DIONISIO NYAGA AND ROSE ANN TORRES

11. EDUCATION, NEOLIBERALISM AND HUMANIZING CURRICULUM

INTRODUCTION

> All schools operate in a marketplace; but the interaction with the marketplace may be particularly evident in the international schools sector, since many such schools are operated by foundations or private companies which charge fees. (Yamato & Bray, 2006, p. 57)

This chapter looks at schooling and human rights from the perspective of the market and industrial production. The onus to such a perspective and thought comes from the way schooling and learning are affected by profit rationalities, managerialism and corporatization (Blum & Ullman, 2012; Natale & Doran, 2012). Such rationalities stamp marketization and industrialization of the class in ways that subjugate and evict bodies that do not matter based on race, gender, sexuality and other social constructions (Dei, 1996). Such rationalities are authored, entrenched and authorized by the state and made to work within the policy framework and the curriculum. The eviction of students from learning centres is not a new phenomenon, as evidenced by the heavy securitization of schools (Nguyen, 2017).

Following constant school shootings in American schools, Trump's government has called for armed teachers as one way of securing the classroom from social evils. However, what is not visible and is more dangerous is the everyday eviction of students of colour from the classroom because they do not fit the Western rationalities. Their presence is a misnomer and represents those who cannot be improved. Since it is costly to process and make them human, they have to be expunged from the classroom. Such eviction is aided by the Western curriculum and sponsored by the state. Such are ways through which militarization (Chadderton, 2014; Foulds, 2013) helps market and industrial rationalities define who is human and subhuman. Marx's conception of labour and alienation is salient in the contemporary classroom, where the educator and the learner are objectified and constantly estranged from each other, and in the process of education. Such estrangement affects the classroom differently and is socially constructed. The question of estrangement is the basis from which the marginalized student and educator disappear, and capital is accumulated. We argue that the disappearance necessitates the accumulation of white power in what Foucault (2004) calls biopolitics/power.

This chapter submits that the classroom is an industrial complex and censors, punishes and violently evicts students differently based on market rationalities of efficiencies and effectiveness. It looks at the classroom, instruments and stakeholders and how they work together in complex ways to create and sustain the complex. The conversation provokes rationalism and seeks to argue for the accommodation of difference. The chapter looks at African systems as areas of interest in recognizing education in global systems as necessary in the de-securitization and demilitarization of education. This chapter claims that education in contemporary society is a marketplace (Ball et al., 1998; Yamato & Bray, 2006) where the highest bidder carries the day. Bidding in this sense is socially constructed and historical. Some bodies cannot bid and have to be sold as property of the capital. Educational tools, instruments and spaces are replicas of an industrial complex, where the highest bidder wins and the rest toil in selling their labour to the capital (Groff, Smith, & Edmond, 2010; Venables & Tan, 2012). This chapter claims that education is colonial (Dei, 2014; MacLellan, 2013; Masta, 2016; Meriwether, 1907; Neeganagwedgin, 2014) and normalizes labour precariousness, securitization and rationalization (Magnusson, 2013). A classroom is a recollection of colonizing narratives where the educator is the worker, and the students are the products to be sold in the marketplace (Nyaga, 2017).

The classroom as an industrial complex allows the educator to refine the product (read student) for sale in the market. To refine is to eliminate the student from the self and indoctrinate market rationalities in what is termed the professionalization of the object. Such a conception looks at the student as crude and dangerous to the safety of capital and by extension whiteness. To that end, students have to be saved from themselves, which ends in erasing the self from self; this erasure is alienating and disenfranchising. Prior knowledge of the student is of no consequence and never appreciated in the classroom. The expression of such knowledge is seen as dangerous and a security threat. The order is to militarize any presentation of such knowledge in the public space.

This erasure of knowledges by any measure is a question of human rights and citizenship. To be human comes with the question of rights. The argument to this conception is that the human has rights that are inalienable. Rights are connected to claims. Inalienability sustains and confers the sustainability of claiming humanness. Rights cannot be taken away since one is human; thus, they are conferred naturally. But how can the human claim rights when their right to exist is in question? How can the human exist when free thinking is constantly questioned and dismissed? In a nutshell, how can the industrial complex exist when the right to humanism is constantly censored and questioned? Could this be a question of biopower, that one must die for the other to exist? Marx's industrial complex and Foucault's biopolitics and governmentality could shed light on this epistemological conundrum. The expelling and subsequent spatial erasure of the learner and the educator are key to maintaining the capital. Such an eviction is violent but also psychic and physical; the student is made to ingest whiteness and capital rationalities and dismissed for failing to follow the capital code of the curriculum.

Aristotle claims that to exist is to think and apply cognition toward self-preservation. We are because we are cognitive beings. To cease to think means to lose human rights. From this conception, rights are a product of cognitive power. History has provided the conception of the human in such a way that rights exist in a gendered way. Not all are human in the sense that to be human is to be public, and there are those who become public while others are made public. To be public is the capacity to apply mental capacity while enjoying citizenship. To be made public is to occupy the space of exception or living in the shadows of the state where physical labour comes to objectify the 'human'. Marx calls labour the oxen, which closely connects to Aristotle's happiness of the pig.

This conversation speaks of the classroom as an industrial complex where alienation comes to define students and educators. Those allowed to be human can exist as citizens while others are made to occupy spaces of exclusion. Marx argues that the industrial complex estranges the labour through the process, product, others and self. This chapter projects Marx's alienation to the class environment and demonstrates the complex ways through which educators and learners are expunged from citizenship through genders, disability, race and other social constructions. Such alienations define students as being needy and a security risk, thus justifying the taking away of their right to be human. The question is, how can inalienable rights exist with the alienation of the human in an industrial complex and yet fail to declare the complex a human catastrophe? What allows such a phenomenon to exist unabated?

In the process of 'human' production, the educator faces estrangements from the tools of work, the product (read curriculum), the process of production (teaching techniques and technologies) and others (students) (Nyaga, 2017; Stieler-Hunt & Jones, 2017), while the student dies in the process of production. The existence of the capital is determined by the death of the learner and the educator in what Foucault calls biopower. To die is to erase and censor the self from the public. Such modalities of governmentality mean unlearning and learning. The process of teaching is alienating to both the educator and the student. The master plan (read curriculum) is an external masterpiece that is disconnected from students and teachers. This speaks to the alienating curriculum as the determinant of learning and schooling in the classroom. The curriculum occupies the watchtower from where the teacher and the student are consistently and continuously watched and policed. The curriculum is the purveyor belt that controls the emotional worker. They must work and watch over themselves; otherwise, they are shamed and punished if the belt stops and activates the alarm bells. Such economies of power allow an efficient and effective production process with the control of the borderlands. As the capital accumulates, so does the extermination of bordered bodies.

The erasure of identities and cultures is commonplace in contemporary society. To die means the process through which the self disappears through learning, in what is reminiscent of the residential school system in Canada (Akhavan, 2016; Thielen-Wilson, 2014). The process of learning is militarized to obliterate the self from the public into the subconscious and subsequent indoctrination of white capital

rationalities. It is a determination of the self as emotional and dangerous to the public peace and as such a terrorizing object. To save the public, intensive nurturing of the student becomes a necessity and, in the process, kills self-creativity.

The curriculum as a factor of production is colonial in its measure and outcome (Dei, 1993, 2008; Dei & James, 2002). It objectifies and simplifies the human in a classroom setting in ways that silence voices. The student is a can that needs to be filled up and branded for export. The educator is assumed to understand the process of packaging the human for sale in the market. In the perspective of an industrial complex, the product passes through the teacher for packaging and branding. Such packaged objects stay silent as work is done on their bodies. The assumption is that they are inanimate and voiceless matter, waiting to be conferred with speech. The very art of professionalization of the object in the classroom provides the rationale for alienation – that rights can be taken away to fulfill the development of the human to citizenship through professionalization. The objective of the complex is to create humans by damaging the resiliency and agency of the less human. As a colonial narrative, the curriculum provides the mechanics of violent production of the 'human' and eventual embodying market rationality by the product (read student). The process of professionalization is replete with the politics of occupation in that the student becomes a colonial space waiting to be conquered and assimilated to white capital. Such borderlands are watched over, and law (read curriculum) ceases to exist.

Walling the borderlands is an essential component of learning in its psychic and physical sense. Such borderlands are violent spaces of exception, where law supervises necessary violence. Violence comes to be accepted in the liminal spaces as a necessary evil in the production of the human. The curriculum divides the classroom into civil and emotional spaces that are outside state limits. Students who cannot complete the curriculum occupy the spaces of exception, where the curriculum authorizes violent expulsion of social misfits. Such removal is socially constructed along the lines of gender, race, disability, sexuality and other marginalizing codes. A student is earmarked and placed on either side of the classroom based on their bodily codes.

This chapter calls for the indigenization of the curriculum to allow for the humanization of learning and teaching. To make sense of this argument, we implicate ourselves as both learners and educators. The chapter also looks at whiteness and white supremacy in teaching and learning. It looks at whiteness and colonialism within the neoliberalism governmentality and subjectivities of the human in the classroom. It identifies the estrangement and alienation among learners and educators. Later, the chapter looks at the Eurocentric curriculum and attempts to identify ways of civilizing the curriculum. These conversations offer some ideas on the way forward toward humanized educational systems.

IMPLICATING SELF

The authors of this chapter come from formerly colonized countries. Nyaga comes from Kenya and Torres from the Philippines. Kenya was colonized by Britain,

while America, Spain and China colonized the Philippines. Kenya received its independence in 1964. Spain had the largest impact on the Philippines' cultural and social aspects. The fact that the Philippines is named after King Philip, one of the Spanish Monarchs, speaks of the Spanish colonial presence in that country. However, this does not denigrate the impact of American and Chinese colonialism in the Philippines. Naming reminds us of the process of discovering spaces as if there were no people in the pre-colonial era. Colonialism stamps itself through evicting others. The naming is an essential point of the occupation of a space.

Through naming and fragging, a space is claimed as private. Such a process buries *a priori* belief systems through the exultation of settler culture. Even after colonialism, Kenya and the Philippines continue to be colonial extensions of their master. Educational systems in these countries continue to operate under the colonial belt. Education in Kenya has been a very political issue before and after independence as attested by Njambi (2005) and WaThiongo (1986). In Kenya, the independent school was an anti-colonial educational system built on the framework of Indigenous values and culture. Both women and men played the role of educators to their children. Education was synchronized with parenting to provide holistic growth of children. Indigenous peoples of Kenya mostly used proverbs, riddles and stories to educate their children. Through colonialism, education was broken from parenting and made a profitable service and tool for civilizing the damaged people. African children were forced to join this school as a process of improving and saving them from their past. Everyone was expected to speak in English and refrain from using local languages. To instil fear, the colonial school system introduced the system of surveillance and censorship called *munitu*. *Munitu* was a cow horn that had a string attached and would be worn around the neck of any student found using their local dialect. *Munitu* is local lexicon meaning monitor. This disciplinary tool identified bodies meant for punishment. It would be passed over from one student to the next so that whoever ended the day with it would physically receive punishment in the form of caning or having to dig a garbage pit latrine.

The school system was designed and continues to regulate and control bodies in the classroom. Such regulation creates spatial molarity (Teelucksingh, 2006) through erasure of some cultures from the educational system (Dei, 1998). Some cultures are eventually referred to as remnants of the past. Such cultures are regulated, censored and pathologized and determined as emotional and uncontrollable. Militarization of subjugated emotional cultures is justified as the only process of cleansing the class from emotional values. In the process of purifying the educational system, the Indigenous cultures are violently relegated to spaces of extinction as witnessed by the death of Black youth in dominant school systems (Thompson & Wallner, 2011). Education and spaces of knowledge production become violent spaces of linear identity creation and subsequent expulsion of the subnormal (Ball et al., 1998). As a tool of surveying educational spaces, the curriculum authorized the normalization of violence to those who fail to improve (Ball et al., 1998). The system is instrumentalized and rationalized to fit capital accumulation and the subsequent death of the student in what Foucault (2006) calls biopolitics of education.

This chapter argues that the school system is an industrial complex where children are violently produced, processed and packaged for sale in the market. The production of bodies alienates, objectifies and simplifies the educator and the learner into one ordered form of capital accumulation. To interrogate militarism and school systems, it is imperative to look at whiteness and white supremacy in the education system. The section that follows defines whiteness and white supremacy and connects it to the educational system. It argues that the current school system is built on a white supremacy bedrock and benchmark.

CURRICULUM AND NEOLIBERALISM

A curriculum is a policy that orients and constitutes spaces of learning and teaching. It sets the rules and process of producing and consuming knowledge and the subsequent claim to human rights. Those who create ascend to power and those who consume descend to the obscurity of human existence. The art of submission to the ivory tower consigns one to human existence and eventual citizenship. We argue that the classroom defines citizenship through submission to capital. It determines who has power and who needs to submit to the ivory tower. The curriculum determines which bodies are to be accepted to citizenship, and which are to be exposed to shame and punishment. The current curriculum is white and colonial in the sense that its ethos is spatial exploitation and violation. It is a moral document that measures spaces as civilized or in need of improvement. The curriculum shapes the classroom into a city and the frontier. Bodies within the classroom come to be either damaged or exulted. Those cast as damaged and deplorable are the raw material for capital production.

Historically, the curriculum works in orderly and linear ways where issues of race, gender and other social differences are concerned. It fails to consult the difference and, in the process, evicts those that are outside capital parameters. Disciplinary actions and corporal punishment are ways through which the difference is expunged from the space. In Canada, Black children and other racialized students are easily identified for shaming due to their skin colour. In such instances, the curriculum authorizes its own erasure to allow illicit power to be imprinted on bodies that do not matter. The curriculum is for students who are different and opens them to policing when identifying bodies to be punished. When such bodies are identified, the system goes off to allow the process of institutionalization and normalization of barbarism and pain on gendered and raced bodies. In other instances, the curriculum makes public those who are different through shaming them. Examinations in the school system allow for a definition of those who are improved and those who must be let to die. The school system is turned into a militaristic space of competing and exulting bodies while relegating others based on social identities. The process of competition prepares the student to embrace disembodiment of the body from the mind as it prepares the body for capital submission.

The process of disembodiment allows a break away from the emotional human and embracing of the rationalized robot. A robot is economical and helps minimize

spending while allowing more profit for the capital. The student is trained to engage in performance of the normal and relegate their creativity to the sidelines. To that end, the chapter claims that the educational system steals the rights of students to be human. To be human is to have the power to think and innovate. When the system is instructive rather than allowing creativity in students, it centralizes education as an industrial complex where production and processing packaging is for the maximization of surplus value. The student becomes an object of refinement meant to be sold into the market; this reduces education to modelling and internalization of others and subsequently devaluation of the self. This educational managerialism needs to be interrogated to allow the difference to speak. Voices from the margins need to be heard and validated. The chapter argues that for such marginalized voices to be heard, the curriculum needs to be fluid and open to the difference. This claim looks at a democratic curriculum as the tentative option toward humanizing learning and schooling.

TOWARDS A DEMOCRATIC CURRICULUM

Democracy in the classroom seeks to look at learning as a social justice process (Dei, 2008; Pinto et al., 2012). The current education system is an event to prepare the student (read products) for sale in the market. To be democratic is to allow the difference to speak in an environment of validation and 'acceptance' (Portelli & Koneeny, 2018). Such difference can conflict with the norm based on its historical point of view. Democracy envisages such conflicts from the difference and works toward facilitation of self-validation of students' experiences. 'Working with' students toward self-determination is a question and acknowledgment of the fact that power is a core element in learning and teaching. Self-determination necessitates students becoming shaped by their own lived experiences. Educators need to acknowledge their power and devise ways of exercising that power with the student and other stakeholders.

To acknowledge power is to realize that we are implicated as educators and as such work toward involving others in decolonizing and democratizing education. Such an implication should not create shame for the educator; otherwise, the educator will work toward self-preservation and through the rush to innocence. Such a move will turn the student into an object of self-preservation and allow charitable teaching and learning which is colonial. The call for democratic schooling is to critically reflex on the self and the tools of teaching and learning. With reflexive teaching and learning, the difference can question the framework of learning (curriculum) and their place in it. To allow the difference to speak and be heard is to respect the right to be human. The classroom setup disengages the students from the teachables by enhancing imitation of the content without critically questioning the material. To be human and to humanize learning and teaching is to engage learners in critical thinking, which is part of reflexive schooling.

Colonial curricula deny the coming out of students by maintaining them in their embryonic moments. They instil fear to move from the normal through threats of

punishment and rewards; this is a conditioning tool to create sameness and disengage the difference. When learning becomes an act of conditioning bodies to perform the truth, it robotizes and stifles self-power to become.

Social justice teaching calls for understanding the histories of a people. Histories allow an understanding of past injustices so that we can understand the present. To be historical is to excavate the 'past' and make it relevant to the present. The past awakens traumas so that the current remains awake. Histories prepare a critical reflective and reflexive teaching and learning. Histories ground us as educators and learners to face injustices of the present. It is important for learning to embrace the past to allow rage and trauma to inform our teaching and learning. Rage seeks to spur the suppressed self to act in presenting the 'past' in ways that everybody learns about the desires of the difference.

There is also the need to look beyond the professional ethical guidelines learning and teaching and include the different morals considered emotional. Teaching and learning should be a continuum of difference. This means that schooling becomes a conversation on different morals without necessarily promoting a morality as the only true and ethical base of teaching. Such a move means critically reflecting on all morals in connection with teaching and learning. Critical reflection seeks to question the morality and ethical teachings such that none are left pure and neat. There is the need to include different voices and experiences in teaching and learning. Among the Embu and Gikuyu communities of Kenya, proverbs, riddles, songs and storytelling were ways through which learning and teaching were realized. Such a method of teaching will allow multiple modes of teaching and learning for creativity, imagination and innovation. Subversive teaching and learning acknowledges the self-limits and allows the difference to speak to fill gaps in knowledge production. Such an inclusion should be through small subversive acts of resistance based on strategic risk taking and management. It is important to include relevant teaching within the teachable. Such learning becomes inspirational rather than focused on profit and market rationalities. Teaching ceases to be an exultation exercise but is rather a process of accommodating different pedagogical strategies of learning and teaching. It looks at political possibilities within and without the classroom (Portelli & Konecny, 2013).

CONCLUSION

This chapter sought to deconstruct the curriculum, classroom and geographies within and without the classroom by infusing the different mechanisms of teaching and learning. It looked at different ways through which learning and teaching are colonial. Learning and teaching are also identified as industrial complexes where the learner and the educators are alienated from the process and the product. The chapter also looked at the militarization and securitization of the classroom and the art of eviction from citizenship. The authors believe that such colonial processes are key areas of how learning and teaching objectify and reduce humans

and subsequent claiming of rights. The chapter argues that education is a question of social justice and human rights process rather than capital accumulation. It also argues that histories, values, languages and ceremonies of Indigenous peoples can trouble the order of teaching and learning. Finally, we conclude that the curriculum needs to be open and fluid.

REFERENCES

Akhavan, P. (2016). Cultural genocide: Legal label or mourning metaphor? *McGill Law Journal, 62*(1), 243–270.

Blum, D., & Ullman, C. (2012). The globalization and corporatization of education: The limits and liminality of the market mantra. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 25*(4), 367–373.

Chadderton, C. (2014). The militarisation of English schools: Troops to teaching and the implications for initial teacher education and race equality. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 17*(3), 407–428.

Dei, G. J. S. (1993). Narrative discourses of Black/African-Canadian parents and the Canadian public school system. *Canadian Ethnic Studies, 25*(3), 45.

Dei, G. J. S. (1996). The role of Afrocentricity in the inclusive curriculum in Canadian schools. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'Éducation, 21*(2), 170–186.

Dei, G. J. S. (1998). Why write back? The role of Afrocentric discourse in social change. *Canadian Journal of Education, 23*(2), 200.

Dei, G. J. S. (2008). Schooling as community: Race, schooling, and the education of African youth. *Journal of Black Studies, 38*(3), 346–366.

Dei, G. J. S. (2014). The African scholar in the western academy. *Journal of Black Studies, 45*(3), 167–179.

Dei, G. J. S., & James, I. M. (2002). Beyond the rhetoric: Moving from exclusion, reaching for inclusion in Canadian schools. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 48*(1), 61.

Ekpo, D. (2005). Any European around to help me talk about myself? The white man's burden of Black Africa's critical practices. *Third Text, 19*(2), 107.

Foucault, M. (2004). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76*. London: Penguin.

Foulds, K. (2013). The continua of identities in postcolonial curricula: Kenyan students' perceptions of gender in school textbooks. *International Journal of Educational Development, 33*(2), 165–174.

Groff, J. E., Smith, P. C., & Edmond, T. (2010). Public k-12 education as an industrial process: The school as a factory. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management, 22*(4), 543.

MacLellan, F. (2013). Mokasige: Redeploying a colonial institution to reaffirm and revitalize Algonquin culture. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 36*(1), 77.

Magnusson, J. (2013). Precarious learning and labour in financialized times. *Brock Education, 22*(2), 69.

Masta, S. (2016). Disrupting colonial narratives in the curriculum. *Multicultural Perspectives, 18*(4), 185–191.

Meriwether, C. (1907). *Our colonial curriculum, 1607–1776*. Washington, DC: Capital Publishing Corporation.

Natale, S. M., & Doran, C. (2012). Marketization of education: An ethical dilemma. *Journal of Business Ethics, 105*(2), 187–196.

Neeganagwedgin, E. (2014). "They can't take our ancestors out of us": A brief historical account of Canada's residential school system, incarceration, institutionalized policies and legislations against Indigenous peoples. *Canadian Issues, 31*.

Njambi, W. N. (2005). Revisiting "Women-women marriage": Notes on Gikuyu women. In *African Gender Studies. A reader* (pp. 145–165). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Nguyen, N. (2017). From school militarization to school securitization: National security finds its place in schools. *Critical Studies in Education, 58*(1), 52–68.

Pinto, L. E., Portelli, J. P., Rottmann, C., Pashby, K., Barrett, S. E., & Mujuwamariya, D. (2012). Social justice: The missing link in school administrators' perspectives on teacher induction. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 129*, 1–22.

Portelli, J. P., & Konecny, C. P. (2013). Neoliberalism, subversion and democracy in education. *Encounters on Education, 14*(14), 87–97.

Stieler-Hunt, C. J., & Jones, C. M. (2017). Feeling alienated – Teachers using immersive digital games in classrooms. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 26*(4), 457.

Tabitha, K. M. (2005). *African womanhood in colonial Kenya*. Oxford: James Currey.

Teelucksingh, C. (2006). *Claiming space: Racialization in Canadian cities.* Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Thielen-Wilson, L. (2014). Troubling the path to decolonization: Indian residential school case law, genocide, and settler illegitimacy. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society, 29*(2), 181–197.

Thompson, D., & Wallner, J. (2011). A focusing tragedy: Public policy and the establishment of Afrocentric education in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Political Science/Revue Canadienne De Science Politique, 44*(4), 807–828.

Venables, A., & Tan, G. (2012). Measuring up to ICT teaching and learning standards. *Issues in Informing Science & Information Technology, 9*, 29–040.

Yamato, Y., & Bray, M. (2006). Economic development and the market place for education: Dynamics of the international schools' sector in Shanghai, China. *Journal of Research in International Education, 5*(1), 57–82.