure*, suggests failure as “a way of refusing to acquiesce to dominant logics of power and discipline and…a form of critique. As a practice, failure recognizes that alternatives are embedded already in the dominant and that power is never total or consistent.”[54] Failure is then a positive engagement with power relations to foster explorative moments within a dominant discourse. Foucault reminds us that discourse is characterized by “series of discontinuous segments whose tactical function is neither uniform nor stable…a multiplicity of discursive elements [tactics] that can come into play in various strategies.”[55]A Foucaultian reading of failures therefore suggests that they are fragments of chaos and uncertainties within dominant discourses that account for the discourse’s presence as well as the always unpredictable and dispersed forms of diversion and perverse. Failure violates dominant discourses and gives us venues to find the discontinuous segments in them; it challenges territorial conceptions of knowledge, expectations, and authority.

The following example from my observations at a high school class illustrates this explorative potentiality of seeking moments of failure under dominant discourses in which MCE educators can begin to recognize and utilize failure. In an Ethnic Studies high school classroom, students are given a self-reflective assignment which involves bringing in different materials as expressions of what makes up their identity. They are asked: "What makes you beautiful?" Very quickly, the assignment takes a narcissistic turn when students begin defining beauty through mainstream media signs, music and texts. Thus, the assignment is carried out through the dominant discourses which aim at capturing students' desires and identifications of who they are through what the normalized cultural media considers "beautiful," "successful" and capable. As students present their accounts of what makes them beautiful, they construct a discursive territory where successful endeavors—such as physical talents, sports, consuming mainstream cultural artifacts and heteronormative language about love and respect—hierarchize their conversations.

One student, however, splinters the dominant discourse and enables an interstitial gap capable of failing it. She presents the lyrics of a contemporary hip-hop song[56] to argue why she is beautiful. Drawing on the song's lyrics—"look into my eyes, it's where my demons hide"—she adds that she embraces her dark side, her imperfections, mistakes and failures that make her beautiful. She regards her failures as accepted traits of *love* by people around her. This is the moment where the normalized discourse of 'why I am beautiful' is deconstructed, debunked and expanded into a critical thinking exercise that aims at exposing the normative notions of success, beauty, and otherness. Her account of herself disrupts the products of normative discourses, which had dictated the rest of the presentations before her. Halberstam argues that these instances where failure functions as a mode of unbecoming norm/al, "allows us to escape the punishing norms that discipline behavior and manage human development with the goal of delivering us from unruly childhoods to orderly and predictable adulthoods. Failure preserves some of the wondrous anarchy of childhood and disturbs the supposedly clean boundaries between adults and children, winners and losers."[57] Failure can thus be an integral component of improvising a tantrum that can dislocate the normative gaze of success. Deterritorial MCE classrooms can utilize the interstitial gap instantiated by bringing forth failure to question the aim and scope of schooling and the presence of the classrooms, students, friends, lovers, citizens, community members and question what discourses are behind these identifications. In the above example, classroom could have asked 'what does it mean for a person, a community or a nation to fail or to succeed? Can failing our definitions of identity, self, family and community allow us to imagine and understand difference?' There are experiential and positive moments in exposing the 'strangeness' of failing our conceptions, failing what we take for granted.

I've encountered immense transformative potential when classrooms were allowed to function as communities of individuals who continually encounter newness in one another. Being open to failure facilitates possibilities for new identifications of who they are—the encounter with a perpetual stranger—allows individuals to refrain from stereotypical assumptions, exploding new desires and unspoken concerns to occupy dialogue. Gert Biesta's work on democratic citizenship refers to this collectivity as democratic subjectivity of ignorant citizens, whose civility is engendered through engagements in always undetermined political processes, not driven by knowledge about what the citizen is or should become but one that depends on a desire for a particular mode of human togetherness.[58] For example, during my observation, the teacher, following the failure rupture offered by the student, began to fail the expectations of teacher authority by offering a tantrum through a personal encounter individual difference. He shared his experience of how he had to cope with being made fun of for being a male cheerleader in a conservative heteronormative school structure. He shared his personal experiences as a male high school student who was also part of a cheer group. The teacher explained how the dominant discourses assigned discriminatory nicknames such as "queerleader" and how his peers and teachers ridiculed him. He offered mechanisms that he improvised to overcome these limitations and power relations that enabled him to desire praxis that did not always fit the dominant discourse. This perhaps was the moment where the teacher escaped or 'failed' the normalized institutional space assigned for him and opted to make himself vulnerable and exposed his emotions. In other words, his willingness to fail his authority as a teacher, allowed him to become the stranger the classroom had never seen before, who was now part of their collective creative tantruming togetherness.

For Deleuze and Guattari, adopting 'lines of flight'—or in our case tantrums—are rich with philosophical potential for political and collective creativity, largely because a willingness to fail the normal into discontinuous segments is to seek deterritorial consistencies rather than capable and acceptable reference points.[59] It is where " failing, losing, forgetting, unmaking, undoing, unbecoming, not knowing may in fact offer more creative, more cooperative, more surprising ways of being in the world."[60] As a pedagogical approach failure allows individuals to capture—echoing Jacques Rancière — a willingness to be 'ignorant'[61] in order to get rid of the 'right' versus 'wrong' binary. This encounter with uncertainty and unknowing is a state of self-estrangement, accepting that the 'ignorance of the schoolmaster' is the condition of emancipation of knowledge and equality of intelligence, which is verified through practice of knowledge. Failure is refusal to conform to territorial locations of authority in classrooms, i.e., Expert vs. passive audience. Failure then facilitates educational experiences in which the spectators function as a classroom community. Ranciere argues these settings cultivate emancipated spectators who "construct stages where the manifestation and effect of their skills are exhibited, rendered uncertain in the terms of the new idiom that conveys a new intellectual adventure. The effect of that idiom cannot be anticipated. It requires spectators who play the role of active interpreters, who develop their own translation in order to appropriate the 'story' and make it their own story."[62] Failing normative assumptions engenders what Gomez-Pena refers to as performance: a space where participants can "perform the multiple roles of sanctuaries, demilitarized zones, centers for activism against xenophobia, and informal think tanks for intercultural and transnational dialogue. Collaborative projects among artists from different communities and nationalities can send a strong message to the larger society."[63] Such a space requires willingness of the facilitators (students and teachers) to engage the unknown and be caught "off-guard," just as the Ethnic Studies teacher who exposed his personal vulnerabilities and the stranger that was hidden behind the territories of curriculum content, syllabus, and assignments and so on.

This willingness to be vulnerable requires an approach in which the facilitator can claim to “have always been careful to teach only what I did not know…new, lively, blazing…under love’s first spell.”[64] Perhaps this is one of the reasons why Freire proposed that educational settings and educators must risk acts of “profound love for the world and for people.”[65] Freire imagined education as always aiming at fostering a world where it is easier to love, which makes us vulnerable and accept failure as a symptom of love rather than weakness or incompetence. In their effort for fostering collective subversive politics to challenge dominant discourses (Empire) Negri and Hardt also make a similar point and argue that “people today seem unable to understand love as a political concept, but a concept of love is just what we need to grasp the constituent power of the multitude.”[66] Failure is embedded in this utopian politics, where vulnerability offers us venues for acts of love/failure to create subversive political potentials.

Self-estrangement

Accepting failure as part of experiential deterritorial learning requires MCE educators to reflect on a second process of tantruming, which I argue is found in processes of self-estrangement. The previous section strived to illustrate that a deterritorial approach to MCE is not carried out in a planned fashion, there isn’t a ‘lesson plan’ to organize. A deterritorial approach utilizes instances where the dominant discourse enables interstitial gaps for educators to exploit and turn them into transformative educational experiences. It is unexpected and thus filled with improvisational creativity. My research suggests that such educational settings bring forth conditions for individuals who are engaged in education to acquire translucence as individuals in classroom communities. A perspective on perception about ourselves and others that is open to failure, contestation and compromise—a deterritorial positionality of the individual, which I refer to as self-estrangement. As Rosalyn Diprose's study on 'generosity' suggests, self-estrangement "is an openness to others that not only precedes and establishes communal relations but constitutes the self as open to otherness. Primordially, generosity is not the expenditure of one's possession but the dispossession of oneself, the being-given to others that undercuts any self-contained ego."[67]

Openness to others by abandoning the unified conceptions of self and self-contained territories of identity through self-estrangement allows a deterritorial approach to doing MCE. It first and foremost highlights the complexity and multiplicity of on-going processes that go into defining individuals in a classroom community as incomplete and ambivalent. By doing so, it displaces territorial locations of individual differences and the subsequent territorial assumptions about power relations in the classroom. By self-estrangement the 'teacher' and the 'student' is no longer in pursuit of the 'acceptable' and 'right' way of doing which often creates gaps of ignorance between each other, i.e., the provider versus the observer, which maintain authority. Once again drawing on Jacques Ranciere— self-estrangement is a willingness to be 'ignorant' while engaging learning experiences in order to abandon the 'right' versus 'wrong' binary and desire to 'know' and territorialize [68] the uncertain. It is an emotional commitment that challenges educators to be translucent as performers. Self-estrangement is a failure to 'know' ourselves, which implies that a transformative teacher's performance in the classroom has to surrender to practices that decenter his/her subjectivity and others. This commitment to a translucent account of subjectivity, Judith Butler argues, is a decentered account of the self which can be the beginning of a postmodern politics of identity. Butler’s argument suggests that territorial mainstream normative accounts of the self as rational, self-unified ethical subject is an impossible construct and suggests that we can know ourselves only incompletely.[69]

A deterritorial approach to MCE pursues these incomplete processes of knowledge to foster multiplicities of voices to rupture and challenge dominant assumptions about the self. In territorial pedagogical settings on the other hand, the unpreparedness and vulnerability of dealing with multiplicities of differences and conflicts are often problematized as obstacles to be avoided or refuted by a “skillful” teacher/stripper. On the contrary, an educational artist embraces vulnerabilities as creative moments. Self-estrangement is the tantrum a new kind of educational artist goes through, who understands that “the boundary between self and Other is fluid rather than fixed: the Other is included within the boundary of selfhood.” [70] What this ontological assumption suggests for deterritorialization of MCE is the creation of experiential learning settings in which individuals begin to face the stranger within their own self (identity or subjectivity) and in others. That is to say that the ontological foundation of a deterritorial and collective MCE is self-estrangement to already perceived notions of subjectivity (self and identity) and acceptable/capable knowledge about the self. Educators (teachers and students) who perform contestations of their discursively assigned identities begin to reject territorial representations of who they are, or what they need to learn or how they are depicted by territorial discourses. Without self-estrangement we are bound to territorial loyalties to what our identity prescribes for us what our political territory is. Claiming to ‘know’ who we are and what we need to ‘learn’ surrenders praxis and conceptualizations of social justice to territorial discourses. This tendency is exemplified in Elizabeth Ellsworth’s essay, *Why Doesn’t This Feel Empowering?,* which critiques classroom pedagogies that address social difference based on territorial descriptions of difference that resort to representational truths and practices. Ellsworth’s observational insights argue that in these settings the classroom begins to balkanize into what Ellsworth calls ‘affinity groups’ which function to *otherize* individual difference and lose sight of any shared experiential communicative contextual possibility. Ellsworth’s study suggests that this is the moment educators must recognize that we cannot simply resort to a single master-text about difference and power relations to communicate our differences. The emergence of these groups in the classroom suggests that there is an element of ‘unknowing’ and not all knowledge and individual experiences in the classroom can be “made to ‘make sense’ — they cannot be known, in terms of the single master discourse of an educational project's curriculum or theoretical framework, even that of critical pedagogy.”[71] Reflecting on experiences in educational dialogues, Ellsworth alternatively advocates for learning experiences that stem from “processes and routes of our acts of interpretation” [72] in which the inability to explain complexities of power relations with inadequate master texts can be the starting point for collective cultural productions to occur in educational settings. Ellsworth supports cultivating the ability to learn by hearing “the discontinuities in our own, and others’ speech, knowledge, and memories—how to give what we already know another meaning.”[73] The intersection of voices constituted by experience, gender, race, class, ability, ethnicity, sexual orientation, resulting in an emancipatory pedagogy of the “unknowable”: incomplete and partial presence of subjectivities that instantiate collectivity of differences in classrooms.

This is not a denial of identity or race or histories that play a significant role in shaping one’s subjectivity. It is rather a self-reflective engagement with difference which resists being confined into acceptable normative definitions that strive to influence who we are and what we ought to understand and learn. The aim is to perceive the territory of identity as a starting point to talk about power and difference (as points of inquiry) and then to deterritorialize these identifications by continually theorizing and questioning; renegotiating their presence to allow for explorative performances to flourish. Stuart Hall calls this project the ‘reconceptualization’ of identity, arguing, what we require “is ‘not a theory of the knowing subject, but rather a theory of discursive practice.’ However, I believe that what this decentering requires—as the evolution of Foucault’s work clearly shows—is not an abandonment or abolition of ‘the subject’ but a reconceptualization—thinking it in its new, displaced or decentered position within the paradigm.”[74]

Rethinking the subject in its decentered position within dominant discourses enables MCE educators to deterritorialize prescribed notions of learning and improvise new ways to read power relations in classrooms and social justice discourses. In *Wondering About a Future Generation: Identity Disposition Disposal, Recycling and Recreating in the 21st Century*, Don Livingston problematizes the notion of the complete “individual” as the end goal of education. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari’s theoretical study of “partial objects,” Livingston alternatively argues that “understanding identity as a process of dividuation rather than individuation will press the curriculum to consider alternative conceptions…When the corporeal body is decentered, the focus of the curriculum is on the production and construction of thoughts and ideas.” [75] Livingston suggests that processes in which educators continually contest who we are as subjects may renew the rich explorative engagement with strangers. Deterritorializing individual identifiers and signifiers of difference may allow MCE classrooms to witness the emergence of a dialogue about always shifting territories and how these territorial shifts maybe helpful to understand how we may deterritorialize our conceptualizations of transformative education. Perhaps Henry Giroux and Elizabeth Ellsworth give us the most vivid examples of how self-estrangement may conceptually operate to deterritorialize our understanding of identity and power relations associated with them. In Giroux's study of how educators may begin to treat racial identities as potential estrangements, Giroux chooses the term 'partial' identity to refer to a self-estranged identity. Writing about Whiteness, Giroux argues that educators can "learn and unlearn, engage in critical pedagogy of self-formation that allows them to be border-crossers, crossing racial lines not to be black, but so they can begin to forge multiracial coalitions based on an engagement rather than a denial of whiteness." [76] Giroux emphasizes that White students should not be confronted with binary choices which either accept Whiteness or dismiss it as a racist category. Instead, Giroux maintains that whiteness should be understood as an evolving partial "multilayered identity"[77] that flattens binaries of White vs. Colored. By reflecting on her own teaching, Elizabeth Ellsworth illustrates the thought processes an educator goes through while trying to decenter her presence in the classroom and how she struggles to address her class through a unified self. By accepting to place her subjectivity as an estrangement, Ellsworth further reflects on her experiences in her classrooms to argue against a representative or affirmative approach to teaching:

> Anglo, middle-class professor…I could not unproblematically "help" a student of color to find her/his authentic voice as a student of color. I could not unproblematically "affiliate" with the social groups my students represent and interpret their experience to them. In fact, I brought to the classroom privileges and interests that were put at risk in fundamental ways by the demands and defiances of student voices. I brought a social subjectivity that has been constructed in such a way that I have not and can never participate unproblematically in the collective process of self-definition, naming of oppression, and struggles for visibility in the face of marginalization engaged in by students whose class, race, gender, and other positions I do not share. Critical pedagogues are always implicated in the very structures they are trying to change. [78]

Ellsworth alternatively advocates that by avoiding oppressive territorial ways of knowing and being, her classes transformed into sites of dispersed, shifting, and contradictory contexts of knowing and being. The intersection of voices constituted by gender, race, class, ability, ethnicity, sexual orientation, resulting in educational experiences in which the ‘partial presences’ of everyone involved in the collective process result in an incomplete pedagogy of the “unknowable” instantiated by the collectivity of differences in the classroom. The aim of a deterritorial approach to MCE is to perceive the territory of identity as a starting point to talk about power relations and difference as points of inquiry and then to deterritorialize these identifications by continually putting them to question, renegotiating their presence in order to allow for collective performances to flourish.

Deterritorializing Multicultural Education
Through Collective Performance

Tantruming MCE through ‘failing’ and ‘self-estrangement’ of knowable and acceptable notions of authority, knowledge and self cultivates collectivities. Collectivity becomes a common occurrence when individual differences and power relations are treated as partial presences rather than fixed territories. Tantrums spark moments and desires for participation of individuals involved in the educational experience to collectively encounter strangers, which allows them to fail territorial assumptions about others and content. Rather than generating calculable and foreseen homogenous terrains, collectivities are disruptive, uneven and uncertain, which makes collectivity an important part of tantruming a deterritorialized MCE. Reflecting on the aesthetic complexity, diversity and effectiveness of collective art, Gregory G. Sholette states that conflict and difference—rather than harmonious "merging"— are necessary for the formation of such collectivity:

> Possibly sparking, violent repercussions both inside the collective and between the collective and existing institutional forms…the effort required to sustain collective work rises in direct proportion to the professional and emotional toll extracted on constituency. Yet it is exactly this state of overdetermination--the heterogeneity of membership, the meetings where too much is attempted or rejected, too much brought to the table and left off the table, the fleeting ecstasy of collaborative expenditure and a space suddenly opened to the unpredictable effects of class, race, gender, sexual preference, age, divergences in ability, knowledge and career status --all of this can never be encompassed within the group identity per se; yet this excess is what makes the collective viable.[79]

Similarly, Norma Gonzalez and Luis Moll describe Funds of Knowledge (FoK) approach to MCE as a collective articulation of learning in which multiplicities of relations emerge and merge as they get invited into classroom dialogues and content. They argue that FoK is about asking "respectful questions and learn to listen to answers. The dialogue that comes about in the face-to-face interaction of the ethnographic interview is key in building bridges between community and school and between parent and teacher. Asking questions with the intent to learn more about others is a powerful method for establishing the validation of community-based knowledge."[80]

The significant question for the purposes of this chapter is: “What occurs during these collective performances?” I argue, the answer is simply collective tantrums, which offer the temporary process of an “organic unity rather than a permanent security of mathematical unity.”[81] In other words, collectivities are not bound to territorial conceptions of the ‘knowable’ self and knowledge, and thus instantiate the ground for individuals to be comfortable with failure and self-estrangement. Jacques Ranciere refers to this project as a “theater without spectators, where those in attendance learn from as opposed to being seduced by images; where they become active participants as opposed to passive voyeurs.”[82] I envision MCE facilitators as performance artists who construct collective stages where the territories, knowledge and identities of everyone involved are blurred and made uncertain. As Pelias and VanOosting’s examination of the performance approach to classrooms and pedagogy suggests, in these settings "all utterances as potentially aesthetic, all events as potentially theatrical and all audiences as potentially active participants who can authorize aesthetic experience.”[83] In her essay *Connective Aesthetics: Art after Individualism*, Suzi Gablik argues for a new kind of public artist to instantiate such social settings that draw upon collective performances. For Gablik, through collective performance “the boundary between self and Other is fluid rather than fixed: the Other is included within the boundary of selfhood.”[84] A collective is thus *failing* already perceived notions of subjectivity (self and identity) and territorial locations of knowledge and power relations to invite always *new* notions of engagement. For Deleuze and Guattari, deterritorialization is a philosophical artistic process of raising attention to the creative task of all art to “form colors and sounds, both music and painting similarly extract new harmonies, new plastic or melodic landscapes, and new rhythmic characters”[85] Accordingly, deterritorializing MCE can be imagined to produce new languages, words, colors and sounds which pull together into—what Antonio Negri calls— “new communities in their collective figures.”[86] These are playful creative moments—where knowledge and learning take place in multitude forms and groups of individuals—and the possibility of subverting territorial and neoliberal desires are cultivated through deterritorializing and liquidifying difference to continually reinvent multiculturalism. Dwight Conquergood uses the term “tricksters” to talk about how we may begin to act as deconstructors of metanarratives and collective translators of difference in these playful collective performances:

> As soon as a world view has been made, lines drawn, categories defined, hierarchies erected, then the trickster, the archetypal performer, moves into breach norms, violate taboos, turn everything upside down. By playing with the social order, unsettling certainties, the trickster intensifies awareness of the vulnerability of our institutions. The trickster's playful impulse promotes a radical self-questioning critique that yields a deeper self-knowledge, the first step toward transformation. [87]

Collective MCE performance has no ownership but exists in a state of continual processes of collaboration and collective creation. Everyone involved (students, teachers, communities, administrators) share, exchange, contest and negotiate the knowledge processes.

Gomez-Pena’s work on “human altars/diptych” (postmodern interpretations of ancient ritual performance in which the human body becomes the centerpiece for a collective practice) may provide us with an example of how deterritorialized multicultural education classrooms can implement such experiential collectivities. Gomez-Pena asks participants in the altar practice to offer their ideas (titles, signs, images and texts) and their bodies to perform the altars (voice, motion, postures and gestures). Performance artists then produce altars that put in motion a collective practice that, for instance in Gomez-Pena's work, illustrate "a dead US soldier retuning from Iraq or Afghanistan."[88] Such collective practices in MCE classrooms can take the form of a daily practice to reflect on a certain topic or a long-term art project: an artistic documentation, for instance syllabus as the centerpiece of a semester-long collective altar-making project.

Multicultural education classes often use group work to allow students to learn from each other. However, these gatherings are dictated by a desire to create representational knowledge products, i.e., posters, definitions, oral presentations, critical consciousness and so on. These gatherings are not collective since they only call upon a "knowable" outcome and the gap between performer and spectators remain unchallenged. Barrie Barrell's work on *Classroom Artistry* suggests that a performance approach to multicultural education needs to be equipped with a willingness to "forego the insistence upon clear-cut behavioral objectives and predictable learning outcomes for the freedom to adjust and to explore new avenues with unpredictable outcomes."[89] Collective altar exercises in MCE can provide such new venues. Instead of being repressive repetitive exercises that force students to reproduce "textbook" evaluations of the content, collective altar creation processes may offer opportunities to engage knowledge through subjective, imperfect and incomplete creativity.

I will try to offer a snapshot of a multicultural education syllabus as an altar collective experiential exercise:

> Before beginning this exercise, the educator must discuss with the participants the experiential trajectory of a decentered performance approach to pedagogy, which contests individual

and textual boundaries in classroom settings. For instance, a collective positionality that embraces the individual experiential sensibility of ‘not know much about multicultural education’ and the fact that ‘not know much’ is in fact the very source of a rich beginning of an indebt dialogue.

1. State that there isn’t a syllabus for the course. No commitment to a predetermined structure; no assignments, no grading scales, no course material. The syllabus will be an open ended and collective canvas for all artists to contribute to; an altar.
2. Ask for volunteers to suggest issues to discuss and invite the class to create a vague and flexible order in which discussions about these topics will take place in the class throughout the semester. Always remind them that the order will be fluid and can be changed at anytime during the semester. This constructive process can initially be carried out without verbal exchange. Individuals can use post-it note pads to stick their desired topics onto a poster paper for others to visit and reflect on.
3. After the discussion, invite the class to argue about why they are in multicultural education, what they imagine will take place in the class. Suggested answers: Tolerance, Cultural awareness, Anti-racism, teaching about difference. Be unprepared, do not try to debunk their input and accept it as valid points that the collective performance will give speed and velocity for renegotiation.
4. Ask the group if they would like to re-name the course and why? Suggested names: Collective education, inclusive education, Communal education, White versus Others education. The collective should not try to find about why they wish to rename the course nor what that should be. Re-visit this question at the end of the semester and compare suggested answers and reasons.
5. Ask the group if they would like to volunteer their body and subjective experiences as case studies for the course.
6. Invite the group to design next meetings readings, activity and assignment based on the syllabus.

At the end of the semester, distribute the syllabus the participants have collectively created. This exercise can yield multiple syllabuses in one classroom. There may be different groups within the class who might desire to take different routes to engage knowledge. The syllabus as an altar is a deterritorialized collective pedagogical practice because unlike a territorial

> syllabus, it does not exert a predetermined knowledge agenda. The disappearance of the syllabus as a territorial power structure also enables the classroom community to move beyond the Expert versus the receiving learner dichotomy. The authoritative power relationships between institutional figures imposing performances over learners are contested. There is now multiplicities of authors and translators of texts and their deterritorial presence dissolves territorial locations of 'power' and difference.

Altars are ritualistic; they are always open for participants to regenerate and incorporate different performances that are always different and not easily repeated. In other words, performance pedagogy is a process and "reframes the whole educational enterprise as a mutable and ongoing ensemble of narratives and performance, rather than a linear accumulation of isolated, discipline-specific competencies."[90] What is new and explorative in these settings is the eagerness to being open to continual change based on the nature of active collective collaboration. Following Augusto Boal's model of engagement with content through collective performances, the classroom content and knowledge are transformed into an evolving language. That is, individuals begin to practice theatre [classroom performance] as a "language that is living and present, not as a finished product displaying images from the past…the spectators 'write' simultaneously with the acting of the actors…spectators intervene directly, 'speaking' through images made with the actors' bodies."[91] In a deterritorialized MCE classroom collectivity students can interrupt the "action" and "play" at any point, change and compromise its direction and even take the place of the original performer. The resulting setting offers educators with deterritorial discussions about content, social difference and power relations. Their discussions emerge and engender subversive performance of social justice and transformative education, which are not limited to textbooks, expert knowledge or institutional desires.

Similarly, Elyse Pineau’s essay, *Teaching is Performance*, which emphasizes the common practices of ‘performance studies classrooms,’ offers exemplars of confronting issues of race, class, gender, and sexuality through collective performances. Pineau describes teaching as performance:

> Students are urged, often required, to engage nontraditional texts, and to explore crossgender and crosscultural experiences through performance. Indeed, the disciplinary dictum that performance enables a "sense of the other" is ground in the commitment to engage multiple-often contradictory-modes of experience in an intimate, non judgmental, and dialogic manner. Certainly the performance method itself, with its commitment to participatory, kinesthetic learning, dismantles the rational bias of traditional instruction. Performance studies is also committed to blurring the arbitrary boundaries between social and educational contexts. Courses in the performance of every-day life, naturally occurring conversation, and bodily experiences of gender, to name just a few, are part of the core curriculum in many performance studies programs. Likewise, the collaborative nature of performance blurs the boundaries between teachers and students. Workshops and rehearsals bring the instructor into the student's space, where they must work together as partners in the learning experience. This democratic partnership extends equally to the research process. Claiming performance as a methodology means acknowledging that a significant part of the researcher's learning occurs in and through the bodies of students, cast members, and informants. Whenever we step out from behind the instructor's lectern or the director's chair, we enter that liminal space where our own identities as "experts" become tenuous. In effect, to be a scholar or teacher of performance means welcoming students to join us in that uncertain, magical space of personal and communal transformation. [92]

A Fund of Knowledge (FoK) approach to MCE also embodies similar deterritorial, collective and performative engagements with learning to address differences and to improvise knowledge content based on those collective performances. Gonzalez and Moll outline FoK focus through a series of questions:

> How do we deal with the dynamic processes of the lived experiences of students? How can we get away from static categorizations of assumptions about what goes on in households? How can we build relationships of confianza ("mutual trust") with students' households? Our answer to these questions focuses on the talk born of ethnography: respectful talk between people who are mutually engaged in a constructive conversation. [93]

FoK offers us settings where individuals involved in educational experiences can perform within a collectivity and highlight the creative processes of confrontation with difference. Such settings can expand the interpretive and imaginative horizons of multicultural education by cultivating failure of acceptable territories of knowledge and difference.

Tantruming Multicultural Education Through Funds of Knowledge

A Funds of Knowledge (FoK) approach to multiculturalism does indeed offer the groundwork for collectivity and overcoming institutionally pregiven criteria of success and territorial identities by incorporating students' home, community and personal skills into content area acquisition. In other words, FoK tries to foster educational settings which admit to being 'ignorant' of students' home and communal realities. As a result, when FoK is carried out by teachers who invest time in home-visits and community outreach programs in order to learn from the 'realities' of students, it tends to demonstrate higher ethical commitment to students' differences. FoK therefore requires willingness of the facilitator (instructor/teacher) to engage the unknown and be caught "off-guard," just as the teacher in the Ethnic Studies course who exposed his personal vulnerabilities and the stranger that he usually hides behind the territories of curriculum content, syllabus, and assignments and so on. This willingness to be vulnerable requires an approach in which educators can claim to be ignorant and ready to fail their preconceptions of difference and subjectivity. In Jacques Ranciere’s *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*,[94] this encounter with uncertainty and unknowing, the acceptance that ignorance of the schoolmaster is the condition of emancipation of knowledge and equality of intelligence, which is verified through doing and practice of knowledge, rather than knowing and teaching it.

FoK scholars Norma Gonzalez and Luis Moll argue that this work builds on a key element in FoK approach to learning premised on the principle that “people are competent and have knowledge, and their life experiences have given them that knowledge…through first-hand research experiences with families, we can document this competence and knowledge, and that this engagement leads to many possibilities for positive pedagogical actions.” [95] The multiplicities of voices that are utilized to validate students’ identities as knowledgeable individuals in which both teachers and students engage in learning experiences is predicated on resources and not deficits. Gonzalez and Moll suggest FoK as a positive approach that emphasizes the role of experience which does not territorialize culture or the processes of learning:

> Open up a panorama of the interculturality of households, that is, how households draw from multiple cultural systems and use these systems as strategic resources…However, the question then remains, how do we conceptualize difference? How can we replace the contribution of the culture concept, yet minimize its by-products? By focusing on practice, on the strategies and adaptations that households have developed over time, we have chosen to focus on the multiple dimensions of the lived experiences of students.[96]

Gonzalez and Moll’s argument for a deterritorial pedagogical approach that focuses on lived experiences reflects the evolving trajectories of social difference and power relations in schools and society. They argue that FoK can map out discourses students participate in, and voice multiplicities of power relations, such as community, family, social resources. FoK approach provides greater access for participation in processes of knowledge production and an ethical engagement with social difference. Ultimately, expanding possibilities of change and challenging territorial conceptual premises of how we make sense of power relations.

Gonzalez rightfully insists that it is crucial for transformative educators to come to terms with how their "students increasingly draw from an intercultural and hybrid knowledge base, appropriating multiple cultural systems, as youth culture permeates greater and greater spheres."[97] For Gonzalez, FoK may enable educators to encounter deterritorial conceptions about knowledge and difference into classroom performances, allowing them to be comfortable with messy and uncertain identifications of self, culture and content. These deterritorialized MCE settings may begin to find it harder to point to 'fixed' locations of power to advocate for transformative social justice education and begin to improvise multiplicities and variety of locations. Deleuze and Guattari refer to this conceptual task as the "age of partial objects" in which a unified whole essence is no longer possible:

> We live today in the age of partial objects, bricks that have been shattered to bits, and leftovers. We no longer believe in the myth of the existence of fragments that, like pieces of an antique statue, are merely waiting for the last one to be turned up, so that they may all be glued back together to create a unity that is precisely the same as the original unity. We no longer believe in a primordial totality that once existed, or in a final totality that awaits us at some future date. We no longer believe in the bull gray outlines of a dreary, colorless dialectic of evolution, aimed at forming a harmonious whole out of heterogeneous bits by rounding off their rough edges. We believe only in totalities that are peripheral. And if we discover such a totality alongside various separate parts, it is a whole *of* these particular parts and does not totalize them; it is a unity *of* all these

> particular parts but does not unify them; rather, it is added to them as a new part fabricated separately.[98]

FoK has the potential to cultivate deterritorial MCE consistencies rather than territorial points of 'unity' and reference points. A utopian perspective that tantrums MCE social justice education through deterritorial notions of individual difference and power relations refrains from essentializing the desire and location of transformative education. As Judith Butler argues "alternative modalities of power to establish a kind of political contestation that is not a 'pure' opposition, a 'transcendence' of contemporary relations of power, but a difficult labor of forging a future from resources inevitably impure."[99] In that sense, the FoK approach to experiential learning "differs from the accumulative way of linear thinking in which a big long-term goal is set prior to all small steps that are controlled by the big scheme as a mathematical unit."[100] It considers deliberate blurring of territories in the classroom, undermining normative subjectivities and texts as sites of creative controversy. By queering, putting out of order and dispersing the context of knowing, FoK approach has the potential to become a collective performance, a tantrum which interferes in the "production of so-called normalcy in schooled subjects where im/perfect outcomes become the norm."[101]

Imperfect outcomes are thus utopias of a deterritorialized multicultural education for improvising collectivity of differences through which the production of new subjectivities and perhaps "new figures of struggle"[102] for progressive education and social change flourish in our neoliberal moment. Hence, based on this utopian premise my study tried to promote experiential dialogue about the foundational conceptualizations of multicultural education and the neoliberal economic discourses that threaten our desire for learning and equity. My study sought theoretical as well as practical tools for a future of MCE, one that is not limited by territorial discourses. I've tried to deterritorialize MCE by reconsidering the impact of territorial assumptions of 'power' and how these assumptions hinder MCE efforts to ethically engage individual difference and democratic political action. In doing so, my research strived to establish a forward-dawning utopian perspective for social justice education invested in addressing individuals and politics through ambivalent and dispersed relations of power in order to cultivate creative and collective educational experiences. The deterritorial approach to learning I've tried to articulate has no specific end or conclusive ideal. It rather inspires educators to continually create, improvise and build upon the surprising performative encounters with individual differences and power relations.

CHAPTER 5

DETERRITORIAL MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE CLASSROOM

> I am not a prisoner of history. I should not seek there for the meaning of my destiny. I should constantly remind myself that the real *leap* consists in introducing invention into existence. In the world through which I travel, I am endlessly creating myself. I am a part of Being to the degree that I go beyond it.
>
> (Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*)

Introduction

In this last chapter, as a way of conclusion, I will try to reflect on my teaching experiences to provide illustrative instances of how a deterritorial approach to multicultural education (MCE) may be played out in educational settings. Education is deeply embedded in what is made available, obvious, and controllable, concerning its practice. Hence, I find my writing clashing against a wall of certainty on which my proposed encounter with tantrums and newness is repressed with closure seeking ‘bottom line’ forms of conventional meaning, i.e., “what does a deterritorial pedagogy look like?” The honest answer is that I don’t know and I am not sure if I should express any knowledge or ownership over what is possible. But what I can offer are my experiences a teacher of Introduction to Multicultural Education classes with teacher education students. In the previous chapter, I have provided theoretical insights and a few illustrative examples of how educators can deterritorialize classroom discussion. For instance, I reflected on using an openly racist tantrum to bring forth dialogue about the voices of dissent to allow the classroom community to collectively engage in critical discussion. In this chapter, I will try to offer other instances where a nonconsensual tantruming approach to teaching can enable educators to explore with deterritorial conceptions to teaching and learning.

I also would like to remind the reader that tantrums do not have to be violent, or dramatic outbursts of emotion. Because the question of how to identify a tantrum becomes highly problematic when we try to outline a descriptive intensity and stage for naming a tantrum. Tantrums can be subtle and come from spontaneous utterances of praxis that do not abide by the normative territories of schooling and learning. What is crucial for deterritorializing MCE educators is to allow for venues for tantrums to cultivate and engender collectively creative social justice education and learning. These instances occur when learners are rendered vulnerable and emotional in their engagement with content, where their territorial definitions of self and knowledge are compromised, contested and made ambiguous.

The “Problem” of Demographics

My experience both as a teaching assistant and as a faculty member teaching MCE to service and preservice student teachers, the student demographics is often dealt as a factor or an obstacle in determining teaching strategies. Based on assumption on "who" the students are, MCE teachers grapple with questions of 'how' to teach, e.g., how to tech a predominantly White classroom—'what' knowledge student demographics in those classes need to be exposed to. These strategies often construct a preexisting subject before any democratic engagement with the students. This perhaps is the initial consensus seeking assumption many MCE educators in predominantly White classrooms are using to begin to construct the persistent 'gap of ignorance' between the Expert teacher and always-already passive-voyeur. Teachers anticipate and prepare their "plans" to expose students to heated topics such as racism and White privilege through an assumption that students are going to resist the content, which in many cases is true. However, the assumption represses and imprisons MCE classrooms into silence by operating as a surveillance mechanism that targets eliminating dissent. Resisting an idea that fundamentally threatens one's way of life is not unusual, because it challenges emotional investments in thought. MCE educators acknowledge belief structures and how they are important in how one thinks. However, what is problematic is the pre-existing, homogenizing, territorial assumption about students presumed to be lacking critical knowledge or that their identities disable them from relating to the controversial material.

Working with MCE teacher colleagues, I often have observed that our conversations about the classroom leads to a discussion about preexisting subjectivities in the classroom. Based on those assumptions, we prepare for war and acquire our arsenal, i.e., readings, discussions, assignments, to ensure that we create a consensual dialogue. In our teaching assistant workshops we talk about how to diffuse tension and how not to make the content "personal" by guiding student discussions through texts. Such trajectories operate to "reduce the complexity and chaos of an ever-changing multiplicity of bodily flux to discrete categories of meaning and constancy."[1] Learning is personal, it is emotional and has to have the intensity to live itself out loud as opposed to being carried out as a silenced, suppressed quarrel. By essentializing what social justice education is—and *who* the educator must address—we often demand students to reproduce the knowledge they need to present in order to pass the class, rather than inviting them to engage content through a process of critical dialogue, disagreement, and compromise. *We take away the one most dynamic learning tool they have, their emotional investments in content*. Jacques Ranciere calls this deduction of individual differences as the 'policing' of politics which merely reinforces what is acceptable and what is not. Ranciere alternatively proposes "dissensus" as a way to foster democratic community, which "is not a conflict of interests, opinions or values; it is a division inserted in 'common sense': a dispute over what is given and about the frame within which we see something as given…the dismissal of categories of those who are or are not qualified for political life."[2] Doing MCE through deterritorial conception of our classrooms, without resorting to policing assumptions of individual difference, may be an uncomfortable teaching position. However, it is much more explorative than a teaching position that relies on certainties to construct consensus.

Deterritorializing MCE classrooms is to try to read the experience of 'education' not merely as a gathering of "conscious" and rational bodies to perform and achieve certain tasks, but as a gathering of imperfect unfinished identities who continually brake. Deleuze and Guattari tell us that bodies are "desiring machines," individuals are not unified and complete fixations but are rather becoming, active, breaking, and creating. Schooling is part of a process bodies go through. The presence of institutional buildings, authority figures, schedules, procedures, and content, along with many other disciplinary structures and norms, impose anxieties and failures, which we have often learned to hide, overcome and silence. One can argue that schooling is where bodies break. This is not necessarily a bad thing. Breaking opens up failures for us to resist normative constraining discourses of education and the disciplinary territories of learning. Failures or breakages also lead to unrestricted desires and experiences of friendship, love, creativity, and sharing, which inevitably resulted in diverse sets of ethical and emotional relationships as well as immense creative energies for collectivity and learning. Edward L. Schieffelin's essay, *Problematizing Performance*, stresses that "social identity and purpose are established between people not so much through rational discourse as through complex and subtle expressive maneuvers that create an atmosphere of trust and a sense of mutual expectations."[3] Breaking and experimenting with failure thus leads classroom communities to foster dialogue through trust that is not merely organized by institutional conventions. MCE is aware of these experiential and social dynamics of education in which expectations play a crucial role in fostering ethical address to honor individual differences. I argue that MCE has to highlight this relational sensitivity in its approach to conveying 'doing' MCE as well as its transformative scope and aim in the classroom.

For that end, in my teaching of multicultural education classes, I strive to forefront tantrums to spark failures that allow our desires to collide with learning, to open up endless possibilities for dialogue. I celebrate my teaching philosophy as an endeavor, which tries to give voice to individual differences and multiplicities of students' funds of knowledge for performing 'always new' and 'collective' engagements with content to challenge and subvert 'consensus seeking' normative schooling. This is particularly important in teaching MCE. Teaching MCE with the assumption that no ‘body’ is fully unified, complete or rational opens endless creative possibilities for the teacher and the students who are engaged in processes of questioning identities, knowledge and multiculturalism from ambiguity rather than consensual territories of who our students are. When a deterritorial teacher approaches her/his curriculum by refusing to try to identify a preexisting classroom demographic, the dialogue highlights collectivity and active participation to become abundant sources of active and experiential learning, opposed to silence and resentment. Welcoming active participation in curriculum design and content reduces the anxieties of how to create consensus.

The deterritorial MCE teacher is attentive to ethical intersubjective ways to engage with and learn from social differences without essentializing them into fixed territorial definitions. For instance, in my teaching MCE courses with student teachers, we begin by deconstructing the syllabus and why it is there in the first place. Why do university instructors begin classes with syllabuses? Then as we approach a certain level of commitment to why we are gathered in the classroom, we collectively begin to grapple with content. We sometimes begin with the term ‘culture’ in multicultural. I ask them what the term means. After deliberation and coming up with a list of variables, we question if these variables are given, unchanging fixed traits. Students are often unsure of their answers largely because this question challenges their personal commitments to their beliefs, experiences and identity. Students then begin to refer to culture through social and historical processes and they become self-estranged. Although they hold on to certain cultural traits, such as religion, ethnicity, family and so forth, they see their sense of belonging as a process. It is important in these settings for a deterritorial educator who is intrigued by the creative communal potential of tantrums in the classroom to refrain from making knowledge claims, i.e., telling students what ‘culture’ is or what their culture is.

No matter how demographically similar it may seem, a classroom community is a complex diverse setting of individual differences. Understanding diversity as a process of becoming rather than references to territorial depictions of identity is crucial for deterritorial educators who seek collective dialogues in their content and teaching practice. Searching for a post-civil rights address to social activism and identity driven political movements in the U.S. for Latina/o populations, Cristina Beltrán uses the term Latinadad to refer to this ever-searching approach to difference as “a practice of identity capable of proliferating in unexpected places...understood as a form of action, Latinidad has no fixed center—it can start up new lines from where it was once broken or shattered.” Diversity is continually emerging and becoming:

> Undocumented Guatemalan labor activists living in North Carolina; Puerto Rucan Libertarians attending college in New Jersey; young Chicano environmentalists attending Morrissey concerts in Los Angeles and supporting Hillary Clinton in the 2008 Democratic primarly; Nicaraguan evangelicals supporting conservative ballot initiatives in Florida; Mexican American senior citizens registering voters in Colorado; queer Cuban radical campaigning for Barak Obama in New York. *This is rhizomatic Latinidad*.[4]

The same decentered argument can be made for any group of students who are part of a collective assemblage in a multicultural education classroom. At the university level, I primarily have experience teaching Introduction to Multicultural Education to future teachers. In my classes, we focused on understanding the role and place of multiculturalism within the sociopolitical context of education while critically deconstructing the impact of power relations in curriculum design and content as well as teacher practice. During our dialogues we examine concepts such as White privilege, retention and tracking, cultural deficit views of diverse learners, myth of meritocracy, to name just a few. I experience many different forms of resistance towards and denial of the content knowledge and reading materials, but gradually these quarrels give way to respectful and courageous conversations about racism, discrimination and repressive power structures in schools. What initially allows me to instantiate dialogical communities of learners (cultural workers) is my eagerness to avoid misconceptions about student demographics as merely "conservative" and lacking critical consciousness and in need of enlightenment. I regard students as individuals who choose to come together to understand power relations and injustices in education with keenness to listen to the Other. By facilitating classes that are open to student contributions in constructing curriculum content and by giving students opportunities to participate in the processes of knowledge production, I experience a collective community of learners who cannot merely be classified as "White-middle-class-conservative." Our ethical relations with difference and commitment to social justice enable us to bring in our lived experiences in our communities and school sites as valuable funds of knowledge to listen, understand and learn from our abundances of differences and experience. In other words, we experience diversity as a collective process of becoming and refrain from addressing our own identity as merely a single territorial categorization. Instead we "endlessly create"[5] our diversity.

From ‘Who Am I?’ to ‘What I May Become?’

In teaching social justice education classes to teachers, it is imperative that the teacher addresses students as becoming, active, breaking and creative desiring machines. A knowledge claim, such as “White teachers need to be aware of their privilege” results in scenarios in which student-teachers in MCE classes are forced to retreat to identity territories they find it difficult to identify with. In my experience, telling a “White” student his/her color is a racial category is more difficult than enabling her/him to question how s/he is a stranger to her/himself. Before students are forced to cling onto a racial identity (e.g., exposed to their Whiteness), I find it more explorative that my students find themselves floating and unable to identify “who” they are, because when students begin to ask “who” they are as Gert Biesta argues such an account of ‘knowing,’ thinks of “education as socialization, as a process of the insertion of newcomers into a pre-existing “order” of humanity.”[6] My teaching thus tries to refrain from the hierarchies of an existing order who we are in the classroom.

In MCE classrooms, teachers often assume that their students are in need of being exposed to critical knowledge. I agree that students must be exposed to repressive power relations in society and education, but it becomes problematic when this ‘teaching assumption’ begins to assign for them who they are, and determines their context of learning. One of my students expressed this problem by arguing that she “felt like the class was designed to make White people feel like they are responsible for all of the injustices that happen.” She felt blamed and ill equipped to address her students in an ethical way. This is no coincidence and made me question my teaching practice, and practices and how as a MCE instructor, I might have ended up territorializing my students.

Alternatively, I propose that teachers emphasize what is in *abundance*—their eagerness to understand, their complex life experiences that prepared them to engage controversial issues, in other words, their funds of knowledge. Exposing issues such as 'White privilege' needs to occur through an approach that asks learners to step into a process of becoming, blurring the territorial claims of their unified self and actively questioning their desires before they can undoubtedly and voluntarily ask themselves: "What I may become?"—rather than—"who am I?" The processes of becoming that are in abundance in classrooms. Students are capable of reading their experiences as part of processes of learning and that their change in their beliefs and actions as they encounter experiences. I try to facilitate my classroom as part of those encounters they go through and allow them to reflect on what they have captured or allowed them to think about what their position as a learner or a teacher is. Sharon Todd captures this in her analysis of how ethical learning occurs in dialogical setting where shared experiences bring more than a self-contained "I." In learning beyond the capacity of the self-contained or territorial identity, Todd finds "limitless possibility for the self, and it is by coming face to face with such limitlessness that the self can exceed its own containment, its own self-identity, breaking the solitude of being for the self."[7] Todd's insistence on an unknowable difference for an ethical orientation of social justice education has influenced my teaching and approach to MCE, which allowed me to experience my students' addressing my classrooms as "safe" environments for discussing controversial topics in their end of semester course evaluations. I try to create a safe learning setting in which our classroom is merely an encounter that offers students to share ideas without worrying about political correctness.

This feeling of ‘safety’ stems from ‘breakages’ of the self-contained “I,” which enables individuals to relate to the collectivity of community. Students feel safe in exposing the stranger they were schooled to self-contain, and they do not shy away from encountering others and being vulnerable, i.e., getting comfortable in participating in discussions and throwing tantrums. Felix Guattari argues that in such setting we experience a “desiring a collective generosity,” which by “bringing into being new representations and proposals”[8] begins to deterritorialize the praxis of learning. The collective generosity also allows the teacher to stop performing a ‘striptease’ and step outside of the authority position the institution grants her/him. For instance, as a teacher, I share my daily life experiences with students as they relate to the content I try to dialogue, I openly express my struggles, privileges, insecurities and uncertainties. In one of my classes, in which we were discussing the subtle effects of discourses of discrimination and how we may be contributing to repressive power relations without being aware of it, I exposed my vulnerability to my students and admitted that my socialization as a male teacher probably had something to do with my learning the names of my male students before others. I wanted the classroom to see that even a teacher who is teaching about culturally sensitive pedagogy can be ‘insensitive.’ But my “failure” became the perfect cautionary lived example as well as a catalyst for collective generosity. One student reflects on my failure in her/his course feedback:

> He also pointed out certain flaws that he faces, rather than portraying himself to be a perfect human being which gives him a realness about him that helps to make him and his teachings authentic.[9]

A ‘teacher’ who strives to refrain from the authority the gap of ignorance grants him or her instantiates the experiential classroom, transforming into an open stage in which individuals actively relates to one another. She or he exposes to the students that the “who” is endlessly going through processes of becoming. Through imperfections, differences and lived experiences, classrooms collectively play out what they may become and try to examine how power relations have an impact on their educational experience. In those instances, education becomes the vehicle by which ‘learning’ instantiates tantrums for creative, artistic and collective dialogue.

Deterritorial MCE exposes the “process of constructing a human reality,” [10] which opts for seeking an address to ‘becomings’ rather than fixed points of reference. The pedagogy I try to implement consequently expands the terrain of learning by offering learners means to go beyond the territorial confines of territorial assumptions of self and curriculum. I encourage my students to understand that the collective and intersubjective nature of our relationship with each other and knowledge is viable and culturally sensitive through active experience and collective dialogue. These connections and experiences transform our class meetings into voluntary gatherings of individuals that meet to dialogue and practice creative and equitable forms of learning and teaching. It renders us vulnerable and emotional as we begin to adopt personal commitments to our cultural work and experiences, realizing that we are all significant in cultivating transformative social change.

Tantruming Teacher: Deterritorializing Empire in a 4th-Grade Classroom

I remember many years ago, when I was in elementary school in Turkey, the best skill I learned was to know when to "be quiet." I don't remember having a single conversation with my teacher, I was just forced to listen, and teacher never cared to listen to students. My teacher only knew my name, nothing more. For obvious reasons, I didn't enjoy being in school. So, many years later, when I got the chance to teach a small group of 4th and 5th grade students at a highly diverse K-5 U.S. school, serving immigrant, refugee and mostly Muslim students, I approached my teaching with a strong desire to listen and genuinely respond. We had many critical conversations, which I believe will resonate with my students for many years.

We started our days with my asking "what do you guys want to do today?" or "where do you want to go today?" I often used that as a hypothetical question to seduce them to actively organize the class. They always responded well, proposing places they thought were fun to go, arguing with each other on the merits of their hypothetical trip they are going to embark on. I would try to teach content based on their decision. Sometimes they couldn't agree and sometimes their disagreement also made for an interesting venue for teaching content area. On one of these days, they proposed to go to Disney Land and I agreed. I thought of a way to teach math word problems using estimated costs and distances to Disneyland and so on. As we were working on Math, my students were having fun as the hypothetical thought of a trip to Disney Land enticed their enthusiasm. They were talking to each other about their life in the U.S. and how much better it was and how much they liked Disneyland. So I listened and then joined their conversation. I asked them why they felt that way, what was better and compared to what. My students who were from war torn regions of the Middle East (Sudan, Iraq and Palestine) began to express their appreciation for feeling *safe* in the United States. They shared the difficulties their families had to endure when they were not in their home countries. One student from Palestine shared her memory of Israeli soldiers storming her house in the middle of the night and taking away male members of her family, how terrified she was when she had to hide when soldiers stormed her family's home. She was grateful that she no longer had to live that way.

I am sympathetic to U.S. efforts to welcome refugees and political asylum seekers, providing them with a second chance to a better life. Many refugees do indeed have a better life in the U.S., However, many of them do not question why they have become refugees in the first place. Why they had to leave. I couldn't avoid the opportunity to expose my students to such critical questions that would give them a chance to examine processes associated with the construction of their so-called reality. Perhaps the fact that I wasn't so thrilled about the hyperreality of Disneyland might also have played a role in my tantrum. Or perhaps because I felt like a refugee myself, who began his U.S. days as an international student half way across the world from Turkey, and I wanted to share my frustration. I was nervous because I knew my tantruming question would fundamentally challenge their assumptions about self, place and safety. I began to weight the emotional task ahead of me and for my students. The moment my students began to grasp the extent of my question, they would never be the same.

So I began my tantrum with a question. I asked my students if they knew who the biggest ally to Israel was. Who provides the Israeli army with weapons and money?

When I told them that it was the West including the U.S.—the country which granted them their safety was also responsible for their dislocation—they were confused, betrayed and sorry. We talked about how and why the West supports Israel. We discussed how a certain percentage of every dollar they would spend on the way to and at Disney Land (in some shape or form) would go into supporting war in the Middle East. Their safety was not a U.S. granted generosity but largely a forced imposition of dislocation. I also provided them different examples of dislocations people around the world go through. I offered them my subjectivity as a dislocated academic refugee, who left Turkey many years ago in search of better educational opportunities, leaving family and friends behind. We talked about what it means for us to be in the U.S. and what it means for the U.S. to have us here. The socio-political consequences were complicated and unclear which puzzled us. Our criticisms turned into frustration we could not grasp the extent of who we were becoming. But we all shared that frustration as a collective group of learners; there was no longer a gap of ignorance separating us, the authoritative dichotomy between a teacher and her/his students was greatly diminished if not erased.

Elementary school teachers are a lot more communal then they think they are. Every word exchanged in the class is delivered to the parents and school community during the car ride home or at the dinner table. The next day, I was called into the principal's office and got a warning. I think the only reason I wasn't fired was that the parents were sympathetic to the critical discourse I exposed my students to. But it was a taboo subject to talk about since it might have easily jeopardized their livelihood in the United States and perhaps force them to face deportation. I might have ruined my students' fun but I think they gained a valuable critical insight into how their political territory is influenced by global socio-political power relations. A trip to Disney Land was never the same and they were much more critical of their choices. I would not have had this opportunity if I hadn't listened to my students, if I only knew their names. I would not have had the opportunity to allow them to critically explore their social status if I chose not to expose my own vulnerabilities. We would not have had the opportunity to be a collective group of learners throughout the year, if it wasn't for the tantrum.

A Non-Last Tantrum:
An Act of Poetry

I've tried to pose deterritorializing multicultural education as an approach that allows educators to see the present as an emerging future. It is a way to try to open multiple roads different from the status quo and strive to address inequalities and power relations not merely as a constraining territorial places, but as terrains to seek where we need to go and how we can become valuable resources for challenging territorial locations of knowing in order for collective dialogue and critical inquiry. It is thus creative and knows no bounds. It is a quest for hope, love, breakages and dreams. It is an emotional encounter with learning. My uncle, teacher, investigative historian, and a poet, who shortly after retiring from his secondary school art teacher position in Turkey, once said to me "do not let poetry be absent from your writing." For a long time, I was blind to the message he was trying to convey. Now that I am writing about a conceptually creative philosophy of education that is rooted in action, I am beginning to understand the creative energy in his words. I begin to see deterritorial education as an act of poetry.

Encountering Deleuze and Guattari's pressing question, 'what is philosophy?' I come to realize that my uncle has already given us a probable answer, 'philosophy is an act of poetry.' Deleuze and Guattari argue that "philosophy is not a simple art of forming, inventing, or fabricating concepts, because concepts are not necessarily forms, discoveries, or products…philosophy is to create concepts that are always new."[11] Philosophy—just like poetry—is not "contemplation, reflection, or communication…which only works under the sway of opinions in order to create "consensus" and not concepts."[12] Poetry and poetic deterritorial education is thus much more than reflection and communication. It is where we relate to the classroom and content with our emotions, daily struggles, desires, angers and pleasures. Holding back those desires that feed our journey to what we are becoming is decaying the creative potential in ways we engage learning. Without poetry, social justice education is just a dry desert of tamed words that don't inspire but merely sketches the already tainted and muted sounds of struggle. Writing poetry of "social justice" education can allow educators to create lines of flight from normalized territorial locations as we experience the everydayness of our desires and emotions in our interrelationship with knowledge and classroom collectivity, while we inspire an endless interplay of more poetry.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Louis Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (New York: Monthly Review Press 1971).

Ben Anderson "Transcending Without Transcendence: Utopianism and an Ethos of Hope," *Antipode* 38, no.4 (2006): 697.

Gloria Anzaldua, *Borderlands, La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999).

Michael W. Apple, "Globalizing Education: Perspectives From Below and Above," in *Globalizing Education, Policies, Pedagogies, and Politics,* eds. Michael W. Apple, Jane Kenway and Michael Singh (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2005).

Michael Arribas-Ayllon and Valerie Walkerdine, "Foucaultian Discourse Analysis," in *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology,* eds. Carla Willig and Wendy Stainton-Rogers (London: SAGE, 2008).

James A. Banks, "The Historical Reconstruction of Knowledge About Race: Implications for Transformative Teaching," *Educational Researcher* 24, no. 2 **(**1995):15-25.

James A. Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 2nd Edition (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).

James A. Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education* (Boston: Pearson Education, Inc., 2008).

James A. Banks, *Cultural Diversity and Education: Foundations, Curriculum and Teaching*, 4th Edition (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001).

James A. Banks, *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004).

James A. Banks, "Teaching for Social Justice, Diversity, and Citizenship in a Global World," *The Educational Forum* 68 (2004): 295.

Ronald Barthes, *Mythologies* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1972)

Ronald Barthes, *The Rustle of Language* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1987).

Barrie Barrell, “Classroom Artistry,” *The Educational Forum* 55, no.4 (1991).

David Bell, “Fail Again. Fail Better: Nomadic Utopianism in Deleuze & Guattari and Yevgeny Zamyatin,” *Political Perspectives* 4, no.1 (2010).

Christina Beltrán, *Trouble with Unity: Latino Politics and the Creation of Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London & New York: Routledge, 1994).

Gert J.J. Biesta, *Beyond Learning: Democratic Education for a Human Future* (Boulder & London: Paradigm Publishers, 2006).

Gert Biesta, “Learner, Student, Speaker: Why It Matters How We Call Those We Teach,” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 42, no.5–6 (2010): 540-552.

Gert Biesta, “The Ignorant Citizen: Mouffe, Rancière, and the Subject of Democratic Education,” *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 30, no. 2 (March 2011): 141-153.

Augusto Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed* (London: Pluto Press, 2008).

Mary Bryson and Suzanne de Castell, "Queer Pedagogy?!: Praxis Makes Im/Perfect," in *Radical In<ter>ventions: Identity, Politics, and Differences in Educational Praxis*, eds. Suzanne de Castell and Mary Bryson (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997).

Ian Buchanan, “Metacommentary on Utopia, or Jameson's Dialectic of Hope,” *Utopian Studies* 9, no.2 (1998): 18

Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble* and *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

Judith Butler, *Giving An Account Of Oneself* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2005).

Dwight Conquergood, “Poetics, Play, Process and Power: The Performative Turn in Anthropology,” *Text and Performance Quarterly* 9, no.1 (1989): 83.

Jim Cummins, *Negotiating Identities: Education for Empowerment in a Diverse Society* (Los Angeles, CA: California Association of Bilingual Education, 2001).

Jim Cummins, *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire* (United States and Great Britain: Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2000).

Linda Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education: How America's Commitment to Equity Will Determine Our Future* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2010).

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press, 1987).

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (London and New York: Penguin Books, 2009).

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).

Lisa Delpit, *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflicts in the Classrooms* (New York: The New Press, 1995).

John Dewey, "Quest for Certainty," in *The Later Works of John Dewey, Volume 4, 1925 - 1953: 1929: The Quest for Certainty*, eds. Jo Ann Boydston and Stephen E. Toulmin (Illinois, Southern Illinois University Press, 2008).

John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (Athens: Swallow Press/ Ohio University Press, 1954).

Rosalyn Diprose, *Corporeal Generosity: On Giving with Nietzsche, Merleau-Ponty, and Levinas*, (New York: SUNY, 2002).

Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

Susan H. Edgerton, *Translating the Curiculum: Multiculturalism into Cultural Studies* (New York: Routledge, 1996).

Alejandra Elenes, *Transforming Borders: Chicana/o Popular Culture and Pedagogy* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2011).

Elizabeth Ellsworth, "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy," *Harvard Educational Review* 59, no. 3 (1989): 321.

Elizabeth Ellsworth, *Teaching Positions: Difference Pedagogy, and the Power of Address* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1997).

Henry Etzkowitz and Loet Leydesdorff, *Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy* (London and Washington: Pinter, 1997).

Henry Etzkowitz, Andrew Webster, and Peter Healey, *Capitalizing Knowledge* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1998).

Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1967).

Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1977).

Michel Foucault, “Questions on Geography,” in *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography*, eds. Jeremy W. Crampton and Stuart Elden (UK & USA: Ashgate Publishing, 2007).

Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College De France 1977-1978* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).

Michel Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, *Vol.1* (New York: Vintage Books, 1990).

Michel Foucault, “Critical Theory/Intellectual Theory,” in *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977–1984*, ed. L. Kritzman (London: Routledge, 1988).

Michel Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended, Lectures at the College De France 975-1976* (New York: Picador, 2003).

Michel Foucault, “Governmentality,” in *Power: Essential Works of Michel Foucault, 1954-1984: Volume Three*, ed. James D. Faubion (New York: New Press, 2000).

Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (London: Penguin, 1991).

Michel Foucault, *The Essential Works of Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, ed. James D. Faubion (New York City: The New York Press, 1998).

Michel Foucault, “The Confession of the Flesh,” in *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980).

Michel Foucault, “The Political Technologies of Individuals,” in *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar With Michel Foucault*, eds. Luther H. Martin, Huck Gutman and Patrick H. Hutton (Great Britain, Tavistock, 1988).

Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979* (NewYork: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Michel Foucault, "The Subject and Power," in: *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and Hermeneutics*, eds. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983).

Michel Foucault, "What Our Present is?," in *Foucault Live: Collected Interviews, 1961–1984*, ed. Sylvere Lotringer trans. Lysa Hochroth and John Johnston (New York: Semiotext(e), 1996).

Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th Anniversary edition (New York: Continuum, 2000).

Suzi Gablik, *Connective Aesthetics: Art after Individualism in Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*, ed. Suzanne Lacy, (Seattle: Bay Press, 1995).

Eva Marie Garroutte, *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003).

Geneva Gay, *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd edition (New York: Teachers College Press, 2010).

Geneva Gay, "Teaching To and Through Cultural Diversity," *Curriculum Inquiry* 43, no.1 (2013): 54.

Henry A. Giroux, *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

Henry A. Giroux, *Education and Cultural Studies: Toward a Performative Practice* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

Henry Giroux, "White Noise: Toward a Pedagogy of Whiteness," in *Race-ing Representation: Voice, History and Sexuality,* eds. Kostas and Linda Myrsiades (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998).

Henry Giroux, "Neoliberalism, Youth, and the Leasing of Higher Education," in *Global Neoliberalism and Education and its Consequences,* eds. Dave Hill and Ravi Kumar (New York and London: Routledge, 2009).

Guillermo Gomez-Pena and Roberto Sifuentes, *Exercise for Rebel Artists: Radical Performance Pedagogy* (London and New York: Routledge, 2011).

Guillermo Gomez-Pena, *The New World Border: Prophecies, Poems, and Loqueras for the End of the Century* (City Lights Publishers 2001).

Guillermo Gomez-Pena, *Warrior For Gringostroika* (Canada: Graywolf Press, 1993).

Norma Gonzalez, “The Hybridity of Funds of Knowledge” in *Funds of Knowledge: Theorizing Practices in Households, Communities and Classrooms,* eds. Norma Gonzalez, Louis C. Moll (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005).

Norma Gonzalez and Luis C. Moll, “Cruzando el Puente: Building Bridges to Funds of Knowledge,” *Educational Policy* 16, no.4 (2002).

Carl A. Grant and Christine E. Sleeter, *Doing Multicultural Education for Achievement and Equity* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

Carl A. Grant, “Cultivating Flourishing Lives: A Robust Social Justice Vision of Education,” *American Educational Research Journal* 49, no. 5 (2012): 911.

Felix Guatarri, *Soft Subversions: Texts and Interviews 1977-1985* (Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2009).

Kris D. Gutiérrez, “Developing a Sociocritical Literacy in the Third Space,” *Reading Research Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (2008): 148–164.

Judith Halberstam, *The Queer Art of Failure* (Durham and London: Duke University Press Books, 2011).

Charles R. Hale, “Neoliberal Multiculturalism: The Remaking of Cultural Rights and Racial Dominance in Central America,” *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28, no. 1 (2005): 10-28.

Jori N. Hall and Laurence Parker, “Rethinking No Child Left Behind Using Critical Race Theory,” in *Facing Accountability in Education: Democracy and Equity at Risk,* ed. Christine E. Sleeter (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).

Stuart Hall, “Who Needs Identity,” in *Identity: A Reader,* eds. Paul du Gay, Jessica Evans and Peter Redman (London: Sage Publications Inc., 2000).

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire*. (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2004).

Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (New York: Flathman, R.E. and Johnston, D., W.W. Norton & Company, 1997).

Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno, *The Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments* (CA: Stanford University Press, 2002).

David Hursh, "Assessing No Child Left Behind and the Rise of Neoliberal Education Policies," *American Educational Research Journal* 44, no.3 (2007): 493-518.

Ivan Illich, *Toward a History of Needs* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).

Fredric Jameson "Generic Discontinuities in SF: Brian Aldiss' Star ship," *Science-Fiction Studies* 2 (1973): 57-68.

Gloria Ladson-Billings, *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African American Children* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994).

Gloria Ladson-Billings, "But That's Just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy," *Theory into Practice* 34, no. 3 (Summer 1995).

Gloria Ladson-Billings, "Fighting for Our Lives: Preparing Teachers to Teach Africa American Students," *Journal of Teacher Education* 51, (2000): 206.

Thomas Lemke, "The Birth of Bio-politics': Michel Foucault's Lecture at the College de France on Neo-liberal Governmentality," *Economy and Society* 30, no.2 (2001): 203.

Pauline Lipman, "Neoliberal Educational Restructuring: Dangers and Opportunities of the Present Crises," *Monthly Review* 66, no. 03 (2011).

Don Livingston, "Wondering About a Future Generation: Identity Disposition Disposal, Recycling and Recreating in the 21st Century," in *Expanding Curriculum Theory: Dis/positions and Lines of Flight*, eds. William M. Reynold, and Julie A. Webber (New Jersey and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2004).

John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* (Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1980).

James Loxley, *Performativity* (London & New York: Routledge, 2007).

Thomas B. Macaulay, "Minute on Indian Education." *History of English Studies Page*. University of California, Santa Barbara. Accessed on April 3, 2012. http://www.english.ucsb.edu/faculty/rraley/research/english/macaulay.html

Peta Malins, "Machinic Assemblages: Deleuze, Guattari and an Ethico-Aesthetics of Drug Use," Janus Head 7, no.1 (2004): 84-104.

Karl Marx, *Capital vol. 1*, trans. Ben Fowkes (New York: Penguin Books, 1976).

Jodi Melamed, "The Spirit of Neoliberalism: From Racial Liberalism to Multicultural Neoliberalism," *Social Text* 24, no. 4, (Winter 2006): 16.

Katharyne Mitchell, "Educating the National Citizen in Neoliberal Times: From the Multicultural Self to the Strategic Cosmopolitan," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28, no.4 (2003): 387-403.

Connie Monson and Jacqueline Rhodes, "Risking Queer: Pedagogy, Performativity, and Desire in Writing Classrooms," *jac: Journal of Rhetoric, Culture and Politics* 24, no. 1 (2004): 85.

Luis C. Moll, "Bilingual Classroom Studies and Community Analysis: Some Recent Trends," *Educational Researcher* 21, no.2 (1992): 23.

Jose Esteban Munoz, *Cruising Utopia: The Then and There of Queer Futurity* (New York: New York University Press, 2009).

Antonio Negri, *Art and Multitude* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2011).

Sonia Nieto, "Public Education in the Twentieth Century and Beyond: High Hopes, Broken Promises, and an Uncertain Future," *Harvard Educational Review* 75, no.1 (Spring 2005).

Sonia Nieto and Patty Bode, *Affirming Diversity*: *The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education* (New York: Allyn & Bacon, 2008).

Sonia Nieto, Language, Diversity, and Learning: Lessons for Education in the 21st Century, (CALdigest, 2010), Accessed on January 5, 2013. http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/language-diversity-and-learning.pdf

Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1974).

Mark Olssen, "Understanding the Mechanisms of Neoliberal Control: Lifelong Learning, Flexibility and Knowledge Capitalism," *Int. J. of Lifelong Learning* 25, no.3 (2006): 223.

Leslie Patterson and Shelia Baldwin, "A Different Spin on Parent Involvement: Exploring Funds of Knowledge Within a Systems Perspective," in *Living and Teaching in an Unjust World: New Perspectives on Multicultural Education,* ed. Wendy Goodman (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2001).

Ronald J. Pelias, and James VanOosting, J. “A Paradigm for Performance Studies,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 37, no.2 (1987): 221.

Michael A. Peters and Tina Besley, *Building Knowledge Cultures: Education and Development in the Age of Knowledge Capitalism* (Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006).

Elyse Lamm Pineau, “Teaching is Performance: Reconceptualizing a Problematic Metaphor,” *American Educational Research Journal* 31 (1994): 10.

Ludwig A. Pongratz, “Voluntary Self-Control: Education Reform as a Governmental Strategy,” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 38, no.4 (2006): 471-482.

Nancy Grey Postero, *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006).

Jacques Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation* (California: Stanford University Press, 1991).

Jacques Rancière, *Dis-agreement: Politics and Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

Jacques Rancière, *The Emancipated Spectator* (London: Verso, 2011).

Jacques Ranciere, *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013).

Maria de la Luz Reyes, “Chicanas in Academe: An Endangered Species,” in *Radical In<ter>ventions: Identity, Politics, and Differences in Educational Praxis*, eds. Suzanne de Castell and Mary Bryson (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997).

Troy A. Richardson, “Interrogating the Trope of the Door in Multicultural Education: Framing Diplomatic Relations to Indigenous Political and Legal Difference,” *Educational Theory* 61, no.3 (2011): 300-304.

Troy A. Richardson, “Indigenous Political Difference, Colonial Perspectives and the Challenge of Diplomatic Relations: Toward a Decolonial Diplomacy in Multicultural Educational Theory,” *Educational Studies: Journal of the American Educational Studies Association* 48, no.5 (2012): 467.

Nikolas Rose, *The Politics of Life Itself: Biomedicine, Power, ad Subjectivity in the Twenty-First Century* (Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007).

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Social Contract* (London: Penguin Books, 1968).

Boaventura de Sauza Santos, “The University in the 21st Century: Toward a Democratic and Emancipatory University Reform,” in *The University, State and Market, The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas*, eds. Robert A. Rhoads and Carlos Alberto Torres (California: Stanford University Press, 2006).

Edward L. Schieffelin, “Problematizing Performance,” in *Ritual, Performance, Media* ed. Felicia Hughes (NY: Routledge, 1998).

Gregory G. Sholette, “Counting on Your Collective Silence: Notes on Activist Art as Collaborative Practice,” *Afterimage: The Journal of Media and Cultural Criticism* (November, 1999): 18-21.

Maarten Simons and Jan Masschelein, “The Learning Society and Governmentality: An Introduction,” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 38, no. 4 (2006): 423.

Maarten Simons, “Learning as Investment: Notes on Governmentality and Biopolitics,” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 38, no. 4 (2006): 537.

Christine E. Sleeter and Carl Grant, “An Analysis of Multicultural Research in the United States,” *Harvard Educational Review* 57, no.4 (1987): 421–445.

Christine E. Sleeter, “Multicultural Education as a Social Movement,” *Theory into Practice* 35, no. 4 (Autumn, 1996): 243.

Christine Sleeter, *Un-standardizing Curriculum: Multicultural Teaching in the Standards-based Classroom* (New York Teachers College Press, 2005).

Christine E. Sleeter, *Facing Accountability in Education: Democracy and Equity at Risk* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).

Christine E. Sleeter, “Confronting the Marginalization of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy,” *Urban Education* 47, no.3 (2012): 562.

Darko Suvin, “Locus, Horizon, and Orientation: The Concept of Possible Worlds as Key to Utopian Studies” in *Not Yet: Reconsidering Ernst Bloch*, eds. Jamie Owen Daniel and Tom Moylan (London: Verso).

Hilda Taba, *Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World, 1962).

Beverly Daniel Tatum, “Teaching White Students about Racism: The Search for White Allies and the Restoration of Hope,” *Teachers College Record* 95, no. 4 (1994): 472.

Beverly Daniel Tatum, *“Why are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?” And Other Conversations About Race* (New York: Basic Books, 2003).

Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham & London: Duke University Press Books, 2003).

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (Portsmith: Heinemann, 1981).

Sharon Todd, *Learning From the Other: Levinas, Psychoanalysis, and Ethical Possibilities in Education* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003).

Stephen E. Toulmin, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

Petra Valentova and tART, "Collectivity: Art-making in a Collective," *Zine* 4 (2012).

John Willinsky, *Learning to Divide the World* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).

Michael Yellow Bird, "What We Want to Be Called: Indigenous Peoples' Perspectives on Racial and Ethnic Identity Labels," *American Indian Quarterly* 23, no.2 (1999): 1.

Michael Yellow Bird, "Indian, American Indians, and Native Americans: Counterfeit Identities," *Winds of Change: A Magazine for American Indian Education and Opportunity* 14 (Winter, 1999).

Iris Marion Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990).

Iris Marion Young, *Inclusion and Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 50.

Slavoj Žižek , "Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism," *New Left Review* I/225 (September-October 1997): 44.

Émile Zola, *The Masterpiece*, trans. Ernest A. Vizetelli, (Digireads.com Publishing, 2010).

Online Resources

Imagine Dragons, Demons, http://www.azlyrics.com/lyrics/imaginedragons/demons.html. Accessed on Dec. 11, 2013.

U.S. Department of State Archive, National Security Council, *The National Security*

Strategy of the United States of America (2002), (accessed on November 20, 2013) http://2001-2009.state.gov/r/pa/ei/wh/15428.htm

U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee, *STEM Education: Preparing for the Jobs of the Future*, Accessed on February 25, 2013. http://www.jec.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?a=Files.Serve&File_id=6aaa7e1f-9586-47be-82e7-326f47658320

U.S. Department of Education, *Race to the Top Fund*, Accessed January 3, 2013. http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html

National Academies, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm: Energizing and Employing America for a Brighter Economic Future* (Washington, DC, National Academies Press, 2007). http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=1

NOTES

[1] Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 187.

[2] Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine, “Foucaultian Discourse Analysis,” 91.

[3] Foucault, “The Subject and Power,”217.

[4] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 66.

[5] See Horkheimer and Adorno, *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*.

[6] See Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus.*

[7] See Dewey, “Quest for Certainty.”

[8] Toulmin, *Cosmopolis*, 55.

[9] Foucault, “Questions on Geography,” 176.

[10] Foucault, “Questions on Geography,” 182.

[11] Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 96.

[12] Tatum, *"Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?,"* 13.

[13] Ellsworth, “Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy,” 309.

[14] Edgerton, *Translating the Curriculum*, 48.

[15] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 3.

[16] Foucault, *Power/Knowledge, 98.*

[17] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 8

[18] Banks, *Cultural Diversity and Education*, 27.

[19] Banks, Cultural Diversity and Education, 147.

[20] Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, 233.

[21] Young, *Inclusion and Democracy*, 50.

[22] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 57.

[23] Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, 74.

[24] Beltrán, *Trouble with Unity*, 4, 115.

[25] Beltrán, *Trouble with Unity*, 56.

[26] Foucault, *Power/Knowledge, 98.*

[27] Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, 98.

[28] Foucault, "Critical Theory/Intellectual Theory," 38.

[29] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 51.

[30] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 51.

[31] Foucault, *History of Sexuality, 8.*

[32] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 33.

[33] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus,* 368.

[34] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 44.

[35] Sleeter and Grant, "An Analysis of Multicultural Research in the United States," 421–445.

[36] Ranciere, *Dissensus*, 69.

[37] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 26. Also see, Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 36.

[38] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 26.

[39] Lipman, "Neoliberal Educational Restructuring: Dangers and Opportunities of the Present Crises," 4.

[40] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity,* 31. Also see Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education,* 25. As well as Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society,* 33.

[41] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*.

[42] Simons, "Learning as Investment,"537 and also see Olssen, "Understanding the Mechanisms of Neoliberal Control," 223.

[43] Giroux, "Neoliberalism, Youth, and the Leasing of Higher Education." Also see Pongratz, L. "Voluntary Self-Control: Education reform as a governmental strategy," 471-482.

[44] Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended*, 243.

[45] Foucault, *Society Must be Defended*, 335.

[46] Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 226.

[47] Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 139.

[48] Foucault, "Governmentality," 209.

[49] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 19.

[50] Gonzalez and Moll, "Cruzando el Puente: Building Bridges to Funds of Knowledge," 623-641.

[51] Todd, *Learning From the Other*, 38.

[52] Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*, 6.

[53] Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, 98.

[54] Biesta, *Beyond Learning*, 28.

[55] Todd, *Learning From the Other*,16.

[56] Butler, *Gender Trouble* and *Bodies That Matter*, 241.

[57] Gutiérrez, “Developing a Sociocritical Literacy in the Third Space,” 148–164.

[58] Bryson and Castell "Queer Pedagogy?!: Praxis Makes Im/Perfect,” 285.

[59] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 219.

[60] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 7.

[61] Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire*, 53-65.

[62] Loxley, *Performativity*, 137.

[63] Loxley, Performativity, 86.

[64] Giroux, “White Noise: Toward a Pedagogy of Whiteness,” 71.

[65] Giroux, “White Noise,”43-44 and 66.

Chapter 2

[1] Hobbes, *Leviathan*, 9.

[2] Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, 51.

[3] Rousseau, *Social Contract*, 61.

[4] Reyes, “Chicanas in Academe: An Endangered Species,” 20.

[5] Ladson-Billings, “Fighting for Our Lives: Preparing Teachers to Teach Africa American Students,” 206.

[6] Tatum, “Teaching White Students about Racism,” 26.

[7] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 95.

[8] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 57.

[9] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 33.

[10] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 64.

[11] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 66.

[12] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 51.

[13] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 64.

[14] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 106.

[15] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 46.

[16] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 26.

[17] Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems*.

[18] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 50.

[19] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 56.

[20] Banks, "The Historical Reconstruction of Knowledge About Race," 15-25.

[21] Sleeter, "Multicultural Education as a Social Movement," 239-247.

[22] Tatum, *"Why are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria*?," 23.

[23] Tatum, "*Why are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria*?," 21.

[24] Tatum, "Teaching White Students about Racism," 472.

[25] Monson and Rhodes, "Risking Queer," 85.

[26] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 194.

[27] Sleeter, "Multicultural Education as a Social Movement," 243.

[28] Beltrán, *Trouble with Unity*.

[29] Delpit, *Other People's Children*, 183.

[30] Biesta, *Beyond Learning*, 7.

[31] Todd, *Learning From the Other*, 9.

[32] Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, 98.

[33] Banks, *Diversity and Citizenship Education*, 29.

[34] Foucault, “Governmentality,” 191.

[35] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 98.

[36] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society,* 157.

[37] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 11.

[38] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 11.

[39] Richardson, “Interrogating the Trope of the Door in Multicultural Education,” 300-304.

[40] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 53-54.

[41] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 59.

[42] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 21.

[43] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 22.

[44] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 11.

[45] Banks borrows this term from a highly popular text for MCE scholars written by Ramirez Manual and Alfredo Castaneda, *Cultural Democracy: Bicognitive Development, and Education* (New York: Academic, 1974).

[46] Sleeter and Grant, “An Analysis of Multicultural Research in the United States,” 421–445.

[47] Gay, *Culturally Responsive Teaching*, 10.

[48] Ladson-Billings, “But That's Just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy,” 160.

[49] Ladson-Billings, *The Dreamkeepers*, 87.

[50] Gonzalez, “The Hybridity of Funds of Knowledge,” 40.

[51] Rancière, *Dis-agreement*, 137.

[52] Ladson-Billings, *The Dreamkeepers*, 25.

[53] Anzaldua, *Borderlands, La Frontera, 36.*

[54] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 188-189.

[55] Anzaldua, *Borderlands, La Frontera,*102.

[56] Nieto, *Affirming Diversity,* 188-189.

[57] Gay, “Teaching To and Through Cultural Diversity,” 54.

Chapter 3

[1] Marx, *Capital*, 227.

[2] Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, *Universities and the Global Knowledge Economy*, 143.

[3] Hardt and Negri, *Multitude*, 210-270.

[4] Peters and Besley, *Building Knowledge Cultures*, 156.

[5] Olssen, “Understanding the Mechanisms of Neoliberal Control,” 223.

[6] Santos, “The University in the 21st Century,” 68.

[7] Apple, “Globalizing Education: Perspectives From Below and Above,” 21.

[8] National Academies, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm.*

[9] Hursh, “Assessing No Child Left Behind and the Rise of Neoliberal Education Policies,” 493-518.

[10] U.S. Department of Education, *Race to the Top Fund*.

[11] Etzkowitz, Webster, and Healey, *Capitalizing Knowledge*, 46.

[12] U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee, *STEM Education.*

[13] Sleeter, *Facing Accountability in Education,* 75.

[14] Sleeter, “Confronting the Marginalization of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy,” 562.

[15] Hall and Parker, “Rethinking No Child Left Behind Using Critical Race Theory,” 136.

[16] Lipman, “Neoliberal Educational Restructuring,” 4.

[17] Lipman, “Neoliberal Educational Restructuring,”6.

[18] Grant, “Cultivating Flourishing Lives,” 911.

[19] Grant, “Cultivating Flourishing Lives,” 915.

[20] Sleeter, *Facing Accountability in Education,* 21.

[21] Grant, “Cultivating Flourishing Lives,” 912.

[22] U.S. Department of State Archive, National Security Council, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America.*

[23] Melamed, “The Spirit of Neoliberalism,” 16.

[24] Hale, “Neoliberal Multiculturalism,” 10-28.

[25] Mitchell**, “**Educating the National Citizen in Neoliberal Times,” 387-403.

[26] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 12.

[27] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education,* xi.

[28] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 19.

[29] Banks, “Series Forward” in: Linda Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education,* ix.

[30] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity,* 10.

[31] Nieto, “Language, Diversity, and Learning: Lessons for Education in the 21st Century,”6.

[32] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 2.

[33] Nieto, “Public Education in the Twentieth Century and Beyond,” 8.

[34] Foucault, “The Confession of the Flesh,” 194–228.

[35] Žižek , “Multiculturalism, Or, the Cultural Logic of Multinational Capitalism,” 44.

[36] Banks, "Teaching for Social Justice, Diversity, and Citizenship in a Global World," 295.

[37] Richardson, "Indigenous Political Difference, Colonial Perspectives and the Challenge of Diplomatic Relations," 467.

[38] Garroutte, *Real Indians*, 69.

[39] Yellow Bird, "What We Want to Be Called," 1.

[40] Yellow Bird, "Indian, American Indians, and Native Americans," 86.

[41] Gomez Pena, *Warrior For Gringostroika, 38*.

[42] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 183.

[43] Willinsky, *Learning to Divide the World*, 254.

[44] Macaulay, "Minute on Indian Education," 10.

[45] Thiong'o *Decolonising the Mind*, 12.

[46] Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, 84.

[47] Illich, *Toward a History of Needs*, 51.

[48] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 8.

[49] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 16.

[50] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 26.

[51] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 5.

[52] Simons, "Learning as Investment," 537.

[53] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 186.

[54] Foucault, "The Political Technologies of Individuals," 153.

[55] Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 271.

[56] Foucault, "About the Beginning of the Hermeneutics of the Self," 203.

[57] Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 139.

[58] Simons and Masschelein, “The Learning Society and Governmentality,” 423.

[59] Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*, 2.

[60] Nieto, *Affirming Diversity*, 60.

[61] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 282.

[62] Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 14-26.

[63] Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” 212.

[64] Sleeter, *Un-standardizing Curriculum*, 7.

[65] Rose, *The Politics of Life Itself*, 154.

[66] Olssen, “Understanding the Mechanisms of Neoliberal Control,” 224.

[67] Foucault, “What Our Present is,”411.

[68] Cummins, *Language, Power and Pedagogy*, 10-11.

[69] Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” 220-221.

[70] Postero, *Now We Are Citizens*, 225.

[71] Gonzalez, “The Hybridity of Funds of Knowledge,” 40.

[72] Rancière, *Dis-agreement*, 137.

[73] Grant and Sleeter, *Doing Multicultural Education for Achievement and Equity*, 14.

[74] Cummins, *Negotiating Identities*, 123.

[75] Moll, “Bilingual Classroom Studies and Community Analysis,” 23.

[76] Patterson and Baldwin, “A Different Spin on Parent Involvement,” 127.

Chapter 4

[1] Banks, *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society*, 12. Also see: Darling-Hammond, *The Flat World and Education*, 16. Also see Nieto, "Public Education in the Twentieth Century and Beyond," 8.

[2] Mitchell, "Educating the National Citizen in Neoliberal Times," 387-403.

[3] Richardson, "Indigenous Political Difference, Colonial Perspectives and the Challenge of Diplomatic Relations," 467.

[4] Simons, "Learning as Investment," 537.

[5] Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster,* 6.

[6] Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 66.

[7] Banks, *Cultural Diversity and Education*, 50.

[8] Bell, "Fail again. Fail better," 64.

[9] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus,* 255.

[10] Suvin, "Locus, Horizon, and Orientation," 134.

[11] Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 1.

[12] See Bloch, *The Principle of Hope*, in Ben Anderson "Transcending Without Transcendence: Utopianism and an Ethos of Hope," Antipode 38 no.4 (2006): 697.

[13] Buchanan, "Metacommentary on Utopia, or Jameson's Dialectic of Hope," 18.

[14] Jameson "Generic Discontinuities in SF," 57.

[15] Buchanan, "Metacommentary on Utopia, or Jameson's Dialectic of Hope," 21.

[16] Munoz, *Cruising Utopia*, 176.

[17] Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?*, 100.

[18] Buchanan, "Metacommentary on Utopia, or Jameson's Dialectic of Hope," 28.

[19] Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 219.

[20] Giroux, *Border Crossings*, 28.

[21] Bhabha, The Location of Culture, 7.

[22] Bhabha, The Location of Culture, 219.

[23] Giroux, *Education and Cultural Studies*, 2.

[24] Elenes, *Transforming Borders*.

[25] Elenes, *Transforming Borders*, 175.

[26] Giroux, *Border Crossings*, 33.

[27] Bhabha, The Location of Culture, 112.

[28] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 315.

[29] Nieto and Bode, *Affirming Diversity*, 51.

[30] Gay, “Teaching To and Through Cultural Diversity,” 54.

[31] Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, 96.

[32] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 94.

[33] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 94.

[34] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 95.

[35] Gay, “Teaching To and Through Cultural Diversity,” 54.

[36] Biesta, “Learner, Student, Speaker,” 549.

[37] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 100-101.

[38] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 100.

[39] Grant and Sleeter, *Doing Multicultural Education for Achievement and Equity*, 55.

[40] Ranciere, *Dissensus*, 53.

[41] Ladson-Billings, “Fighting for Our Lives,” 206.

[42] Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire,* 53-65.

[43] Barthes, *Mythologies*, 86.

[44] Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 44-78.

[45] Biesta, “Learner, Student, Speaker,” 540-552.

[46] Munoz, *Cruising Utopia*, 22.

[47] Pelias, and VanOosting, “A Paradigm for Performance Studies,” 221.

[48] Gomez Pena, *Warrior For Gringostroika*, 38-39.

[49] Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, 120.

[50] Guatarri, *Soft Subversions*, 79, 206.

[51] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus,* 155.

[52] Taba, “Curriculum Development,” 33.

[53] Munoz, *Cruising Utopia*, 176.

[54] Halberstam, *The Queer Art of Failure*, 88.

[55] Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 100.

[56] Imagine Dragons, *Demons*.

[57] Halberstam, *The Queer Art of Failure, 3.*

[58] Gert Biesta, “The Ignorant Citizen,” 42.

[60] Halberstam, *The Queer Art of Failure, 2.*

[61] Rancière, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*, 65.

[62] Rancière, *The Emancipated Spectator*, 22.

[63] Gomez-Pena, *The New World Border*, 71.

[64] Barthes, *The Rustle of Language*, 340.

[65] Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 89.

[66] Hardt and Negri, *Multitude*, 351.

[67] Diprose, *Corporeal Generosity*, 4.

[68] Ranciere, *The Emancipated Spectator, 22.*

[69] Butler, *Giving and Account of Oneself*, 7.

[70] Gablik, *Connective Aesthetics*, 84.

[71] Ellsworth, “Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering?,” 321.

[72] Ellsworth, *Teaching Positions*, 125.

[73] Ellsworth, *Teaching Positions*, 135.

[74] Hall, “Who Needs Identity,” 16.

[75] Livingston, “Wondering About a Future Generation,” 43.

[76] Giroux, “White Noise,” 71.

[77] Giroux, “White Noise,” 43-44 and 66.

[78] Ellsworth, “Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering?,” 309.

[79] Sholette, “Counting on Your Collective Silence,” 18-21.

[80] Gonzalez and Moll, “Cruzando el Puente,” 629.

[81] Valentova and tART, “Collectivity,” 11.

[82] Ranciere, *The Emancipated Spectator*, 4.

[83] Pelias, and VanOosting, “A Paradigm for Performance Studies,” 221.

[84] Gablik, *Connective Aesthetics*, 84.

[85] Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy*, 176.

[86] Negri, *Art and Multitude*, 51.

[87] Conquergood, “Poetics, Play, Process and Power,” 83.

[88] Gomez Pena and Sifuentes, *Exercise for Rebel Artists*, 119.

[89] Barrell, “Classroom Artistry,” 338.

[90] Pineau, “Teaching is Performance,” 10.

[91] Boal, *Theatre of the Oppressed*, 102.

[92] Pineau, “Teaching is Performance,” 21.

[93] Gonzalez and Moll, “Cruzando el Puente,” 627.

[94] Ranciere, *The Ignorant Schoolmaster*, 65.

[95] Gonzalez and Moll, “Cruzando el Puente,” 625.

[96] Gonzalez and Moll, “Cruzando el Puente,” 629.

[97] Gonzalez, “The Hybridity of Funds of Knowledge,” 37.

[98] Deleuze and Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus*, 42.

[99] Butler, *Gender Trouble* and *Bodies That Matter*, 241.

[100] Valentova and tART, “Collectivity.”

[101] Bryson and Castell. "Queer Pedagogy?!," 285.

[102] Hardt and Negri, *Empire*, 61.

Chapter 5

[1] Malins, “Machinic Assemblages,” 84-104.

[2] Ranciere, *Dissensus*, 69.

[3] Schieffelin, “Problematizing Performance,” 195.

[4] Beltrán, *Trouble with Unity*, 168.

[5] Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks,* 229.

[6] Biesta, *Beyond Learning*, 7.

[7] Todd, *Learning From the Other,* 30.

[8] Guatarri, *Soft Subversions*, 206.

[9] Course and Instructor Feedback Report for: College of Education, Department of Education, Culture and Society, University of Utah, for Summer 2010.

[10] Schieffelin, “Problematizing Performance,” 205.

[11] Deleuze and Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?*, 5.

[12] Deleuze and Guattari, *What is Philosophy?*, 6.