

publications are in the areas of disability studies, multicultural education, feminism, and sociology of education. She has published articles in several journals such as *Educational Theory*, *Studies in Education and Philosophy*, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *Disability & Society*, and the *Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies*, among others. Her book, *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Towards a Transformative Body Politic* will be published in 2012 (Palgrave MacMillan).

## REFERENCES

- Brinkley, D. (2006). *The great deluge: Hurricane Katrina, New Orleans, and the Mississippi Gulf Coast*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Giroux, H. A. (2006). Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, class, and the biopolitics of disposability. *College Literature*, 33, 171–196.
- McRuer, R. (2006). *Crip theory: Cultural signs of queerness and disability*. New York: New York University Press.
- Spillers, H. J. (1987). Mama's baby, papa's maybe: An American grammar book. *Diacritics*, 17(2), 65–81.

## Rematriating Curriculum Studies

EVE TUCK

*State University of New York at New Paltz, New Paltz, New York, USA*

In this article, I discuss potential roles for curriculum studies in upending settler colonialism, which I locate as the anchor system that permits heteropatriarchal White supremacy. As a whole, I want to attend to possibilities for anticolonial curriculum within what I call a “methodology of repatriation.” Dale Turner and Audra Simpson (2008) wrote:

For Indigenous people colonialism is *not* an historical period that is now over; it continues to define the relationship between our people and the European newcomers. In this respect, Indigenous peoples live with the practical, and philosophical, effects of colonialism in the *present*. (p. 8, emphasis original)

As Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes, within *settler* colonialism “the determinate articulation [between colonizer and native] is not to a society but directly to the land. . . . Settler colonies are premised on the elimination of native societies. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is a structure not an

event" (p. 2). Settler colonies require the displacement of Indigenous peoples from homelands. Wolfe goes on to define settler-colonial discourse—and I think this is especially pertinent in discussions of curriculum studies—and questions of who speaks as going far beyond liberal concerns with equity or access. "Indeed, claims of authority over Indigenous discourse . . . continue the usurpation of Indigenous space (invasion is a structure and not an event)" (p. 3, parentheses original).

Recently I have been working to describe what it might mean for tribal communities and urban communities (a) to repatriate the aims of research/curriculum and (b) to use research/curriculum to repatriate knowledge and theories that have been used against us and our interests. The word repatriate comes from the Latin word, *repatriare*, which means restoring homeland, or going home again. In Indigenous contexts, repatriation often refers to the returning of the human remains of our relations, but it also regularly refers to the reclaiming of sovereignty, land, subsistence rights, cultural knowledge and artifacts, theories, epistemologies and axiologies.

In 2010, in an American Educational Research Association session on repatriating curriculum studies, curriculum scholar Heather Sykes pushed back against the term *repatriation* for reifying heteropatriarchal dominance. I appreciated this critique, and went to the Indigenous literature on repatriation to see how Indigenous scholars were and were not taking up this issue. I saw in some of Devon Mihesuah's (2000) work that some Indigenous activists have taken up the language of rematriation, especially those from matrilineal societies and in reference to returning human remains and funerary objects to the earth. I invoke the language of rematriation in the title of this essay expressly because of the discussion of attending to the significance of land in curriculum studies in the latter part of this article. However, in my other theorizing I persist in my use of the word repatriation in some ways because it is imperfect. There are words in other languages that may be more fitting; the inadequacy of the word repatriation points more to the inadequacy of the English language to describe and facilitate decolonization. We get blisters from using inadequate tools, but blisters can be drained and the work can still be completed.

For several decades, the great divide in the social sciences was along the fault line of quantitative vs. qualitative research—now, in this post-post positivist, almost-post-evidence, post-voice moment, the divide appears to me to be this: do you do research on people, or with people? A corollary question is "Do you do curriculum studies on people or with people?" A curriculum of repatriation or rematriation is an approach for participatory decolonizing educators and scholars—people who choose to consider curriculum in community, not on communities, and in ways that are anticolonial, not imperialistic. When curriculum studies are rematriated, alternative aims of curriculum in communities begin to surface:



The first is a remembrance of the true purpose of knowledge in/for our communities.

The second is to uncover the quiet thoughts and beliefs of a community.

The third is to map the variety of ideas in a community.

The fourth is to confirm that "indigenous traditions are the repository of vast experience and deep insight on achieving balance and harmony" (Alfred, 1999, p. 21).

The fifth is to make generational knowledge of elders, youth, parents, warriors, hunters, leaders, gardeners, fishers, teachers, and others available to other generations.

The sixth is to make use of home languages to express ideas, and to bring new language to new and recovered ideas.

The seventh is to honor all of our relations by engaging in the flow of knowledge in community.

The eighth is to reflect the cosmologies of our communities. This means that the chain of value of curriculum studies is shaped by a community's understanding of the relationships between human knowledge and/within the cosmos. It means that curriculum inquiry projects are crafted to have multiple points of entry, and multiple meanings to be drawn. It means that there is continuity between curriculum and community life that moves in recursive ways to further inquiry and further applications of meaning.

The ninth is to engage place and land in ways that dramatically differ from more commonly held constructions of place and space. In much of curriculum studies, place is usually slated as significant in three primary ways: as space, as text, and as *context*. A curriculum of repatriation would seek to deepen considerations of place, beyond context or backdrop. The notion I raise here pushes back against the presumed fixity of place, especially when the fixity is balanced upon the preeminence and permanence of settler colonialism and the nation-state.

Curriculum studies that take up place critically recognize the deep history, present, and future of a place, and mark as relevant the economic, colonial, ecological, cultural, and global importance of places, boundaries, borders, and diasporic imaginaries. Indigenous scholars have long challenged Western frameworks that relegate *land* to *property*, legally and philosophically, because the concept of property is predicated on ownership (Chamberlin, 2000). Conceptualizations of place that rely on latent notions of property are tangled in the ideologies of settler colonialism, dependent upon constructions of land as extractable capital, the denial of indigenous sovereignty, the myth of discovery, and the naturalization of the nation-state.

A  
bution  
colon

Eve T  
on sc  
contro  
The In  
Review

Alfred,  
ou  
Chamb  
w  
(p  
Mihesu  
Li  
Turner  
fro  
Wolfe,  
po

Ra

Hope,  
concep  
people  
discou  
its mea  
is in p

A rematriation of curriculum studies is concerned with the redistribution of power, knowledge, and place, and the dismantling of settler colonialism.

### CONTRIBUTOR

**Eve Tuck** has conducted participatory action research with urban youth on school push-out, the value of the GED, and the impacts of mayoral control. Tuck's writings have appeared in the *Harvard Educational Review*, *The International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, and the *Urban Review*.

### REFERENCES

- Alfred, G. R. (2005). *Wasase: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom*. Peterborough, Ontario, Canada: Broadview Press.
- Chamberlin, J. E. (2000). From hand to mouth: The postcolonial politics of oral and written traditions. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 125–141). Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: UBC Press.
- Mihesuah, D. (2000). *Repatriation reader: Who owns American Indian remains?* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Turner, D., & Simpson, A. (2008). *Indigenous leadership in a flat world*. Retrieved from [http://www.fngovernance.org/research/turner\\_and\\_simpson.pdf](http://www.fngovernance.org/research/turner_and_simpson.pdf)
- Wolfe, P. (1999). *Settler colonialism and the transformation of anthropology: The politics and poetics of an ethnographic event*. New York, NY: Cassell.

## Race and the Project of Hope: Complications of Antiracist Curriculum

ZAHRA MURAD

*Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Ontario, Canada*

Hope, as a noun or a verb, is difficult to situate and define. While the concept of hope carries deep personal, spiritual, and emotional meaning for people, there remains an aspect of hope that is defined socially, through discourse and narrative. Situating *hope* as a term that gains at least some of its meaning through socially constructed narratives reveals how its meaning is in part determined through agendas of power. Hope, with its flexible,