Activism as/in/for Global Citizenship: Putting Un-Learning to Work Towards Educating the Future

Stephanie Curley, Jeong-eun Rhee, Binaya Subedi
and Sharon Subreenduth

INTRODUCTION

The editors' charge to connect global citizenship education and the theme of activism—as a key issue in learning and teaching about and for global citizenship—presents us with an imperative to theorize how we act and become global rather than just learning about it. Thus, we explore activism as/in/for global citizenship theoretically, historically, and in practice. However, as education can be overly practice-based and under-theorized, we do not offer a curriculum guide, "what works", or a "to do" list of best practices (Daza 2013b). In our view, there is no magical formula for educating the future—no one,

S. Curley (✉)
Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, UK
e-mail: S.curley@mmu.ac.uk

J. Rhee
College of Education Information & Technology, New York, NY, USA
e-mail: jeong-eun.rhee@liu.edu

B. Subedi
The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA
e-mail: Subedi.1@osu.edu

S. Subreenduth
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, USA
e-mail: ssubree@bgsu.edu

simple or best way of teaching and learning activism and global citizenship education because contexts, histories, and socio-political dynamics complicate them both (Maira 2009; Verma 2010). Instead, we focus on the long-term project of 'decolonising the mind' (wa Thiong'o 1986) towards more complex, nuanced and critical global citizenships (Subedi and Daza 2008).

To become an educated human, including an educator, one necessarily learns hierarchical violences that disconnect the world and self from the so-called Other. Therefore, to think more relationally and outside of regimes of truth requires a radically different way of knowing, that does not simply follow our usual habits of thinking (Foucault 1980; Spivak 2012). Therefore, we argue that un-learning is an important *acti*vism for educating a future global imaginary—for inculcating authentic global-thinking citizens. Un-learning is activism because it implies educators' bringing the un-learning into educational practice, and it further implies the 'self-transformation' of the educator, the students and the field and actions of education. We argue that activism as/in/for global citizenship asks educators and students to be unlearners—because to interrogate their location within the global power structure and requires radically different ways of thinking about self, world, other.

What Does It Mean to Un-Learn to Think Differently?

As we write this chapter in 2016, "Black Lives Matter" (BLM)[1] banners and die-in demonstrations block major motorways and access to airports across the USA and the UK. Arguably, BLM has grown into a trans/national movement (McKenzie 2016), and serves as a visible, albeit North/West example, of *activism as/for/in global citizenship education*. BLM, and our use of it as an example here marks how what might be considered global is simultaneously limited by localities, as well as English-language—and USA—centrism.[2]

Additionally, our use of BLM shows how *activism*, *global*, *education*, and *citizenship* are entangled and complicated by sense-making that emerges from who and where we are and can be. Because we are always inside our own sense-making, it is difficult to see how we make sense of the world. We argue that un-learning can help us see our habitual ways of thinking and thus how thinking, habitualized through power-laden frameworks, goes on to shape our relationships with people and the world. In contrast to un-learning, the concepts of *activism, global, and citizenship* are used widely in societal and educational (policy) practices, often in neutral, apolitical and ahistorical ways that erases, both intentionally and unintentionally, the traces of power relations from which they emerge (de Oliveira Andreotti and de Souza 2012). As we have written elsewhere, salient models of nation-building and democracy (Daza 2013c), global education curriculum (Subedi 2013) and social justice (Subreenduth 2013a, b) may be well-intentioned but ultimately undermined by the habitualized thinking that undergirds them (Spivak 2012).

Unfortunately, many salient forms of thinking are inherently hierarchical and insidiously laden with a humanism that actually de-humanizes us (discussed in the next section). And too often, narratives on citizenship privilege human lives and discount the violence against ecology and non-human subjects, as well as forget the interdependent relationship between social and ecological justice (Martusewicz, Edmundson and Lupinacci 2015).

For example, one's entry point may make it easier to recognise BLM as *activism* than as *education* and *citizenship*, but BLM educates and illustrates different citizenships and learned frames of references. In a "Herstory" (not *his*tory) of BLM, Alicia Garza explains why Black freedom is world freedom:

> When we are able to end hyper-criminalization and sexualization of Black people and end the poverty, control, and surveillance of Black people, every single person in this world has a better shot at getting and staying free. When Black people get free, everybody gets free… (http://www.thefeministwire. com/2014/10/blacklivesmatter-2/)

Under the learned ideology of white supremacy, making sense of the BLM logic, which puts Black people at the center, not at the margin, requires un-learning white-black hierarchy (Daza 2009, 2013d; Merryfield and Subedi 2001) and ways in which the world has been divided (Willinsky 1998). Because of this lack of un-learning we see that a dominant response has been "all lives matter" (May 2016).

What we can learn from the plethora of articles and blogs trying to interpret, explain and analyze the hashtag "all lives matter" in response to BLM is that the distinction is not simply linguistic[3] but deeply onto-epistemological and difficult to address across and beyond the varying frames of belief (e.g., learned regimes of truth) that shape our thinking and being. In our view, ontology and epistemology cannot be separated (Daza and Gershon 2015); while space disallows a full discussion, onto-epistemology in a nutshell is how our sense of sense is generated: how we come to know/understand what world/beings/objects/selfs are, or what we think they are through our specific being/existence. This shows the immense challenge of translating across onto-epistemologies boundaries and the unlearning required to recognise multiple worlds (Spivak 2012). To understand the meaning of both thinking and being at the same time is to keep in tension simultaneously multiple ways of being and imagining/knowing the world, and relationships to it and within it—as in our example above of BLM, where alternate world views animate two phrases "black lives matter" and "all lives matter." The chapter brings forth these issues of onto-epistemological differences as we theorize global citizenship education through activism.

Although in our view we can never fully grasp all the frameworks within which we live and work, efforts to make our learning visible are not in vain (Kumashiro 2015). To be able to learn, un-learn, and re-learn is to notice, even if only sometimes and partially, how thinking, being, and imagining is

being learned, both somatically/physically and socially. Keeping with Gregory Bateson (b. 1904–d. 1980), we learn to learn; so, thinking, being and acting is not neutral, ahistorical, linear, or simply natural—but learned. In this same way, we cannot simply, linearly, or completely un-learn who we are, where and when we live, or how we think. Nevertheless, to notice these onto-epistemological dilemmas is education. When we can notice that there is no non-complicitous subject position, then we can better notice our interdependent relationships (e.g., why Black lives must matter for all lives to matter) and thus understand the limits and possibilities of global—this is *activism*.

Global citizen/ships are not outside of learned ways of being in (and dividing) the world (Willinsky 1998). In particular, it is a challenge to think citizenships outside of "nation"—Spivak (2012) refers to this as "nation-think". And we must remember that nation-states privilege certain identities/markers of citizenship (Banks 2004). Thus, our move is to engage with the current debates on citizenship in transnational (and unavoidably international) contexts and foreground how we un-learn to become global-national-local with tensions, privileges, and contradictions. To do this, we begin by outlining some of the assumptions that inform global citizenship education, such as humanism and nation-think. We also explain what we mean by "activism as/in/for global citizenship", reflected in our chapter's title. Then, our section on learning and teaching offers three frameworks that shape what activism looks like and the meaning or purpose of global citizenship. Each framework offers a different engagement with curricula material, concepts, and pedagogy.

Education as Becoming Human

Education may have many guises and it may play out differently in different geographies, but often formal education in the global North/West (USA, UK and Europe), and elsewhere via (neo)colonialism and globalization, is rooted in humanism, produced by Enlightenment/colonial ideas. Consequently, the production of the knowing/knowable subject (i.e., an educated subject) has a strong relationship with "becoming human"—developing, transmitting, training, and educating what is/can be cognitive, social, political, moral/ethical, physical/biological, and so on. This "becoming human" project, or the project of civilization, has served as the epistemological foundation of European coloniality: racism, capitalism, heteropatriarchy, etc. Therefore, while education is often touted as "the great equalizer", we ask readers to remember that it has served as a tool of both liberation and oppression (Subreenduth 2013a). Now, in the regime of a global capitalist economy, which some call "new imperialism" (Rhee 2009; Tikly 2004), nation-states educate citizens for the global market; becoming human means being consumers (Black 2010). The importance of these old and new histories cannot be overstated in global citizenship education, as we underline

how the analytical category of citizenship is not natural/neutral. Global citizenship education, akin with other attempts to educate differently (See Daza 2013a; Merryfield and Subedi 2001), is complicit with nation-think and the imperial legacy of becoming human.

Thus, we take up Spivak's charge: "we must learn to do violence to the epistemological difference and remember that this is what education 'is'" (2012, p. 10). Our task here is to displace such underpinnings and re-imagine what it means to be a human citizen subject (before Enlightenment dictated humanism). We are very concerned with noticing and un-learning deeply embedded and largely elusive transcendentalized frameworks, such as nation-think, as a means towards activism. Spivak (2012) argues that nation-think always already worlds spaces, bodies, and imaginaries. In the continuing yet new process of (post)colonial[4] worlding (Spivak 1985; Willinsky 1998; Coloma 2013), through the establishments of the Bretton Woods Agreements, the United Nations, and General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade (Read these examples not only as institutional, but also at the level of episteme.), we have learned to divide the world. For recent examples, Scotland is already its own nation with its own citizens but yet Scotland's referendum to become a separate nation-state from the UK failed, while the UK's referendum to withdraw from the European Union succeeded. The irony of these examples show the epistemic depth of nation-think in practice and that the nation is still prominent in understanding global citizenship and activisms.

For postcolonial nation-states, nation-think has been a way towards decolonizing and claiming their independence (e.g., Bandung Conference). However, as Tuhiwai Smith (1999) argues, in the context of Maori Indigenous knowledge, the very concept of "global citizenship" can easily recolonize those who are marginalized in society, such as Indigenous people who often are not included in conversations about "global". Likewise, refugee subjects, often seen as non-citizens of the world (or as stateless), are not part of the conversation on citizenship or global citizenship. Thus, we, as people and educators, often make sense of global citizenship education through nation-think. Rather, we argue for de-transcendentalizing "nation" and working through the politics on who and how we speak about global citizenship. Otherwise "global" risks being a new name for old (colonial, imperial, national) violences.

However, to de-transcendentalize modern notions of "citizen" and "nation" through which we have to think can prove impossible. Yet, being able to notice the limits helps us imagine different ways to think global and citizen, as you can't imagine what you already know (Spivak 2012). Also, foregrounding complicity moves towards un-learning habitual thinking, doing, and dividing (Daza 2012). In the face of the imperial legacy of becoming human, our central query is: How can we mobilize global citizenship to promote decolonization? For us, activism as/in/for global citizenship education is about engaging in anti-oppressive practices that can create a more equitable

world (Kumashiro 2015). As demonstrated in BLM, when Black Lives Matter, all lives can matter, because being as free as we can be is through interconnection, not individualism (see also Relativist section). Heeding to the historical understanding of how education has always been part of nation-state building projects, we invite readers in diverse geographies to work with questions: when educational institutions include global citizenship education, how does it work and what does it look like vis-a-vis its nation-state building project? How can activism be a new imagination for (making) global citizens? What are the limitations and dangers of activism as/for global citizens? What are other ways we can think of activism as/in/for learning? And in doing so, what possibilities emerge for making different global citizens differently? Rather than try to get away from complicity and contradictions, we embrace a more complicated sense of *activism*, *global citizenship*, and *education*.

Why 'as/in/for'

Most discussions in the public domain assume there is one, best/right/real truth to be told, but when relationships and meanings are "on the move"— fluid, multiple, contested—then activism and global citizenship education may imply, as well as mobilize, different educations: different learning, teaching, curricula, and assessment for different purposes. In this way, "global citizens" themselves and the processes of engaging with global citizenship, including in/formal education, *are* activism—actors shaping an interdependent society, whether within or beyond formal/State structures governing citizenship.

Activism ***within*** global citizenship and education often focuses on specific issues, such as immigration, aid, equity and access, climate change, literacy, BLM in itself and so on, that are transnational. In this way, people and groups in different geographies are not simply showing solidarity with, and support for, the issues of others, but the issue itself is transnational. In this case, structural racism does disproportionate violence to Black Lives. Although minoritized, people of colour are the majority of the world's population. The UK BLM movement is NOT about the USA but about State sponsored violence against Black lives that has deep roots in colonial white supremacy and anti-black racism. Social movements that desire to be heard in the global context can be seen as an exercise to claim citizenship rights that have been violated, whether historically or presently. They are often organized around how the everyday citizenship rights are being suppressed by people or organizations in power, as well as by epistemic regimes of power (e.g., white supremacy, heteronormativity, androcentrism, anthropocentrism, etc. (Martusewicz, Edmundson and Lupinacci 2015). Like the call to de-transcendentalize nation-think, identity politics offer both limits and possibilities. Consider how BLM's explicit support of Palestinian sovereignty can be seen as a way to ally with struggles of people of colour globally, especially

against States that use language, religion, white supremacy and other markers to suppress citizenship rights. (Un)Learning (about) oppression within and beyond nation-states can be useful sites to engage with different meanings and impossibilities of global citizenships, as well as how to become a critical ally, rather than a so-called liberator or white saviour, in global contexts across the planet (Rhee 2009, 2013; Subedi 2013).

Finally, activism *for* global citizenship might best be understood as a double desire for people to be both more planetarity and more worldly. According to Spivak (2012, p. xiv), global citizenship presents a double-bind between 'the uselessness of human life (planetarity) and the push to be useful (worldliness)':

> If we imagine ourselves as planetary accidents rather than global agents, planetary creatures rather than global entities, alterity remains underived from us, it is not our dialectical negation, it contains us as much as it flings us away—and thus to think of it is already to transgress, for, in spite of our forays into what we metaphorize, differently, as outer and inner space, what is above and beyond our own reach is not continuous with us as it is not, indeed, specifically discontinuous. (p. 339)

In other words, "to re-imagine the subject as planetary accident" (p. 339) interrupts "globalization [a]s achieved by the imposition of the same system of exchange everywhere," as well as us/them (self/Other) binaries (p. 335). In the planetary–global bind, the Other and self contain and repel each other equally, which provides a different onto-epistemological engagement (Thinking with our previous onto-epistemological example; "All Lives Matter" is imposed as origin/al in response to BLM). In contrast, often what/who is imagined as Other in our habitual thinking is positioned as derived from the self and in a deficit-bind with what/who is imagined as the original source. In this way, the Other is falsely disconnected from the self as the self is positioned as superior, more advanced, civilized (human), normal, and/or the animator and standard-bearer. The following section addresses how educators can put unlearning to work vis-à-vis activism as/in/for global citizenship in education.

Three Frameworks that Shape What Activism Looks Like and the Meaning and Purpose of Global Citizenship in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment

In this section, we present three major ways that activism as/in/for global citizenship is approached in classrooms (Subedi 2013; Subreenduth 2013a). It is important to emphasize that the first two dominant frameworks are discussed through our critiques as they rarely involve unlearning. The third framework offers our possibility for activism through global citizenship education. We utilize Marjane Satrapi's (2003) graphic novel *Persepolis*

as an example of how we can do un-learning by providing different ways of inquiry into a curricular text, which may offer opportunities of un-learning habitualized thinking. While thinking with theoretical frameworks has limits, including the pretense of seeming more complete, distinct, and straightforward than they actually are, we believe providing analytical frames of inquiry through which to engage curricula material, concepts, and pedagogy can help educators and students notice how and what we learn.

Deficit Model

As discussed at the end of the last section, otherness (alterity) is precisely when an Other is imagined as derived from a source (e.g., the self as origin/al, superior, standard-bearer) and consequently is subordinate, deviant, isolated, and disconnected. The deficit model rests on these taken-for-granted assumptions about so-positioned original sources of animation against which anything else is positioned as deficient. The Other becomes a problem to be fixed and the solution is to be more like its source. However, like a vicious circle, the Other can never be the source within this overriding deficit framework. Unlearning deficit-thinking is to think the Other is already whole, complete and connected.

Under the deficit model, activism is not focused on unlearning frameworks or changing systems and societal structures. Rather, it is myopically focused on helping, liberating, civilizing/humanizing, or saving deficient Others (cultures, groups, individuals). For example, rather than examining how a problem in a particular local setting interconnects with structural issues or with other communities and societies, a deficit approach treats each problem as if it is contained and often self-inflicted. Then, the deficient, undeveloped or underdeveloped, uncivilized, and/or undemocratic Other (individual, nation-state, etc.) is viewed as the root cause for the problem. Under a linear model of development and a modern discourse of progress, this deficit approach sees "whiteness" and North/Western, English-speaking, and capitalist/industrialized societies as more progressive and democratic. Consequently, the global majority is positioned as less civilized (Subedi 2013). Under a deficit framework, the solution is to be more like the so-positioned originals, in this case North/West societies, and to take up Euro-American (colonial/imperial) notions of becoming human. For example "universal human rights" are part and parcel of the Enlightenment project: rights, human, individual, and constitutional are differently operating, and interweaved with local–national–international–global histories and politics that deny and grant humanity, rights, land, and status such as citizen (Spivak 2012).

Because people and groups endowed with full humanity as agency (can) act on problems (Martusewicz, Edmundson and Lupinacci 2015; Subreenduth 2013a, b), under the deficit model, the activist struggle is to gain human, individual, and civil rights to protect the Other, rather than questioning how

these concepts exclude vast peoples in the first place. It may include the desire to save the Other or make the Other a (lesser) version of the self: a thinking that is deeply implicated in colonial racial discourse, civilizing missions, etc. When activism is approached as a rescue, charity, service, aid, or development project, Freire (1970/2000) has warned that "one cannot expect positive results from an educational or political action program which fails to respect the particular view of the world held by the people. Such a program constitutes cultural invasion, good intentions notwithstanding" (p. 95).

We return to BLM for another example of how the deficit model works. As justifications for police killing black people or State violence against Black people, one of the dominant counter arguments against BLM includes high black-on-black crime rates and Black people's non-compliant attitudes and behaviors toward law enforcement. This deficit approach works by trying to make State violence against Black people their own fault and by consequently implying that it is something Black people can fix themselves, if they change themselves, which is sometimes referred to among people of colour as "acting white." However, a deeper analysis can reveal how inherently biased societal institutions disproportionately target and impact Black people because they are Black; e.g., US Department of Justice report (2015) on the Ferguson Police Department shows racial bias and revenue generation were integral to institutions.

The deficit model is well entrenched. Most of us must actively and continuously un-learn deficit-thinking. In this way, un-learning is pedagogical and activism. In teaching and learning, we can start by imagining Others as complete and not problems to be fixed. We can notice issues are rarely isolated but rather local-national-global all at once. We can notice deficit-thinking in ourselves and the world by examining current and historical events and asking who/what is Othered/centered. We can refuse binaries and static categories. We can engage in broader structural analyses that do not blame victims and survivors for their own oppression. We might better question how humanism mobilizes benevolence and other activisms based on deficit-thinking about humans and localities.

Relativist–Pluralist–Neoliberal Multiculturalist Model

In attempts to move away from a deficit model, the relativist, pluralist, or neoliberal multiculturalist approach emphasizes understanding the existence of different solutions, perspectives, and approaches to a problem. It seeks to include as diverse perspectives as possible in the process of inquiring an issue, soliciting ideas and solutions, and making decisions about how to bring changes. However, this approach misses how our habit of thinking, in which we do not examine our own habit of thinking (Spivak 2012), contributes to ever-increasing inequality.

A simple move for inclusion and plurality, which appears to be a new (and thus better) thinking, has become a new habit of thinking (and neoliberalism thrives on proliferation). Yet, this valorization for diversity that pretends to redress the existing unequal structures of differences such as race, gender, and nation-state cunningly masks how it supports and rationalizes neoliberal (or new imperial) violence (see below and Rhee 2013, for theorizing neoliberal multiculturalism). The binary between self and Other is often indeterminate, economic, political, and cultural; inequality and discrimination continue. By assuming "we are all the same" or "we are all different but the same," Western orientation toward universal human rights (Subedi 2013, p. 630) and individualism based in humanism is reinscribed. Through this inclusive model—fixated with an individual/private self as a choice maker with free wills—certain members of our planet are systematically excluded and become disposable. We lose the ability to account for historical and structural matrices that allow the existence of such a self who is responsible only for one's self. Individual freedom of choice, disguised as a tool for achieving global equity, is in fact a neoliberal concept that plays a pivotal role in managing difference through subjectification, humanization, and dehumanization (Subreenduth 2013a).

Under this framework, global citizenship becomes a "neoliberal racial project" (Rhee 2013); individuals and/or national citizens, as markers and extensions of nation-states—being able to compete and consume (the Other) in the global market. Often, becoming global is to consume or exploit in order to benefit the individual self (and this happens at different levels of self, i.e., individuals, institutions, and States). Un-learning this framework is crucial for educators like us, who work in institutions that promote global citizenship education, sometimes as a way to learn how to compete and exploit rather than be more planetary and interconnected.

For example, when Western liberal discourse problematically equates African female genital mutilation with female cosmetic surgeries in Western (industrialized) societies and then both of these phenomena are framed simply as individual choices, this logic presents neoliberal individualism (Sensoy and Marshall 2010). When consuming/appropriating/eating the Other's culture and traditions including spiritualities is considered as activism for self-salvation from capitalism's malaise (e.g., the popularity and Westernisation of yoga), it perpetuates neocolonial individualism (Rhee and Subedi 2014). Neoliberal individualism is epitomized when an elite from any cultural/ethnic group marketises one's cultural identity to claim a Self that automatically generates the Other, e.g., "Tiger Mother" (Rhee 2013) or erase/denies historically and structurally institutionalized conditions of life to claim "we are (all different but) all the same" [e.g., Prince Ea's (2017) music video and Ko and Ko's critique (2017)]. What binds the above examples is that they reinforce a habit of thinking through which we learn to think that individuals

can make different choices and triumph anything and everything (history, institutionalized power differences, materiality, policies, international politics, military violences, climate change, etc.). This puts individuals as primarily responsible for our condition of life but inevitably sustains hierarchical, deficit-thinking. Due to space limitations, we refer readers to the above references that work to un-learn neoliberal/multiculturalist thinking rather than delineating those critiques here. Below, we take up Marjane Satrapi's (2003) *Persepolis* to present a decolonising approach for activism as/in/for global citizenship education.

Decolonising Pedagogy

A decolonising framework queries how histories shape the present articulations of (global) citizenship. It also provides anti-essential perspectives on how we have come to understand concepts such as culture, nation, and citizenship through how the Other has been written in dominant imagination (Subedi 2013). By sharing the value of contrapuntal reading (Said 1993), educators can help students unlearn the complex relationship between local and global and how politics shape the articulations of global citizenship.

As a way to discuss this approach, we use Marjane Satrapi's (2003) *Persepolis*[5] to explore the complex meanings of national and global citizenships as analytical categories. Written as a memoir of growing up in Iran, the author as narrator is a 13-year-old girl who shows how the political events and the socialization of children in schools/society cannot be separated from broader historical events that are integral parts of colonial and neocolonial formation. Educators/students may notice how they, too, cannot be separated from historical formation. By touching upon national and international citizenship politics and power differences, sex/gender, and religion, the text can enable readers to see the realm of international in contrapuntal ways and un-learn how one is situated in local–national–global citizenship narratives. In this way, the memoir offers a way to examine how global citizenship is a contradictory identity/category: it is both inclusionary and exclusionary and has the potential to critique nationalistic and oppressive ways of conceptualizing citizenship ideals.

Persepolis is a text that can enable students to think through how one is situated in the broader colonial and neocolonial history and contemporary white politics on racism and Islamophobia. A postcolonial (un-learning) pedagogical approach is not simply about understanding a text but using the text to understand one's own self, world, and Other, as habitualized through nation-think, race/identity politics, etc. This is a project of deep un-learning. As Satrapi explores how she is situated and shaped, educators/students can explore their own habitualization. When used as a decolonizing pedagogy, *Persepolis* enables students to do the following:

1. Engage the inter/national realm of activisms, politics, cultures, educations, and citizenships, and particularly explore how the concept of "local" in a given place is complexly intertwined with the national and global;
2. Un-learn how one has learned global, especially about other societies, and particularly about Iran, a nation-state that has been consistently demonized in US textbooks and media;
3. Notice how complex citizenship narratives are and particularly how this story about growing up in Iran disrupts stereotypes of culture and religion;
4. Explore complicity through the characters, particularly regarding socioeconomics, gender, religion and State/political oppression and violence;
5. Study ourselves and critique our own learning and positionality in the world and particularly notice our complicities, whether or not intentional, in local/global oppressions.

Below we outline a decolonising (un-learning) pedagogical approach using *Persepolis*. What we highlight here is that readers may engage the text in different ways, while the text itself may NOT do the work of unlearning (*activ*ism) unless educators and learners interrogate their own self-other-world relationships, assumptions, sense making, and participation in the realms of activism as/in/for global citizenship. Thus, while we offer how *Persepolis* as sample material can be used for decolonising and un-learning, we do not suggest prescribed curricula or offer any specific lesson plans or other prescriptive methods of teaching. Rather, questions are posed as a potential means for un-learning to take place. In our view, activism cannot be prescribed. As we discuss in the BLM example at the beginning of the chapter, one's entry point may make it easier to recognise BLM as *activism* than as *education* and *citizenship*, but BLM educates and illustrates different citizenships and learned frames of references. Similarly, one's entry point may make it easier to recognise *Persepolis* as education (and global citizenship education, in particular). However, as we posit herein, a decolonising approach to unlearning offers the means of activism, precisely because we cannot fully untangle activism as/in/for global citizenship education. Once we approach the concepts as if they have their own territory—metaphorically—we risk falling into our habitual thinking. Below, we try to show how the concept of global citizenship (education) has more critical pedagogical usefulness when it is theorized as an act of engaging how one is implicated in inter/national history and contemporary political formations (e.g., globalization, Islamophobia, etc.) and as a practice of a complex identity that enables the self to critique how, and what, one has learned what s/he knows and who s/he becomes (Table 37.1).

Table 37.1   Teaching and learning pedagogy/possibilities

The text can offer analytical inquiries into the following:	*Teaching and learning pedagogy/possibilities*
How citizenship narratives are influenced by both colonial and neo-colonial discourses	Citizenship politics in Iran are addressed, particularly the rule of fundamentalist governments in the 1980s; how authoritarian regimes deploy State sanctioned surveillance mechanisms; the use military and police to suppress dissents; and how various political propaganda discipline people and daily life. Satrapi frames the suppression of rights in relation to broader struggles to critique Arab, European (particularly British) and US economic and political interventions in Iraq. The text enables readers to recognise how internationals in Iran focus on Iranian resources (oil) to enrich international corporations and international governments. Educators might ask: What are the histories and politics of one's own self/citizenship? What does international mean in different localities?
The relationship between gender and citizenship	The text serves as a critique of citizenship that is shaped by patriarchal values. Satrapi examines questions of gender by noting how over centuries men have yielded power by engaging in various wars. Aligned with war narratives (described later), she examines how men in power "play" the politics of the State to discipline people on ways to perform citizenship. Women are used by the State to discipline other women on citizenship, e.g., during the Khomeini era, women teachers mandated girls to wear a headscarf as a way to show allegiance to the State; serving the patriarchal State, women tell other women how to be patriotic and how not to protest the State. Yet, notably, gender is not a monolithic category in the text. Women of various social and political beliefs negotiate different forms of citizenship and contest the politics of the State differently. Educators can ask: What are markers of citizenship and patriotism from one's own experience? How do these markers discipline women and men? How are citizenships gendered/sexed?
The relationship between religion and citizenship	The text shows how State politics and religious dogmatism shape socialisation and schooling. It demonstrates how family lives are regulated, and how State sponsored political activities encourage fundamentalism. Educators and students can explore how their socialisation, schooling, and family life are influenced. The text also examines ways in which people question and resist State sponsored religious citizenship practices. Students can examine in their own localities ways in which religion, whether openly or sublimely, enters State and school cultures; and how (quasi-governmental) organizations may attempt to influence school policies or practices that support their agenda. Students may recognise and critique how marginalized religious backgrounds are silenced; e.g., often in US and Western contexts, what counts as "authentic" religion is conflated with brands of Christianity, whereas Islam or Hinduism is racialized (Rizvi 2004). The text generates discussion on Islamophobia; educators could extend via comparisons with anti-Semitism, etc.

(continued)

Table 37.1 (continued)

The text can offer analytical inquiries into the following:	Teaching and learning pedagogy/possibilities
Critical consciousness and the value of questioning people in power	Satrapi questions social norms, especially taboos that impose restrictions on what can/not be said or done. Educators using the text can help students understand how Satrapi does/not conform to socialization and dominant habits of thinking inculcated by schools. The text offers examples of how labels (communist, hijab, etc.) are used as markers of who/what is il/legitimate; students can un-learn by questioning what marks "real" citizenship, and one as "stranger" and "foreigner" (Ahmed 2000) in different localities. The text asks students to constantly interrogate how one is asked to be loyal citizen and raises questions over the value of questioning or resisting practices that are imposed in society. Questioning power, the text also examines how torture is a way to control/discipline subversive subjects to State mandates. Educators can ask how torture has been justified by their own State and its implication to how (national) citizenship discourses are mobilized within the rhetoric of "protecting" the nation-state (US war-on-terror, etc.). The text also critiques war and ways in which wars are waged in the name of protecting economic and political interests. *Persepolis* asks who supported the regime of Saddam Hussein and then invaded Iraq? By examining who supports and invades, educators/students can examine the degree and consequences of different complicities, as well as critique the concept of "ally". Satrapi notes the impact of Iraq and Iran wars and how people coped with being at war. Educators can ask how war impacts different peoples/places differently, e.g., as death of people and infrastructure, im/migration, military service, economic gains/losses, etc.
Relationship between privilege and citizenship	Educators can explore how individuals and families from different circumstances (socioeconomic, etc.) encounter or perform citizenship differently. Because of her middle class family privilege, Satrapi and her family have access to mobility (passport, travel to Europe, etc.), economic resources (work, car, apartment, etc.) and the ability to change schools and study abroad. Contrariwise, Mehri, a maid/nanny, has lived with Satrapi's family since Mehri was eight years old (p. 34). Mehri, is not formally educated in school and does not learn to read and write. Mehri's character is a reminder of different citizenships and that global citizenship is not accessible for many, e.g., women who are poor, not formally educated, and who sacrifice living with their own families in order to make a living in cities. Educators might ask how citizenship is classed?

Conclusion and Future Research

No lives matter, until black lives matter…when black lives matter, then all lives matter….

When we can begin to imagine the Other as not from the self (e.g., 'them' as not from 'us') is to begin to un-learn agency and activism underpinned by the becoming human project that can reinforce us/them and deficit-thinking about the Other. However, planetary subjectivity is not to become one whole or be the same as, neither is it to be separated and disconnected (i.e., the impossibility of non-complicity is not homogenization or the reduction of difference) nor is it neoliberal individualism. Activism as an inherent part of educating for, and unlearning as an inherent part of activism for global citizenship, is to rethink agency, activism, and education regarding who can act, how and what it means. Global citizenship in such (post)Enlightenment ruins is necessarily within nation-think but must also transgress it—to interrogate the taken-for-granted and critically engage with global histories, politics, structures.

Activism in this chapter presents (un/re)learning as transgressive. Thus, this chapter emphasizes if (and how) we might engage people in learning to learn doubly—being, thinking, and acting both planetary and worldly. Part of this work is helping educators and young people notice how we are always already local, national, and global. When we notice the relationship among our local selves/lives, the planet, and the local-national-global, then we have the chance to learn doubly or otherwise. This chapter suggests how we might learn and teach this "peculiar mind-set" (Spivak 2012, p. 339) by approaching global citizenship education as/in/for activism and vice versa by approaching activism as/in/for global citizenship education.

Notes

1. In 2012, the hashtag "#BlackLivesMatter" was created in response to the acquittal of George Zimmerman, the man who killed Trayvon Martin, a Black teenager, in the US. BLM has continued to grow through social media as a response to racist policing and violences against Black lives (see blacklivesmatter. com). It also has entered formal political dialogue on the national stage, inciting the US presidential race, for example (Rosier et al. 2016).

2. We might discuss "bring back our girls" in Nigeria (http://www.bringbackourgirls. ng/), the Arab Spring (see Jamshidi 2013), or other trans/national projects on which we publish (See Daza 2006, 2007, 2013a; Rhee 2009, 2013; Subedi 2013; Subreenduth 2013a, b).

3. Yet, we can see at surface-level how concepts are elusive and shaped. Pearce's (2015) article "Why the term 'Black Lives Matter' can be so confusing" states: "the words could be serving as a political rallying cry or referring to the activist organization. Or it could be the fuzzily applied label used to describe a wide range of protests and conversations focused on racial inequality" (n.p.). According to BLMs Wikipedia entry "The phrase 'Black Lives Matter' can refer to a

Twitter hashtag, a slogan, a social movement, or a loose confederation of affiliated groups and organizations that advocate for multiple causes related to racial injustice" (BLM, n.d.).

4. Read the postcolonial as not after the colonial era but as "a reminder of continuously changing, adapting, persistent colonial and neocolonial structures and relations that have chained all of us (Rhee and Subedi 2014).

5. Providing alternative access to the curricular material, in 2007, Marjane Satrapi and Vincent Paronnaud directed a film based on the graphic novel.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. London: Psychology Press.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2004). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Black, C. (2010). *Schooling the world (2010): The white man's last burden*. Lost People Films.

BLM. (n.d.). In Wikipedia. Retrieved August 22, 2016, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_Lives_Matter.

Coloma, R. S. (2013). Empire: An analytical category for educational research. *Educational Theory, 63*(6), 639–658.

Daza, S. L. (2006). Local responses to globalizing trends: Student-produced materials at a Colombian public university. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 19*(5), 553–571.

Daza, S. L. (2007). Student activism (Latin American). In G. L. Anderson & K. G. Herr (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of activism and social justice* (pp. 1347–1349). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daza, S. L. (2009). The Non-innocence of recognition: subjects and agency in education. In R. S. Coloma (Ed.), *The postcolonial challenge in education* (pp. 326–343). New York: Peter Lang.

Daza, S. L. (2012). Complicity as infiltration: The im/possibilities of research with/in NSF engineering grants in the age of neoliberal scientism. *Qualitative Inquiry, 18*(8), 773–786.

Daza, S. L. (2013a). Reading texts, subtexts, and contexts: Effects of (post)colonial legacies in/on curricular texts in different contexts. Special issue. *Qualitative Research in Education, 2*(3), 206.

Daza, S. L. (2013b). Putting Spivakian theorizing to work: Decolonizing neoliberal scientism in education. *Educational Theory, 63*(6), 601–619.

Daza, S. L. (2013c). Storytelling as methodology: Colombia's social studies textbooks after La Constitución de 1991 *Qualitative. Research in Education, 2*(3), 242–276. doi:10.4471/qre.2013.28.

Daza, S. L. (2013d). A promiscuous (feminist) look at grant-science: How colliding imaginaries shape the practice of NSF policy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(5), 580–598.

Daza, S. L. & Gershon, W. (2015; 20th Anniversary Issue). Senses beyond the Eye/I: Sound, silence and sonification as inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*. doi:10.1177/1077800414566692.

de Oliveira Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. M. T. (Eds.). (2012). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Jamshidi, M. (2013). *The future of the Arab spring: Civic entrepreneurship in politics, art, and technology startups*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Ko, A., & Ko, S. (2017, January 29). Reasons why the "I am not a label" video makes no sense. Retrieved from http://www.4synapses.com/education/i-am-not-a-label-labels-were-made-up-to-divide-us/.

Kumashiro, K. (2015). *Teaching and learning Toward Social Justice*. New York: Routledge.

Maira, S. (2009). *Missing: Youth, citizenship and empire after 9/11*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Martusewicz, R. A., Edmundson, J., & Lupinacci, J. (2015). *Ecojustice education: Toward diverse, democratic, and sustainable communities*. New York: Routledge.

May, S. (July 13, 2016). #AllLivesMatter hashtag is racist, critics say. USA TODAY. Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2016/07/13/why-saying-all-lives-matter-opposite-black-lives-matter/87025190/.

McKenzie, S. (5 August 2016). Black lives matter block London's Heathrow Airport. *CNN*. Retrieved from http://edition.cnn.com/2016/08/05/europe/black-lives-matter-uk-heathrow-shutdown/.

Merryfield, M. M., & Subedi, B. (2001). Decolonizing the mind for world-centered global education. *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities*, (pp. 277–290).

Pearce, M. (October 20, 2015). "Why the term 'Black Lives Matter' can be so confusing". *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved July 13, 2016 from http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-black-lives-matter-explainer-20151020-story.html.

Prince E. (2017, Jan 29). I am Not Black, You are NOT White. [video file] Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q0qD2K2RWkc.

Rhee, J. (2013). The neoliberal racial project, governmentality, and the Tiger mother. *Educational Theory, 63*(6), 561–580.

Rhee, J. (2009). International education, new imperialism, and technologies of self: Branding the globally educated self. *Multicultural Education Review, 1*(1), 55–81.

Rhee, J., & Subedi, B. (2014). Colonizing and decolonizing project of re/covering spirituality. *Educational Studies, 50,* 340–357.

Rizvi, F. (2004). Debating globalization and education after September 11. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 157–171.

Rosier, S., Aubert, E., Aull, C. Coyle, K. Eirich, K. Haas, J., & Hilton, S. (2016). 2016 presidential candidates on the Black Lives Matter movement. *Ballotpedia*. Retrieved from https://ballotpedia.org/2016_presidential_candidates_on_the_Black_Lives_Matter_movement.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Satrapi, M. (2003). *Persepolis*. New York: Pantheon.

Sensoy, Ö., & Marshall, E. (2010). Missionary girl power: Saving the third world one girl at a time. *Gender and Education, 22*(3), 295–311.

Spivak, G. (2012). *An aesthetic education in the era of globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spivak, G. (1985). Three women's texts and a critique of imperialism. *Critical Inquiry: Race, writing, and difference, 12*(1), 243–261.

Subedi, B. (2013). Decolonizing the curriculum for global perspectives. *Education Theory, 63,* 621–638. doi:10.1111/edth.12045.

Subedi, S. & Daza, S. L. (Eds). (2008). *Postcolonial Perspectives on Education: A Special Issue. Race Ethnicity and Education*, 11(1).

Subreenduth, S. (2013a). Theorizing social justice ambiguities in an era of neoliberalism: The case of post-apartheid South Africa. *Educational Theory, 63*, 581–600.

Subreenduth, S. (2013b). Insidious colonialism in post-apartheid education: Interplay of black teacher narratives, educational policy, and textbook analysis. *Qualitative Research in Education, 2*(3), 213–241.

Tikly, L. (2004). Education and the new imperialism. *Comparative education, 40*(2), 173–198.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* London; New York: Zed Books; University of Otago Press; Distributed in the USA exclusively by St Martin's Press.

United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) Civil Rights Division. (2015). Investigation of the Ferguson Police Department. Retrieved from https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson_police_department_report.pdf.

Verma, R. (Ed.). (2010). *Be the change: Teacher, activist, global citizen*. NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. (1986). *Decolonizing the mind*. London: James Currey.

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Authors' Biography

Stephanie (Daza) Curley is re-searcher of interdependence and social-somatic processes of learning to learn. Her research falls across four areas: (1) Local Responses to Global Policy Practice Trends in Education and Society; (2) Social Science Research Methodology; (3) STEM Culture and Philosophies; and (4) Difference. Steph is editor of *Educational Studies*, the official journal of the American Education Studies Association and Research Fellow in the Education and Social Research Institute at Manchester Metropolitan University, where she also directs the Masters in Research.

Jeong-eun Rhee is a professor of education at Long Island University, New York. Her scholarship focuses on anti-oppressive education through the lens of race, class, gender, immigration and other socially constructed differences; qualitative research methodology; and international education, empire, and politics of knowledge. Her commitment has been to opening up a space for the unsayable, silenced, and marginalized in the production of knowledge to delineate historical, material, and spiritual interdependence.

Binaya Subedi teaches classes on diversity and equity, global education, race, poverty and immigration at the Ohio State University. He has published articles in a number of journals and is editor of the journal *Educational Studies*. Professor Subedi has conducted community work in Nepal and in urban areas of the Midwest. His current research examines the identities and experiences of refugee/immigrant youth in mid-western U.S. cities.

Sharon Subreenduth's research and scholarship locate the historical and contemporary context of curriculum production and practice and interconnect local and global knowledge, responsibility and accountability, while addressing issues of cultural identity, power, race, gender, class, and colonialism and imperialism.