LYNETTE SHULTZ

CHAPTER 3

DECOLONIZING SOCIAL JUSTICE EDUCATION: FROM POLICY KNOWLEDGE TO CITIZENSHIP ACTION

CURRENT LOCATIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EDUCATION

In the past few years I have watched with interest as the theme "social justice education" became visible in more than a few progressive education journals and meetings that resisted the neoliberalization and globalization of education and of policy. Over time, however, I worry about what it means that social justice is declared from such disparate places as conservative government education documents, activist networks, international institutions, and even a few corporations that name social justice in their efforts to project images of sustainability. While this might suggest it is best to abandon the term and look for another signifier for citizens' attempts to overturn systems and practices of injustice, I argue that the power of "social justice" as a container for centuries of wisdom, activism, and social transformation should be reclaimed and restored for these purposes. This chapter, then, is an attempt to locate social justice education in a way that might help practitioners, policy makers, and academics claim it for the generative and regenerative work that will improve the lives of the many who continue to suffer through poverty, racism, patriarchy's sexism, and other exclusions. My location in this work is complicated. I am a "not knower" (Brown & Strega, 2005) in many ways when it comes to social justice. As an academic in a Canadian university and a person who identifies/ is identified as a white, middle class woman, I have access to and privilege within some of the elite enclaves that I will be critiquing in this chapter and therefore, write "from the belly of the beast" in many ways. I have also been working as an anti-oppression educator for many years and have come to shift my "not knowing" by *engagement through education*

A.A. Abdi (ed.), Decolonizing Philosophies of Education, 29–42.
© 2012 Sense Publishers. All rights reserved.

as a social justice process as I witness neocolonialism and capitalism spread with their call for liberalism, individualism, and patriarchy's angry justice. This justice has called responses from around the world that are neoconservative and, in many cases, fundamentalist in their adherence to rigid identities and borders of many types. I have learned by listening and by experience that we should all be concerned about citizenship and democracy right now. It appears the elites hate democracy (that is *real* democracy where all of the people who are impacted by situations and policies have a process and a place to provide their knowledge, speak about their experience, and claim their entitlements) because it holds the possibility of disrupting their privilege which is the system that supports them. Those who are marginalized hate democracy because it has come to them as a scam: that it is limited to voting for someone to represent them and it turns out these representatives and their processes have no real interest or respect for the knowledge or experiences of anyone outside their narrow circle, nor has it resulted in improvements in most citizen's material conditions. The marginalized are used to having someone else represent them and speak for them, and here is the core of the problem. The powerful neoliberals and neoconservatives promote the idea that there is only one way to have a democratic society and that is one that is based on global capitalism, liberalism, individualism, and the freedom to engage in the world in these ways through the creation of systems and structures that ensure these are the only possible ways to move in the public sphere. Therefore, the majority of people in the world - in this model of democracy - are free to be hungry, sick, or uneducated, because, according to neoliberal and neoconservative discourses, they have made the "individual choice" to be poor. We see many approaches to social justice positioned in this way as people take up the need to provide some respite for the poor and marginalized but are unable to even identify the system and its processes that perpetuate poverty and other exclusions. To rest social justice education on this kind of understanding is misguided and incomplete at best, and more likely destructive in its omissions. What I know is that the work of fully democratizing social justice through democratizing knowledge, citizenship spaces, and the participation processes in these spaces, must be learned into being.

As others have pointed out (see for example, Gerwitz & Cribb, 2002; North, 2008) current uses of the term social justice are based on conceptualizations of social justice issues that have many facets. Abdi (2008; 2009) and Shultz (2009) argue for a closer investigation of the tensions and contradictions of social justice as conceptualized and practiced in educational policy, sites, and relationships. The tendency of educators to treat social issues in simplistic ways continues to be a problem but understandable as education takes place within a neoliberal context. David Harvey (2005) argues that the deceit of neoliberalism is that neoliberal policies, and the discourses that support them, are presented as the only way to access the rights and freedom that will end poverty and marginalization when,

in fact, they are designed to keep power and privilege located in the elite classes. The deception is a mask for capitalism's exclusions. While many recent ideas of social justice are framed through the analysis of distribution, recognition, and participation, a welcome extension from Rawlsian liberal analysis of justice as distribution, often the language and foundational ideas perpetuate colonialism, patriarchy and an aggressive liberalized capitalism. Monga (1996) points out the deceit of both neocolonialism and its predecessor colonialism with its racist policies and practices that served to de-humanize the majority of the world's people. From the perspective of the subjected person this must be seen as a decitizenizing project (Abdi, 2008) formed by colonialism, patriarchy and economic imperialism for a disturbing interplay that creates elites and also the structures to keep them in their positions.

In this chapter I will examine the "Education for All" (EFA) policy regime through the powerful concept of decolonization because it can provide the backstory to how these educational policies are linked to current social, political, and economic problems and their social exclusions, and also make visible the key locations where policy and practice can be shifted. EFA policy has an extensive reach in due, at least in part, because much of it is framed in the ideals of equity and justice. Who would argue against the equal inclusion of girls in education programs or the provision of adult literacy classes? However, despite these goals being celebrated by governments and civil society members in most parts of the world, achievement of the goals and the social justice they trumpet, is still far away. By approaching the policy from a decolonization perspective we see the limitations of much social justice in EFA literature and programming. Decolonization is a process of justice and transformation that, if it is to actually occur, will need to build on justice, compassion, and a relational creativity that is lacking in current public spheres (and quite likely in most private spheres). Because those in every society who are marginalized suffer daily humiliation, the beginning point for education as a decolonizing project must be that processes of colonization exist on every level from the personal to the transnational and therefore, the links between local and global policy knowledge, spaces and actors should be central to the analysis. I use decolonization as the overall frame for this work by drawing on a wealth of knowledge from writers such as Edward Said (1978; 1993) and Franz Fanon (1959/1965; 1963/2004) who described decolonizing as resistance to hegemony and a practice based on a critical consciousness of not only social class but history and geography. As Mudimbe (1988) points out the Enlightenment didn't result in a universal understanding of humanity but instead developed an insistent logic of what it is to be human and therefore, who is to be considered human. History reveals those who were deemed to be less human and non-human in the colonizing project. Dehumanization was the process that opened the possibility for the destructive economic, social and

political pieces of colonialism. The colonizers could not believe that power and knowledge could rest in the "non-human" as it did in the Europeans or they could not have even imagined a project as destructive to the bodies and communities of the people they encountered around the world (see Abdi, 2008) [1]. The kind of genocidal violence that was unleashed in this colonial project was so extensive that no wonder we struggle with its legacies today.

This chapter explores how decolonizing the knowledge, spaces, and participation in the public sphere can provide an important understanding of how many current conceptualizations and uses of social justice are problematic and provides an extended understanding of how education for social justice can be a generative, decolonizing project. Decolonization forces us to conceptualize the whole system and its structures through a historical, geographical, and epistemological lens that makes visible which people are de-citizenized and how this takes place, as well as shedding light on the structures and the discourses that hold the system in place. Colonialism has been the grout that holds the mosaic of global/ globalized oppressive relations in place, a grand project of patriarchy and capitalism. As David Smith argues, "capitalism is a distinctly Western phenomenon, arising out of the particular struggles of the Western tradition. These have been struggles over identity and authority, god and monarchy, rights and privilege, private property and community" (2009, p. 102). Each of these struggles describes issues of power and positioning within a hierarchy, and as the imperialist capitalist project grew and strengthened through colonialism, these contested hierarchies became imposed and embedded into every society they touched, requiring of citizens everywhere an obedience to a system of suffering and exclusion. While a full description of the history of capitalism is beyond the scope of this chapter, suffice it to say, the iron will of capitalism that serves the one goal of accumulation of capital has been widely analyzed and supported through examples from all parts of the world. Its legacies of poverty and environmental and social destruction are also extensively documented. This destructiveness can be seen in the diminished public sphere where the citizenry, trained to be obedient, have found few means for engagement or resistance that might shift the hegemony of the global capitalist project.

If we are to engage in projects of decolonization, the analysis of patriarchy's relationship to capitalism and colonialism must also be included if social justice is to satisfy its potential of creating inclusive public spaces where what is of common good can be identified and addressed. Patriarchy is defined by Gilligan and Richards:

> Patriarchy is an anthropological term denoting families or societies ruled by fathers. It sets up a hierarchy – a rule of priests – in which the priest, the *hieros,* is a father, *pater.* As an order of living, it elevates some men over other men and all men over women; within the family, it separates fathers

> from sons (the men from the boys) and places both women and children under a father's authority (italics in original). (2009, p. 22)

Gilligan and Richards continue with their argument of the impact of patriarchy on democracy through the historical analysis of Roman patriarchy, Christianity, and imperialism. They provide the example of the colonized Indian society:

> A patriarchally founded British imperialism thus enforced on Indian life a conception that led colonized Indian men, in their own abject status, to require and rationalize the more radically abject subordination of Indian women, whose goodness, identified as sexual purity, was idealized as self-sacrifice… The highly gendered honor codes of family life, not subject to state power but regulated by religious authorities, was a patriarchal legacy of the British to the Indians. (p. 252)

Key here is the idea that patriarchy, spread from public to private relationships, ensured an obedient citizenry through fear. As the Indian example shows, a hierarchy is maintained when it forms the basis of social relations and becomes enforced through social institutions such as the family and religion. Over time, these relations become so normalized (through regulations and common practices) that their source ceases to be questioned and what remains is fear and obedience. Like capitalism and colonialism, patriarchy requires and creates obedient citizens.

THE COLONIZER'S EDUCATION FOR JUSTICE

Education and educators have been central to this project and its triad of colonialism, capitalism, and patriarchy. Education systems are very effective ways to create obedient citizens through particular policies, curriculum, and teacher education programs. Mudimbe (1988) provides a helpful description of educators and missionaries who believed in their own goodness as civilizers while enacting the destructive economic and social project of the European empire-building through the conquest and conversion of African peoples' mind, bodies, and land:

> … of all these 'bearers of the African burden', the missionary was also, paradoxically, the best symbol of the colonial enterprise. He devoted himself sincerely to the ideals of colonialism: the expansion of Civilization, the dissemination of Christianity, and the advance of Progress. Pringle's 1820 vision sums it up nicely: 'Let us enter upon a new and nobler career of conquest. Let us subdue Savage Africa by justice, by kindness, by the talisman of Christian truth. Let us thus go forth, in the name and under the blessing of God, gradually to extend the moral influence… the territorial boundary also of our colony, until it shall become an Empire'.(Hammond & Jablow, 1977 in Mudimbe, 1998, p. 47)

Education policies coming from the colonial powers were highly effective in creating the deep changes in the social, political, and economic relations within colonized societies. Often touted as acts of justice with moral education goals, the education that was imposed in these societies was a package of the patriarchal fear, the capitalist suffering, and the colonizing rejection of the full humanity of anyone not fully embodying the European elite's image of superiority. The legacies of these education policies and practices have been longstanding, and the evidence is in many of the EFA policies we see currently circulating in policy circles. The rules by which the world plays are rules from the enclave of the elite. Such enclosure requires that policies (and therefore democracy) are reductive rather than generative. Education policy that is reductive has a long history of preparing teachers and students to take their place as obedient citizens.

EFA Policy and Social Justice

North (2008) frames the tensions in social justice education through three distinctions: how knowledge and action are linked; how the macro and micro are related; and how redistribution and recognition are engaged. These important aspects of social justice are helpful in evaluating the location and perhaps anticipating the kind of education that might emerge from a particular understanding of social justice. What is missing in this conceptualization is a discussion of the space (both geographical and temporal) of justice and the knowledges that are included in the conceptualization from its inception, its processes and its impacts. Justice and its social as well as material manifestations cannot be delinked from its place, its people, and the relations and processes that surround it.

While there are multiple discourses embedded within the policy and certainly in its implementation, I want to address some of the core discourses that are used by advocates of EFA as statements of social justice. From the outset of "Education for All" policy processes, it was clear that this was an area the government leaders from both international aid donor countries and recipients of this aid, international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), and local educators found appealing; after all, who would disagree with expanding education policies? As Phillip Jones (2007) argues, for 60 years multi-lateral agencies have pushed international leaders to support large scale education initiatives. Over this period there have been various shifts in the policy actors' commitments but overall, EFA policies were, and continue to be, promoted within elite circles and come with a long list of conditionalities including structural adjustment programs to satisfy International Financial Institutions, and short term thematic foci (for example, girls education or teacher training) to to conform to transnational INGOs. While education as a global agenda was "seen as the job of national governments supported by funding

and expertise from bilateral donors and international organizations" (Mundy, 2007, p. 3), it is clear that much of the failure to achieve EFA was due at least in part to "each OECD government [seeking] to use educational aid to promote its own unique political and economic interests" (2007, p. 5). Here we see a familiar colonizing story emerging. If we examine the policy through the decolonization lens, it is important to ask very particular questions of the foundational intentions and agendas of EFA policy. For example, whose education is described in the documents? Whose knowledge is included? What access do the recipients of this education have to the policy processes? Who is a visitor/ an outsider/ an outcast in the policy processes? What damage will participation in either the processes or the goals of the policy do to local citizens and their communities?

EFA has come to be seen as a corrective for a system of human and material relations gone awry (Chisholm, Bloch, & Fleisch, 2008). It is often linked to social justice through goals for poverty reduction; equity of access and inclusion of specific groups who have traditionally had less access to education, for example girls or children with disabilities as well as pastoral and nomadic communities, or migrant workers; and the provision of new technical skills to enable participation in the global economy (Kitamura, 2007; UNESCO 2005; UNESCO 2006; United Nations Millennium Project, 2005; World Bank, 2002). It is important to note that these are the groups whose social and economic livelihoods are outside what is needed for globalized capitalism and are in tension with the privileging of private ownership of property and production. Women's domestic and community work is viewed as unproductive by capitalists and therefore, part of the EFA policy would see a shift from these roles to having enough education to participate as productive members of the formal economy. Nomadic communities and seasonal migrant workers challenge many of the ideals and myths of capitalism with its focus on private ownership and property rights. Societies whose members move freely across places, unencumbered by goals of accumulation, and live according to seasons rather than clocks, are seen as deficient in their ontological and epistemological orientations. Education is touted as the way that these persons can be included in a grand "universal human project". There is little room for discussions about the colonial, capitalist and patriarchal agendas of this project and how these might impact targeted groups.

New discourses of consensus in the EFA policy regime mirror patterns and relations of colonialism. Terms currently being used to describe global education policy call for a "global compact" (Sperling, 2009); harmonization of policies across countries and regions (Mundy, 2007; UNESCO, 2006); utilizing global aid architecture to achieve EFA with donor countries leading policy processes and directions through their funding decisions (Mundy, 2010). Here what is important is the shift from policies that were being resisted (and non-involvement is a powerful resistance) as indicated in the lack of success of the 20-year EFA project,

to normative discourses that are fixed by the valorization of consensus that suggests an authority of universalism and Truth. That this authority exists outside the reach of most citizens who will be impacted by the policy is a colonial pattern being repeated. There is no place for policy knowledge that exists outside the engaged elites. The EFA policy is already predetermined by these elites and what is left for national and local actors is for them to implement and regulate. Here we see, again, the need for the obedient (colonized) citizen. Policy knowledge, spaces and actors are bordered in ways that support traditional colonial relations and the system that perpetuates the elites' positioning. While many claim it to be a social justice project, EFA policy is positioned to merely prop up the system rather than transform it to unleash the creative and generative possibilities of citizens working within their own cultural and geographic contexts.

We should be thorough and open in addressing the current legacies and acts of neo/colonization that elites visit on the marginalized. While it is currently in the self-interest of the elites of the world to maintain obedient citizens that support the global economic system, as we see with EFA policies, there are discourses of social justice being heard within the corridors of governments, corporations, and organizations. Again, considering knowledge, spaces and actors, these "talks" exist in an elite enclave, a product of a particular group that create their own enclosure to deliberate about justice (Deetz, 1992). As a result, we hear declarations of the need for justice delivered with great urgency for change but little for difference. Social justice within the elite bubble- this change with no difference – can never lead to any transformation of distribution, recognition, or participation usually named as the key components of a project of social justice. With limitations on the actors who are able to engage in the policy processes limiting the knowledges that are included along with a carefully guarded policy space created through these limits, social justice from the enclave sits tidily outside spaces where change can be either learned or practiced. Responding to issues of justice from the elite enclave is not a call for solidarity and deep democracy but rather, using discourses of individual capacity building and freedom, the so very familiar triad of capitalism, patriarchy and colonialism maintain their dehumanizing impact on those already marginalized.

The failure of EFA to achieve its timebound goals also needs a decolonization analysis. It is not enough to say this failure is a result of governments and global civil society not getting their message spread widely enough. If we move beyond seeing citizens as obedient, the failure may highlight local agency. From a perspective of colonization these processes should look familiar. Anti-colonial activists, early on in the struggle, were able to name the knowledge that would render colonialism impotent. Franz Fanon (1959/1965; 1963/2004) described African citizens as the leaders of a new humanity who could represent collective social strength against the individualism of Europeans. His description of the

power of African diversity and foundational epistemology of dignity was in stark contrast to the uniformity demanded by the colonizing Europeans. Fanon, like Monga (1996), describes the direct links between a rising apathy as a resistance to European uniformity and the hierarchy of the colonial project that made it impossible for any African person to participate in the public sphere as an emancipated citizen. EFA policy analysis that positions the recipients of education as capable agents and holders of knowledge that is key to their own development reveals the dangers of promoting a globalized, harmonized, education. The current framing of EFA as a social justice project requires that we ignore difference, making it a glossy kind of justice. In this, we are missing the bodies and voices of those who Fanon and Monga describe above. It is impossible to hear these voices without hearing their context and history. If social justice is to exist, it needs to be outside the elite enclave. This would require that a multiplicity of knowledges and solidarities, held together through relationships of engagement, be the foundation for policy processes and enactments.

Decolonizing Knowledge, Spaces, and Participation for Social Justice

As I have argued, historically, elites have taken discourses that might be considered justice oriented and manipulated them to keep particular people playing by the rules of colonialism, patriarchy, and capitalism. These rules were based on ideas of what constitutes a human worthy of the entitlements of citizenship. Odora Hoppers (2009a; 2009b) states that, in the case of the continent of Africa, the first step is decolonizing knowledge. This means developing, what she describes as cognitive indifference to the western model of knowledge creation and dissemination, and instead enabling " demands for compassion, an ontology of dignity , and the daring of the oppressor and the oppressed to even try to enter into the traditional relations of colonization" (opening remarks, Pretoria, 2010). This is based on her analysis of the current state of African epistemologies within the intellectual exchanges of world academy. She argues that

> the transition from bandit colonialism through the intricate systems of the modern triage society that is wired for Western cultural compliance requires more than just critique, or a prayer for the meek to inherit the earth. It requires a decisive consensus that the meek do not inherit the earth by their meekness alone – they need defenses of the mind and conceptual categories around which they can organise their thoughts and actions. (2009b, p.1)

How do we make visible the knowledge and experience which have been silenced, denounced, and undermined in the education policy field? What is the consequence of the absence of this policy knowledge if we know that democratic policy and therefore, endowed citizenship requires participation in the knowledge creation and

dissemination of policy knowledge by all actors who are impacted by the policy within policy spaces that are inclusive and non-coercive? Monga (1996) reminds us that the refusal of "global brain trusts" (p. 33) including the academy, international development agencies, and financial institutions, to approach African knowledge and its context with any kind of respect or rigour has been a key factor in the continuing marginalization and exploitation of so much of this diverse continent. However, as Monga continues, African people have in no way sat passively by and there is "internally, an agility of Africans and African regimes to re-invent themselves and create a political bricolage of opposition" (p. 150). Again, we can learn from the African context by acknowledging the wisdom of civil disobedience and what Monga describes as the way that African communities have survived the long history of slavery, colonialism, and institutional racism that assailed them. Civil society, as the organized social networks and movements that respond to the state and global institutions, demanded democratization through analysis of public discourses and finding ways of "collective indiscipline" (p. 11). The epistemology of resistance as an affirmation of dignity must be located within understandings of social justice and of social justice education.

EDUCATING AGAINST HUMILIATION AND PESSIMISM

If we leave social justice in the hands of the elites there is little likelihood that change will take place and the majority of the world's people will continue to live the humiliation of exclusion as well as the humiliation of inclusion. Here I mean to point out that processes of participation can perpetuate humiliation when they continue to misrecognize and silence people, their knowledges, and experiences. Forced inclusion, like exclusion, are dehumanizing and de-citizenizing when they perpetuate the ideal citizen as one who is obedient and agreeable, supporting the myths of harmony, compliance, and universal Enlightenment. While many people take this as reason enough for pessimism and abandonment of social justice projects , I suggest that such responses are part of the fear and anger produced to limit systemic and localized change. The obedient citizen should easily be discouraged, and see that change is not possible. In contrast, if we take the example of the millions of colonized citizens who have continued to resist through non-involvement as well as organized actions against the colonial system, we can see places where social justice changes can be generated.

On what, then, should we base our claims in these revised discourses of justice? Is there a way of mending the broken systems of the world by finding educational processes that shift centre-periphery knowledge locations and thereby create inclusive spaces for social, political and economic engagement? This requires that we wrestle with the exclusions created by the colonization, patriarchy, and capitalism triad by placing knowledges as multiple, historical, cultural and

dynamic/generative at the centre of social justice conceptualizations and processes. It is clear that processes of justice must be addressed (theoretically and pragmatically) at all levels. Therefore, it is helpful to distinguish the "path to social justice" as different from "the path of social justice", with the latter holding the possibility of achieving decolonization, the deep democractic project, that is needed to address the multitude of global and local issues and to position dignity as a foundation of human existence. Here it is important to see the processes of social justice rather than justice as merely an outcome or product. If education is to be a social justice project then there are ways to shift the policy processes and programs to reflect deepening democratization and social justice.

Decolonizing Knowledge for Policy and the Public Sphere

The first area to address is decolonizing knowledge so that it might build a more inclusive public sphere. Here the role of education is important in shifting the obedient citizen to the emancipated and engaged citizen. We can draw on understandings of the creativity of inclusiveness and the processes of generative complexity within dynamic, social systems. This understanding should be contrasted to the rigid hierarchies that have historically determined our understandings of policy processes. Scharmer's (2007) work in this area suggests that understanding the dynamic complexity of a social system helps us see how the causes and effects of social (and political) actions and relations should be seen as far apart in both space and time and therefore, analysis and attention to processes and relationality are important. With these dynamic processes, any system's social complexity requires that we recognize a plurality of worldviews, knowledges, and experiences that are held by the people involved in any justice issue or social problem. Scharmer addresses a third, critical complexity, generative complexity, which addresses the way in which events "unfold in unfamiliar and unpredictable ways" (p. 2). While many concepts of justice suggest that it is an endpoint requiring the uncovering or identification of a path to justice, understanding justice through this frame of complexity suggests that engaging in the processes of justice requires us to take a path *of* justice where change is understood as disruptive and unpredictable. Scharmer describes this as emerging complexity where "solutions to problems are unknown; the problem statement itself is unfolding; and who the key stakeholders are not always clear" (p.63). If this is the starting point for policy processes and educational practices, efforts will be directed at bringing together the people who hold different knowledges and can therefore, provide the insights into the dynamic and generative processes that are taking place. Rather than shut down these processes, they must be seen as the location of social justice and the efforts and struggles will be located here in trying to find ways to make these processes work in radically democratizing ways. These processes require engagement with

difference and diversity, and it is here, when comparing this with colonized policy processes, we see how to challenge the long history of obedient citizens created by the familiar triad of colonialism, patriarchy, and capitalism.

Decolonizing Policy Spaces

Decolonizing policy knowledges requires that we examine the spaces in which engagement with multiple knowledges takes place. As the analysis of EFA policy has shown us, the democratizing of knowledge and public spaces must be the foundation of social justice or we risk perpetuating the damaging relations of colonialism. Research is needed to identify how these spaces are best created given the burden of historical legacies and their current versions of decitizenization. Using a decolonizing analysis as a foundation, it is clear that these policy spaces must allow for a fully human participation which includes making room for dissenting voices and divergent knowledges. Participation in the public sphere should not require blind obedience and the destruction of diversity in an effort for harmonization. Processes are needed to deal directly and openly with conflict before it becomes violent as we have learned from colonialism, patriarchy and capitalism (Shultz, 2009). These spaces should be organized in ways that they resist the kinds of passive equality and obedient citizenship where justice is decided and provided by institutions rather than an active equality where citizens engage in the struggles of democracy by creating processes and places to deliberate and engage with multiple perspectives and knowledges.

CONCLUSION

The example of Education for All policy provides an important view of globalized policy processes and the problems of social justice that is located in the enclaves of the elite. Using a decolonization analysis, the patterns and connections of creating obedient citizens to support elite systems of colonialism, patriarchy, and capitalism become more evident and therefore, we can see areas where change is possible. This chapter is not a call to abandon social justice or social justice education, but it is a call to re-examine the location of social justice as an endpoint or product and to place it as the foundation of relationships and processes that form and maintain a fully democratized public sphere. Whether we are addressing issues that have a global or international reach, or localized issues and distributions, processes of social justice that open the public sphere to the generative complexity and creative potential of diversity should be seen as ways to address the significant challenges that we face today. The social, economic, political, and environmental/place-based goals of justice demand that we find processes that increase the range of actors and knowledges that participate in policy from inception to the implementation and

resolutions of policies. This democratization of knowledge, spaces, and participants can provide the path to addressing many of the urgent issues of our time. We need to watch for the legacies of colonialism with its supportive patriarchy and capitalism because these power discourses and processes continue to drive many international, national and local relations. Education policy has been a longstanding area of international engagement for social justice. It would be wise to begin by decolonizing the EFA policy processes to model new possibilities of having inclusive, democratized and democratizing public spheres created and sustained by active citizens. Education in such spheres will be, by extension, social justice education.

NOTES

[1] There are many excellent descriptions of this perspective from indigenous scholars in many countries but for a notable description with its links to education see Abdi, 2008.

REFERENCES

Abdi, A. A. (2008). De-subjecting subject populations. In Abdi & Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for human and global citizenship*. New York: SUNY Press, 65–80.

Abdi, A. A. (2009). Recentering the philosophy of the foundations of knowledge: The case of Africa with a special focus on the global role of teachers. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *55*(3), 269–283.

Brown, L., & Strega, S. (2005). *Research as resistance: Critical indigenous and anti-oppression approaches*. Canadian Scholars' Press.

Chisholm, L., Bloch, G., & Fleisch, B. (2008). *Education, growth, aid and development: Towards education for all*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.

Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonialism: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. SUNY Press.

Gerwitz, S., & Cribb, A. (2002). Plural conceptions of social justice: Implications for policy sociology. *Journal of Education Policy*, *17*(4), 499–509.

Gilligan & Richards. (2008). *The deepening darkness: Patriarchy, resistance, and democracy's future*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Fanon, F. (1963/2004). *Wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Fanon, F. (1959/1965). *Dying colonialism*. New York: Grove Press.

Jones, P. (2007). WCEFA: A moment in the history of multilateral education. *International Perspectives on Education and Society*, *8*, 521–538.

Kitamura, Y. (2007). The political dimensions of international cooperation in education: Mechanisms of global governance to promote education for all. *International Perspectives on Education and Society*, *8*, 31–71.

Monga, C. (1996). *Anthropology of anger: Civil society and democracy in Africa*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Mudimbe, V. Y. (1988). *The invention of Africa: Gnosis, philosophy, and the order of knowledge*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Mundy, K. (2007). Education for all: Paradoxes and prospects of a global problem. *International Perspectives on Education and Society*, *8*, 1–30.
Mundy, K. (2010). International aid to education. *Comparative Education Review*, *54*(1), 113–124.
Ngũgĩ Wa Thiong'o. (2009). *Re-membering Africa*. Nairobi/Kampala: East African Publishers.
North, C. (2008). What is all this talk about "social justice"? Mapping the terrain of education's latest catchphrase. *Teachers College Record*, *110*(6), 1182–1206.
Odora Hoppers, C. (2009a). Education, culture and society in a globalizing world: Implications for comparative and international education. *Compare*, *39*(5), 601–614.
Odora Hoppers, C. (2009b). From bandit colonialism to the modern triage society: Towards a moral and cognitive reconstruction of knowledge and citizenship. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies*, *4*(2), 168–180.
Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge.
Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
Scharmer, O. (2007). *Theory U: Leading from the future as it emerges*. Cambridge, MA: Society for Organizational Learning.
Shultz, L. (2009). Conflict, dialogue and justice: Exploring global citizenship education as a generative social justice project. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Education*, *4*(2), 3–15.
Smith, D. G. (2009). Critical notice: Engaging Peter McLaren and the new Marxism in education. *Interchange*, *40*(1), 93–117.
Sperling, G. (2009). *A global education fund: Toward a true global compact on universal education*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press.
UNESCO. (2005). *EFA global monitoring report 2005. The quality imperative*. Paris: UNESCO.
UNESCO. (2006). *EFA global monitoring report 2006*. Paris: UNESCO.
United Nations Millennium Project. (2005). *Toward universal primary education: Investments, incentives, and institutions. Report from the Task Force on Education and Gender Equality*. Earthscan and the UN Millennium Project, London. Retrieved from http://www.unmillenniumproject.org
World Bank. (2002). *Achieving education for all by 2015. Simulation results for 47 low income countries*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Lynette Shultz
Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta