

# Difference and Conflict in Global Citizenship in Higher Education in Canada

*Vanessa Andreotti* University of Oulu (Finland)

*David Jefferess* UBC Okanagan (Canada)

*Karen Pashby* OISE, University of Toronto (Canada)

*Cash Rowe* University of Calgary (Canada)

*Paul Tarc* University of Western Ontario (Canada)

*Lisa Taylor* Bishop's University (Canada)

This paper presents a multi-voiced response to the question: how might conflict and difference be conceptualised in global citizenship education (GCE) imaginaries in Canada? It offers responses from six educators engaged with GCE research and practice in higher education institutions in Canada<sup>1</sup>. The responses address different angles and issues related to difference and GCE, such as multiculturalism, (neo) colonialism, paternalism, indigeneity, internationalism, neoliberalism, benevolence and national identity building in Canada.

**Keywords:** global citizenship education; conflict; difference; higher education

## Introduction

An increasing body of literature testifies to a growing interest in global citizenship education's (GCE) highly productive and contested potential. In Canada, GCE is situated in the space between the nation and the world (Richardson, 2008) and its definitions, approaches and orientations have changed 'with the times and Canada's evolving image of itself' (Richardson, 2008:115). GCE in Canada has been framed as paradoxical in the sense that it tends to project a transnational identity at the same time that it reinforces Canadian exceptionalism (Jefferess, 2008). Jefferess (2008) states that the result of this trend is, in part, a patriotic discourse that reaffirms specifically Canadian 'values' and 'attitudes' and a need to export these values to the rest of the world. Recent publications in Canada and internationally have analysed and critiqued various conceptualisations of global citizenship and explored different frameworks for its application within educational contexts (see, for example, Peters et al, 2007; Abdi and Schultz, 2008; O'Sullivan and Pashby, 2008). However, perspectives that are based on ontological assumptions that challenge Western humanism, such as some indigenous, religious, spiritual, philosophical and 'ethnic' perspectives, are still widely underrepresented in this body of literature (Andreotti and Souza, 2008).

A postcolonial analysis (Said, 1978; Spivak, 1990; Bhabha, 1994; Chakrabarty, 2000; Young, 2001) of the global citizenship debate internationally would interpret this invisibility as lack of analysis of issues of power and difference in these discussions, often focused on constructing consensus and saturated with normative and universalist claims. Within this logic, conflict acquires a negative connotation and difference tends to be seen as something that needs to be eliminated. The privileging of Western humanism and its culturally situated ontological and epistemological assumptions generate a self-perpetuating pattern: certain ways of perceiving/knowing the world attain universal status and are perceived to be culturally neutral while other ways are conceptualised as 'culture' – they are ascribed only local value or appropriated as an exotic part of the dominant knowledge/culture.

In his critique of the privileging of Western knowledges in higher education (HE), Ashis Nandy (2000) argues that the role of universities is to pluralise the future by pluralising knowledge in the present. Gayatri Spivak (1999) asserts that, for this pluralisation of knowledges to happen, those who have been used to defining the terms of the debate need to learn to listen to those who have been excluded from the table. According to Spivak (2004), this requires a pedagogical project based on an un-coercive rearrangement of desires where the focus is on unlearning and 'learning to learn from below'. The theorisation of this pedagogical project has been one of the concerns of postcolonial theory, which, in the words of Leela Gandhi (1998:37) focuses on the possibility of imagining a 'non-coercive relationship or dialogue with the excluded Other of Western humanism'.

This possibility and the challenges posed by universalist/normative dominant patterns of thought provide the context in which the central question in this article was formulated: how might conflict and difference be conceptualised in global citizenship (GCE) imaginaries in Canada? Six researchers/educators engaged with the GCE debate articulate their situated responses to this question and reflect on the complexities of working with difference in their contexts of teaching and research. David Jefferess' response engages with ideas of benevolence, hospitality and (the forgetting of) aboriginality in GCE initiatives at the University of British Columbia (UBC) in Kelowna. Drawing on her research and teaching at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) in Toronto, Karen Pashby outlines the problematic connections between discourses related to GCE and those related to nation building and multiculturalism in Canada. Lisa Taylor explores the psychic dynamics of learning drawing from her research in global justice teacher education at Bishop's University near Montreal. Paul Tarc, from the University of Western Ontario, in London (Canada), critiques 'parochial' internationalisation approaches that support the propagation of simplistic and depoliticised notions of culture and interculturalism. Cash Rowe, a Cree academic at the University of Calgary and Vanessa Andreotti, from the University of Oulu, make use of the metaphor of the 'soul wound' to explore GCE's unfulfilled potential to address metaphysical questions

and suture the fabric of relationships that has been torn by colonialism. Each situated response offers a critical analysis of a key dimension of difference and conflict in GCE in different contexts.

### **David Jefferess (UBC) on benevolence and hospitality**

'Thinking Globally. Acting Globally. From Here.' is one of the slogans of the global citizenship initiative at the University of British Columbia (UBC). Like other Canadian universities, the UBC system has foregrounded global citizenship in its academic plan, broadly defining it in terms of service learning, intercultural awareness, internationalisation, and the study of global social inequality.

The placement of the tag, 'From Here,' after the appeal to think and act globally seems to situate the work of global citizenship, but I want to argue that the phrase 'From Here' reflects the way in which our situation, our entitlement, to be global citizens is naturalised. The ethics and politics of our positioning 'here' is crucial to interrogating the presumption of global citizenship to 'seek to imagine and work towards a better world' (University of British Columbia, 2004). Indeed, we are able to 'imagine and work towards a better world' because of how and where we are situated as Canadians and, in this case, as UBC students/faculty. Our cosmopolitanism ironically reinforces a politics of inclusion and exclusion, local and foreign, which is both national and reflective of the differential positions of status within the nation/campus.

Paradoxically the tag, 'From Here,' does not demarcate place at all; rather it normalises and dehistoricises the local, or who we are. In the rhetoric of global citizenship, certain members of the UBC community, the we, who can be global citizens, are unmarked, in contrast to those who are marked as members of 'cultural communities' on the campus, namely those students defined as 'aboriginal' or 'international' who are 'here' but are produced within GCE discourse as outsiders. Their presence gives meaning to the phrase, 'From Here,' as their 'difference' reinforces our sense of belonging here.

In his musings on cosmopolitanism, Jacques Derrida claims that '*ethics is hospitality.*' Hospitality, he argues, 'has to do with the *ethos*, that is, the residence, one's home, the familiar place of dwelling inasmuch as it is a manner of being there, the manner in which we relate to ourselves and to others, to others as our own or as foreigners' (Derrida, 2002:16-7). One can welcome the neighbour or stranger into their home because there is no dispute over whose home it is; indeed the act of hospitality to the stranger is the naturalisation of that belonging, that possession. Global citizenship, in contrast, is typically outward looking, seeking to recognise relationships beyond the borders of nation and locality; often this is done as if our relation to others, elsewhere, was not present, historical, and material, for instance in the chocolate we eat, the gas that fuels our cars and buses, 'our' mathematics, or the land that we 'own.' And it is done as if that material relationship was not

historical and structural, but the result of fortune (i.e. as Canadians we are fortunate, and so we have a responsibility to...). To some degree, to be a global citizen requires going elsewhere to learn and, more often than not, to 'help.' This comfort in leaving one's own home and entering an other's in order to be hospitable to that other might better be called benevolence (Jefferess, 2008). But, like hospitality, it reaffirms our identity as 'From Here,' which signifies place or home as well as a manner of being or relation: benevolent.

For people, like myself, a non-indigenous person who is part of/naturalised as the UBC Okanagan community, our here should not be so comfortable, or our place in it unmarked. The university is located on unceded territory of the Syilx people; the Okanagan Nation Alliance asserts: 'We survive and continue to govern our mother and her resources for the good of all for all time' (Okanagan National Alliance, n.d.). Our here has a specific history and present. In various ways, the place of the various UBC campuses is acknowledged; one of the commitments of the university is 'Aboriginal engagement,' but this form of acknowledgment typically reflects not so much recognition (i.e. that the UBC community *includes* aboriginal people and is situated on unceded aboriginal territories) as colonial hospitality. The Syilx people have been made the stranger; services and initiatives directed towards 'aboriginal people' are placed in the category of global and civil citizenship: indigenous people are welcomed by the university to welcome those who occupy the land (i.e. people like me, the racially/culturally unmarked From Here) (UBC, 2010:13).

There is a stark contrast here between hospitality within indigenous epistemologies and on-going (white) settler 'hospitality' which manifests itself as material and cultural appropriation. Thomas King (2003) reminds us that the presence of colonial history is often disavowed in the very act of recognition; he writes that as governments apologise they also convince themselves, and us, 'that Native rights were something that flowed from government largesse, or... that Native rights had been 'gifted' to Native people' (King, 2003:137). It is this rhetoric of the gift, of hospitality, that, I think, underwrites so much of the ethic of global citizenship.

The intercultural awareness of global citizenship, From Here, must be a critical examination of culture, history, relation, more than simply a celebration of (their) difference. Jeannette Armstrong writes:

Imagine how you as writers from the dominant society might turn over some of the rocks in your own garden for examination. Imagine... courageously questioning and examining the values that allow the de-humanising of people through domination... Imagine writing honestly, free from the romantic bias about the courageous 'pioneering spirit' of colonialist practice and imperialist process. Imagine interpreting for us your own people's thinking towards us, instead of interpreting for us our thinking, our lives, our stories (Armstrong, 1990:143-4).

For global citizenship to engage with conflict and difference, rather than seek to avoid and erase, we must examine how this discourse constitutes 'us' (and various others). Below, Rowe and Andreotti engage with the intersections of western and

indigenous epistemologies in the metaphor of the 'soul wound.' These sorts of collaborations are essential, both in terms of the personal and the cosmological. In order to address the normalisation of racial, cultural and regional privilege exhibited in the UBC initiatives, I think it is precisely these sorts of collaborations that will help to contend with difference and history rather than seek to understand 'them' or aim to overcome it, i.e., closing the dark chapters of our past.

Here are some questions to guide discussions around these themes that particularly take up Armstrong's (1990) assertion that non-indigenous people need to better understand the violence of their privilege and 'hospitality':

- How is it that we conceive of here and, by way of what dynamics of inclusion/exclusion, who belongs here?
- How does this comfort in being 'Canadian' allow us the privilege, and indeed the arrogance, to believe that global citizenship means exporting our values and practices to others in the world?
- How might those of us who are typically made normative in discourses of Canada and global citizenship, the 'civil' white folks, trouble our assumptions of place and relation, rather than continue to naturalise our being From Here and our position to help?

### **Karen Pashby (OISE) on Multiculturalism**

My response to the central question in this paper, how might conflict and difference be conceptualised in global citizenship education imaginaries in Canada is framed by my lived experience as a secondary school teacher who has taught in a variety of settings from northern Quebec, to suburban Brazil, to inner-city Toronto. My response is also shaped by the research that I am currently conducting into the theoretical and pedagogical relationship between global citizenship education and multiculturalism, while also teaching in the initial teacher education program at OISE/UT. I will attempt to connect the work of some key theorists and researchers in Canada writing about GCE and multiculturalism in order to argue that global citizenship education is connected to official and popular discourses of cultural diversity which, in the 'Canadian imaginary', are rooted in the language of 'multiculturalism' (Pashby 2006, 2008).

Even the most critical of multicultural and/or global citizenship education approaches are implemented within a context of various popular and official discourses of multiculturalism. Historically, multiculturalism has defined an 'inclusion' approach to cultural diversity in government policy, school curriculum, and popular understandings of Canada as a 'cultural mosaic'. Critics have pointed out how this framework tokenises minorities while encouraging those who fit the dominant norm to feel benevolent and even superior for 'including' others. In this sense, the 'mosaic' avoids any relation between diversity and conflict (e.g. Day 2000; Jones 2000).

James (2008:103) describes how despite 'multiculturalism' historical and structural racism has and continues to serve 'as a mechanism to maintain a culturally 'white' Canada.' Joshee (2009) argues that today there is a complex web of understanding around multicultural education. There is a return to a language of diversity and equity, but redefined by logics, 'inspired by the ideologies of neoliberalism and neo-conservatism' (Joshee, 2009:96). Diversity is altered so as to identify those members of groups seen as 'diverse' as 'the problem,' as lacking what is necessary to succeed in Canadian society, and as threats to the potential for social cohesion (Joshee and Pashby 2008).

According to Richardson (2008, 2008a), GCE is tied to nation-building, and conceptualisations of GCE in Canada have changed along with Canada's international status and perceived role in international affairs. He identifies shifts in perspectives that characterise how GCE has been imagined in curriculum and schooling. Historically, he locates an 'Imperial Imaginary' focused on the rights and responsibilities implicit in being a member of the British Empire and Commonwealth. Joshee and Pashby's work also identifies that Liberal Imperialism has and continues to structure Canadian understandings of citizenship and diversity (2008).

Broadly, Richardson (2008) argues that educators and theorists today are struggling to unite under one view of GCE based on two distinct global imaginaries with divergent perspectives on global issues, the 'ecological' and the 'monopolar.' According to Richardson (2008), the ecological imaginary encapsulates ecological relationships, interrelatedness, and the importance of physical and cultural diversity. In this view, GCE develops a sense of connectedness, empathy and appreciation for diversity and differences and contributes a critique of globalisation.

While the ecological imaginary has become popular with critical scholars and can be associated with social justice frameworks, Richardson (2008) defines a competing imaginary that threatens the transformative potential of the ecological imaginary. The monopolar imaginary is based on individualism and neoliberal economic ideals. While emphasising superficial differences, individuals are understood to have the same fundamental wants and needs. The monopolar encourages competition and an acceptance of globalisation as good (see also Shultz, 2007).

There is a parallel between this latter view and Joshee's (2009) concern about the way that a neoliberal-neoconservative context re-frames equity and diversity as individual development and social cohesion. Furthermore, Pike (2008) argues that more than half of a century of activity related to global orientations to citizenship education in Canada has not made a significant impact. He asserts that any attention to global education is implicit in 'cultural education'. Like Joshee (2009) and Richardson (2008), he suggests that a neoliberal vision of global education has taken over a more critical version: '[i]n the post-9/11 era, it seems the urgent need for greater global literacy has gone largely unheeded' (Pike, 2008:224).

Richardson (2008) argues that the opposing themes of interdependence and autonomy are evidence of the ideological roots played out through GCE language. Like Joshee (2009), Richardson (2008) suggests that the more complex and justice-oriented view has not been completely usurped by the neoliberal one but is very much threatened. While Richardson (2008) does not explicitly address the function of discourses of multiculturalism within these global imaginaries, his insistence on the relationship between GCE and nation-building and his findings on discourses of GCE in Canada echo Joshee's (2009) observations about historical and contemporary multiculturalisms in Canada. In particular, he traces the imperialistic versions of 'we' and 'they' and how inequitable differences are pathologised against a British, Western norm. The tensions between constructing social problems in terms of individual deficits and interrogating the structures that cause certain groups to be marginalised are common to multicultural education and GCE.

The work of Joshee (2009) around multiculturalism and of Richardson (2008) and Pike (2008) around GCE raise three key problems for research and theory into GCE in Canada. First, and connecting to some of David Jefferess's points (see above), GCE in Canada may be entrenched in a liberalist, multicultural view of diversity tied to historical discourses of imperialism that leave an unproblematised national identity. Left uncontested, this view may reify the premise that Canadians know how to do diversity while blaming those who do not fit a Canadian norm as the problem. Secondly, GCE initiatives may be limited in terms of criticality by an ideological and policy-based context of neoliberalism emphasising individualism and social cohesion over the interrogation of power imbalances, an issue that Paul Tarc also raises in his response. Thirdly, GCE can be used to encourage students to understand geopolitical issues 'out there' rather than as connected to problems around diversity, conflict, and power in local and national contexts.

I am interested in conducting more research to examine the degree to which distinctions are made between multicultural and global views of citizenship. I am curious about whether GCE has become an extension of multiculturalism or has ignored some of the local tensions inherent to multiculturalism. In my work with teacher candidates, I introduce critical literacy frameworks (such as *Through Others Eyes* and *Open Spaces for Dialogue and Enquiry*) to begin to probe at neutral understandings of 'Canadianness' and to assist them in problematising their view of multiculturalism as a 'done deal' and an 'accomplished feat' in Canada. I want to help them identify their assumptions about 'teaching diversity' in terms of teaching students from different cultural backgrounds and races in their classes in Toronto and teaching about diversity when they plan and deliver lessons relating to local, national, and global issues.

There is much to unpack around the way that unchallenged popular and official discourses of multiculturalism interrelate with and frame how global citizenship is imagined in a Canadian context. A major question to consider then is: to what

extent does global citizenship inherit, revise or step-over the way that multiculturalism has functioned as a central discourse of diversity and national identity in Canada? Furthermore, what kinds of research, theorising, policy changes and resource creation are needed a) to encourage a more critical and ecological imaginary of citizenship and diversity, and b) to combat the encroachment of individualistic and market-driven ideas of multiculturalism and global citizenship?

### **Lisa Taylor (Bishop University) on Paternalism, Affect and Pedagogy**

I believe our primary concern as educators and cultural activists lies in understanding the pull of paternalism when citizens of the North turn their attention to those of the South, and intervening into the ways a Eurocentric colonial imaginary and West-centred global order construct the terms and limits of thinkability in this encounter. Schueller (2009) has argued that even explicitly anticolonial projects share with traditions of colonial knowledge production a Eurocentric universalising framing of the 'global' that reinstates what Mignolo calls (2000) 'the colonial difference'. Such global framings tend to reinscribe the 'triumph of globality' (Radhakrishnan, 2003, cited in Schueller, 2009). In contemporary globalisation theorising what unites radically different political projects is a common 'totalising pretension' and 'presentist periodisation' that flatten complex, multicentric histories (Cooper, 2001:192-3).

Like my co-authors, then, I'm concerned that within GCE imaginaries, difference continues to structure hierarchical relations of feeling, knowing and being even as it is disavowed in claims of pluralism. We see this in discourses of charity or benevolence (the rhetoric of the gift and hospitality identified by David Jefferess) or 'global competence' as Karen Pashby argues in this article. Pashby also reminds us that GCE inherits pedagogies of nation, particularly liberal multiculturalism. Liberal multicultural education has been amply problematised for its construction of cultural difference in relativist, discrete and monolithic terms as an object of 'educational commodification' (Willinsky, 1998) or decontextualised projective empathy (Boler, 1999; Taylor, 2007). Re-articulated within GCE, these pedagogies of multicultural 'ethnorelativism' (as Paul Tarc terms them) encourage First World learners to 'learn about' different 'cultures' of the South in ways that confuse cultural practices with the negotiation of material and discursive conditions. The apparent egalitarianism is anchored, however, in liberal multiculturalism's epistemological Eurocentrism and normative white bourgeois civility. The result, argues Spivak (2004:532) is 'at best, cultural relativism as cultural absolutism,' a benevolent appetite for depoliticised reductive diversity. Within these imaginaries, difference is an absolute binary dichotomy (North/South; 'Us'/'Them'; 'dispensers'/supplicants of human rights; Spivak, 2004:530) that centres and normalises the sovereign Western subject of knowledge and agency: the privileged 'universal' learner and cosmopolitan expert who 'overcomes' the Other's difference and particularity, 'understands' and 'helps' her (Gunew, 2004:15).

My research in global justice education (GJE) with preservice teachers focuses on the ways the learning encounter is shaped and circumscribed by not only the discursive formations and institutional practices described above, but the seductive pull of benevolent, sovereign subjectivities into which students are invited. I am interested in the ways GJE might attend to the affective dynamics of learning and not-learning (Britzman, 1998). Such a pedagogy, what Spivak (2004: 526) has called 'the uncoercive rearrangement of desires,' implies an explicit pedagogical focus on self-knowledge (Britzman, 2000) defined as:

'the work of knowing the self [which] entails acknowledging not just what one would like to know about the self but also what is difficult to know about the self, including features we tend to project onto others: aggression, self aggrandisement, destructive wishes, and helplessness (Britzman, 2000:202).

I have argued that these dynamics are not incidental but central to the experience of global justice learning as we face and grapple with our implication and investment in relations of global inequity that have devastating impacts on our fellow global citizens. As I open myself to comprehending the horrific suffering and injustice not only consequent of, but necessary to, the resources I enjoy as a citizen of the global North, resources accruing over five centuries of slavery, colonisation, genocide, underdevelopment and transnational capitalism, there is what Todd (2009) names as a violence implicit in the call of this understanding. This violence is implicit both in my freedom to turn away in indifference and in the overwhelming sense of responsibility I might feel for the Other of my 'good fortune': that is, to the humans and other creatures with whom I share this planet.

Following Todd (2009) and Britzman (1998), then, I assume that global justice learning struggles with the 'kernel of trauma in the very capacity to know' (Pitt and Britzman, 2003:756), especially when learning/unlearning involves facing humanity in all its complexity (Todd, 2009). A profound epistemological and ontological crisis ensues when we encounter:

others who are not who we thought they were, are not the image we have constructed of them, are not who we want them to be or hate them to be or need them to be so that we can continue to be who we think we are (Ellsworth, 2005:89).

The crisis in learning opens a time and space of epistemological and ontological disorientation between the apprehension of others 'whose differences survive our attempts to deny, change, assimilate, demean ... control', to know, help, rescue or develop them (Ellsworth, 2005:89), and the rushing in of colonial and neo-imperial imaginaries to re-order power relations of knowing and being. The challenge of anticolonial global justice education lies in pedagogically provoking and sustaining this moment and space of epistemic vertigo from the ego's self-defense, from the refusal of relationality, from the consolation of familiar, hegemonic structures of authority and innocence.

One of GCE's greatest risks, then, is becoming in practice a pedagogy of consolation (Britzman, 1998) in ways which draw comfort from colonial hierarchies of knowing, being and feeling. Most troubling in prevalent approaches analysed in this article is that the crisis in learning initiated when children are exposed to knowledge of global inequity and suffering is closed down as *consolation* is offered rather than critical and ethical tools to respond to this crisis: consolation in terms of re-establishing a subject-object relation of Aristotelian Pity (i.e. pain for undeserved suffering of distant others) that reduces 'their' suffering to spectacle for my consumption; consolation in the security of the 'here'-ness David Jefferess raises, the affirmation of our normative position as the hosts, dispensers and defenders of rights sealed in the benevolent gesture; or the consolation of developmentalism's promise of familiarity, mastery and resolution as discussed by Paul Tarc. All of these practices operate to close down the anxious, violent crisis of learning selves when they are called to recognise and revise their habitual and hegemonic relationship to global Others, a closure wrought through the restoration of their moral superiority and authority.

Understanding Global Justice Education as an exercise in 'difficult knowledge ... when knowledge references incommensurability, historical trauma and social breakdowns' (Pitt and Britzman, 2003:756) focuses my pedagogy on difference, not as an object of relativist knowledge or projective empathy, but rather as a process of difficult learning. Difference in learning indexes the crisis (Felman, 1987) of relationality that opens up in difficult learning: my relation to my learning self in time (Ellsworth, 2005), to notions of who I am and the values and certainties that define me; my relation to the discursive formations, historical legacies and others' memories I inherit; relationships and obligations I can and cannot bear to recognise; relations of authority, implication and affiliation to local and global others that I am asked to negotiate without falling into easy tropes of heroism, idealisation, relativism or a new moralist triumphalism. I hope that in my pedagogy of global justice learning, then, difference in learning opens a crisis in the totalising pretensions of presentism and universalism shoring up a sovereign learning self and holds open that vertiginous space without rushing to resolution or consolation.

### **Paul Tarc (UWO) on (Parochial) Internationalism**

From my perspective, a GCE imaginary is coalescing in higher education in response to a conjuncture between strategic internationalisation agendas (Altbach and Knight, 2007; Board of Governors University of Western Ontario, 2009) and liberal desires to transcend these narrower 'branding' dimensions of internationalisation through experiential or 'transformative' pedagogical approaches. At a basic level, the internationalisation agendas heighten attention to, legitimise and provide funding opportunities for new international initiatives. At the same time, the heightening material presence of international students, international exchanges and international partnerships present new challenges that in turn demand educa-

tional responses such as internationalising curricula, EFL support and cultivating 'global competencies' in faculty and students. With the demand for these educational responses comes openings to express liberal desires in promoting a 'transformative' pedagogy for 'global citizenship' from varied disciplinary and support domains.

The problem, so to speak, is that, for the most part, the more sophisticated analytic resources to examine subjectivity, difference, power and representation remain incommensurate with the dominant constructs in this emergent imaginary. As business and engineering schools take the lead in increasing the international presence of research-intensive institutions through international partnerships and exchanges, it is not typically the humanities or critical social sciences that inform the 'education of global citizenship,' but the more accessible and pedagogically-expedient developmentalist theories of learning, cultural difference and adaptation.

On the one hand, 'conflict and difference' are technical or pedagogical problems to be resolved rather than seen as constitutive of the self and of the pedagogical encounter. On the other hand, 'cultures,' now further encased by Islamophobia and 'Clash of Civilization' narratives (Rizvi, 2004:168), are themselves essentially conceived as distinct and irreconcilable; in this case it is the inter-culturally competent trainer (Paige, 1993) who facilitates dialogue at a meta-level (read ahistorical and apolitical) to teach the 'progressive' lessons of an ethnorelativism (Bennet, 1993:46-47). Once again difference is effaced by focusing on the ['universal'] stages of adaptation and techniques of intercultural communication, rather than the geo-historical and political making and re-making of (already hybrid) cultures. In this latter case, performing a meta-level pedagogy of 'ethnorelativism' becomes a universalising maneuver that obstructs its own locatedness in particular assumptions and norms. Ironically, in an institution so hung up on (Western) disciplinary expertise, expertise in 'international education' is parochial. It rests on unacknowledged metaphysical assumptions from our 'home' theoretical discourse of developmentalism, and then explicitly focuses on the authority of 'experience' or on the vagaries of 'what works in the classroom.'

Beyond theoretical preferences, part of what privileges developmentalist learning theories in internationalising curricula is that they are, in fact, well oriented to the short-term demands of workshops and institutionalised courses that are to prepare individuals from any disciplinary background for their upcoming or potential international experiences. My own university's initiatives to educate faculty on 'internationalising education' are instructive. I recently attended a session run by my university's teaching support center. Admittedly I wasn't preoccupied with picking up quick tips for engaging partners internationally or for injecting a little 'global perspective' in my teaching. Still I was struck by the lack of scrutiny given to the heuristic being advocated to support an education for global citizenship. While a guiding principle presented was that knowledge is partial and socially constructed,

this principle seemed not to apply to the theory of intercultural learning and adaptation itself. Moreover, although the facilitator cautioned that, 'we have to be careful not to re-produce stereotypes in inter-cultural training,' it seemed to me that her teaching anecdotes and research vignettes were doing just that, re-inscribing cultural essentialisms and advancing simplistic notions of transformative learning.

Indeed, a few illustrations that the instructor used to illustrate the adaptation theory being advanced provoked audience reactions that seemed to highlight exceptionally well the difficulties of the proposed model. For one example, the instructor shared interview snippets from her research on inter-cultural learning that were to show how two of her participant-students, one from the West and one from the East, were both in the 'ethnocentric stage' of development because each one believed that she was right. The problem with how the example played out in our session was that a few individuals in the audience thought that the individual from the East was more right or at least more informed in her critique of Western feminism's claim to speak for all women, than was the American. And so while the instructor thought that these snippets would clearly illustrate the stages of her two student-participants as ethnocentric (and that the specific content of their utterances was irrelevant), a number of us were troubled by the lack of consideration of the larger contexts in which each of the snippets could be read. When confronted with this problem, the facilitator could only suggest that if we could see the whole interview data we would understand her point. My point is not to criticise the very capable teacher but to illustrate how the assumptions of the intercultural model she was advancing seemed to have broken down at the very moment that she was attempting to illustrate its efficacy.

I suspect there are similar scripts being played out in GCE performances at other institutions of higher education. Intercultural developmentalist approaches seem to fit well with the short term demands of training for intercultural competence, but where individuals have the opportunity to more fully engage in the complexities of learning and not learning across difference, the models tend to break down. In this way, perhaps the pedagogical importance of such models ought to be reframed as concrete starting points to problematise the inherent challenge of learning (across difference), rather than as theoretical truths to be accepted and applied. In my own classes I have used models of cultural difference in this way as entry points for problematisation. But even more productive in the classroom may be a turn to literature and to consider the psychic dimensions of learning and not learning that Lisa Taylor has focused upon in her response. Clearly the assumptions accompanying the lens of 'difficult knowledge' (Britzman, 2000) offer an alternative to those of developmentalism that underlie the intercultural learning models. To see international education as difficult would be to acknowledge that our frames of reference need to be stretched and even at times bracketed as we attempt to account for difference. Might we begin with the acknowledgement of the breakdowns in mean-

ing that difference can provoke in embarking upon an education for global citizenship?

A challenge presents itself of how to intervene more critically but still be comprehensible and compelling to students and colleagues within the constraints of scheduled classes, short term exchanges and transdisciplinarity. As I begin to think about how to revise the 'International Education' pilot elective I began last year, I am hoping to rely more on video representations of encounters with (cultural) difference and learning that might be the vehicle to translate more complex theories of subjectivity and learning with my students. It could be productive to show how the 'international' encounter is lived out in the bodies of those who are subject to cross cultural exchange using artistic and literary representations. Engagements with the affective dimensions of encounter might compel students to acknowledge and question the schooled assumptions and norms that, in their imperatives for 'mastery' and application, short-circuit the thinking that might do justice to the complexities of human learning and living.

### **Cash Rowe (UC) and Vanessa Andreotti on the Soul Wound**

In our response, we will employ the concept of the soul wound in the work of Eduardo Duran (2006) to suggest that a change of root metaphors is necessary for GCE to fulfill its potential to suture historically torn relationships by taking better account of the effects of (neo)colonialism and of aboriginal ontological/epistemological differences. In 'Healing the Soul Wound', Duran (2006) attempts to bridge Western and Native American worldviews by shifting root metaphors for health and healing in clinical practices in the field of psychological counseling, we suggest that this shift of metaphors is also useful in addressing issues of epistemological difference in GCE. Duran uses Foucault's (1967) analysis of the connections of mental health profession and social control, the idea of the collective unconscious of Jung (1977, 1988), as well as the Native American medicine wheel to hold ways of knowing in tension without a hierarchy and to create a productive hybrid space where a 'liberation discourse' for decolonisation can emerge for his patients. He affirms that this epistemological hybridism is critical in addressing health issues in culturally relevant ways that 'take the actual life-world of the person or group as the core truth that needs to be seen as valid just because it is' (Duran, 2006:14).

Duran's (2006) starting point is the systematic genocide inflicted upon aboriginal peoples and the resultant historical and inter-generational incremental trauma and internalised oppression. He uses the metaphor of a collective and deep soul wound to represent this process. This metaphor emerged when he asked aboriginal people to talk about the problems of their communities in his work as a researcher. Aboriginal people's ideas of spiritual injury, soul sickness, soul wounding and ancestral hurt challenged the expected symptom-oriented framings of the research methods he was deploying at the time. Duran (2006) uses the metaphor of the soul

wound to talk about the spiritual, epistemic, psychological and physical violences of colonialism, which affect both the *colonised*, the *colonisers* and the *land* itself. Healing this soul wound is conceptualised as a process that can only be done collectively and involving all parties. Therefore, the focus of his therapy is to help individual patients establish a different relationship with their pain, learning to be resilient to it, and stop self-medicating with alcohol, drugs, or other self-destructive practices, including suicide. In this way, the conceptualisation of mental and psychological disturbances moves from a Western paradigm based on individualised pathologies to one where patients are supported to reinterpret and:

form [new] relationships with their life-world [which] includes forming relationships with the source of their pain so that they can make existential sense of what is happening to them (Duran, 2006:15).

His approach emphasises that ‘an understanding of historical context must underline the use of intervention strategies with Native people’ (Duran, 2006:17). This contextual-historical understanding, for aboriginal communities, involves the acknowledgement of internalised oppression, or the identification with the aggressor/perpetrator of violence. Duran (2006) uses Butz’ (1993) metaphor of vampire biting to extend the metaphor of the soul wound to make the reproductive effects of violence more explicit. The idea of the vampire emphasises that once someone is touched by violence, there is a poisonous infection of violence at a soul level, which means that ‘some of the vampire or perpetrator is already in the person after the person is victimised’ (Duran, 2006:18). He explains this concept in relation to the violence inflicted through colonialism:

In essence, we have all internalised much of the personal and collective wounding of our [Western] culture. Our culture has been affected by a long history of violence against other cultures which continues to the present. The wounding that is sustained by the collective culture has an impact on the psyches of the individuals and in society. The fact that the soul has been eradicated from our healing circles is an indicative of a collective wounding process that has never been grieved or healed. It is from this wounded inner self that we, in the mental health field, seek to wound others through the secrecy and darkness of our practice, and we attempt to ward off our shadow through exhaustive ethical codes [...]. (Duran, 2006:20)

If one reads education through Duran’s (2006) lens, one can draw parallels with the mental health field in education’s role in pathologising difference and reproducing the soul wound through cognitive imperialism (Battiste, 1998; Battiste and Henderson, 2000) and the propagation of ideas that support different forms of genocide. This pattern can be read as an effect of the Western positivist epistemologies to which Duran refers and that violently project particular ways of being, seeing and knowing as universal norms through modern Western institutions. Shields, Bishop and Mazawi (2005) illustrate this with reference to the social, cultural and power relationships that frame schooling and classroom interactions:

Pathologising is a process where perceived structural-functional, cultural, or epistemological deviation from an assumed normal state is ascribed to another group as a product of power

relationships, whereby the less powerful group is deemed to be abnormal in some way [...] pathologising is a mode of colonisation used to govern, regulate, manage, marginalise, or minoritise, primarily through hegemonic discourses (Shields, Bishop and Mazawi, 2005:x).

Thinking GCE beyond these patterns and limitations is a difficult task that requires a shift of root metaphors leading to a shift of conceptualisations and pedagogical strategies.

From an aboriginal understanding, GCE could be interpreted as a process of healing the soul wound at a collective level. This healing would involve re-constructing our perceptions and re-establishing relationships with all our human and non-human relations, especially the land and those who have been socially and historically subjugated. The question of difference and conflict, in this sense, would be interpreted and addressed from a much more positive and relational stance. As an illustration of this possibility, Cajete (2004) argues that the four directions of the Native American medicine wheel enact this positive approach to difference as a metaphor for learning:

The four or more directions generally serve as allegories for sacred orientations to places in Indigenous traditions. Each has associated plants, animals and natural phenomena. And each of the plants and animals represent a perspective, a way of looking at something in the centre that humans are trying to know. The idea of moving around to look from a different perspective, from the north, the south, the east and the west, and from above, below or within, is contained in the creative process [...]. Indigenous logic moves between relationships, revisiting, moving to where it is necessary to learn or to bring understandings together. This might be called the sacred dimension of Indigenous science. Western science has struggled mightily to remove the role of spirit from understanding the world. Indigenous science works from the other side, continually infusing relationships with spirit through its discovery and rediscovery (Cajete, 2000:210-11)

Cajete's (2000) emphasis on the centrality of spirit echoes Duran's (2006) critique of the removal of the soul in Western health practices. Therefore, although understanding historical processes is essential and often integral to many GCE progressive practices based on poststructuralist and postcolonial theories, it is not enough to address the collective healing of the soul wound described by Duran (2006). In this view, what needs to be shifted is the root metaphor of learners and learning itself: bringing metaphysical questions and 'the soul' back to the picture, and seeing education as a form of healing, a form of ceremony. Perhaps this is something worth considering once epistemological hybridism becomes a reality in GCE in Canada, which seems to be the first major challenge for GCE in this context. Questions that could guide discussions in this direction include:

- How can the dominance of Western discourses (liberal, progressive, etc.) sustained by (neo)colonial systems and institutions open space for ways of knowing that have been historically deemed inferior in academic contexts?
- How can we promote ethical engagement with these 'other' ways of knowing on their own terms without objectifying, homogenising, essentialising, romanticising or institutionalising them?

- How can we responsibly address open metaphysical questions in GCE work without falling into the kind of absolute relativism where ‘everything goes’?
- How can we work with the soul wound in educational institutions in ways that heal and not increase such wound?

## **Conclusion**

The responses in this paper indicate that much of GCE practice in Canada tends to construct seemingly neutral notions of difference that generally fail to engage with conflicts and tensions inherent to processes of globalisation and ideas of citizenship and nationhood. The different voices in this article outline different ways these contradictions are enacted in discursive and pedagogical practices in higher education. They point to questions and strategies that could help move discussions forward. David Jefferess argues that GCE in Canada tends to prioritise ‘looking outward’ (globally) from what is in fact a contested colonised ‘here’. According to Jefferess, this tendency constructs normative notions of who belongs and who counts as citizens and prompts the avoidance and erasure of conflict and difference in ‘benevolent’ pedagogical work. Karen Pashby argues that global citizenship is intrinsically tied to discourses of multiculturalism that neutralise diversity by prioritising Canadian nation-building and social cohesion, which gives rise to a sense that Canadians are naturally good global citizens because they know how to ‘do diversity’. She asserts that, within a context of neoliberalism and the re-emergence of conservatism, extra emphases on individualism and cohesion shut down spaces for postcolonial understandings and for the interrogation of such assumptions.

Lisa Taylor complements this critique by emphasising the ways discourses of pluralism in fact disavow the extent to which hierarchical relations in Canada and globally are structured by difference. She cautions against the way in which benevolence and charity underlie the liberal multiculturalist view of diversity turning learners into citizen-subjects who seek consolation and avoid difficult, uncomfortable or conflictual knowledge of their complicities in global relations and hegemonic social hierarchies. Both Lisa Taylor and Paul Tarc problematise how learning about ‘Others’ can ironically secure such hierarchies. Tarc uses examples from his own institutional context to argue that, in a context of neoliberalism, the internationalisation of higher education becomes a commercial strategy that projects ethnocentric universalism as the solution to intercultural engagements. Cash Rowe and Vanessa Andreotti return our explicit attention to the colonial underpinnings of the Canadian imaginary in terms of making visible the (neo)colonial violence and resulting internalised oppression experienced by aboriginal communities. They explore the ways Western positivistic epistemologies pathologise difference in the cultural relationships that frame the learning spaces of classrooms and schools. In their argument, they reposition marginalised aboriginal epistemologies as a source of new metaphors of learning and learners based on notions of healing. Like the

other contributors, they identify the main challenge to a postcolonial framework of GCE in Canada as that of overcoming mono-logical ways of seeing that fail to recognise difference.

This multi-vocal piece questions the capacity for GCE imaginaries in Canada to probe at the universalising ethnocentrism of Western humanism and to interrogate neutralised discourses of diversity as cohesion. The contributors express concern for the potential reinforcement of colonial understandings and hierarchical ways of thinking that reassert a Western episteme rather than opening up spaces for alternative ways of knowing and learning. They reject understandings of learning, particularly learning about global 'Others', as naturally progressive and benevolent. Rather, they construct learning as contextual and difficult. While their work highlights the contestability of the very concept of global citizenship learning in the Canadian context, their collaboration is evidence of a momentum among scholars and educators across Canada, working to bring more complex and nuanced approaches to conceptions and practices of GCE in higher education.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the Consortium for Peace Studies at the University of Calgary (Canada) for the support provided in the development of this collaborative article.

*Vanessa Andreotti (vanessa.andreotti@oulu.fi) holds a professorial chair in global education at the University of Oulu in Finland. Her research interests include post-colonial and post-critical pedagogies, as well as indigenous studies and indigenous education. She has extensive international experience in collaborative and inter-disciplinary research in the field of global citizenship education. Vanessa was born and raised in Brazil in a mixed-heritage family.*

*David Jefferess (david.jefferess@ubc.ca) teaches at UBC Okanagan in Kelowna, Canada. His current research examines how benevolence, as a structure of attitude and reference, informs North Atlantic discourses of global citizenship, humanitarianism, and development. As a white, male, materially-privileged Canadian, David was taught to understand his experience as 'normal,' rather than contextual; he is working to unlearn this.*

*Karen Pashby (k.pashby@utoronto.ca) is an experienced secondary school teacher having taught in downtown Toronto, northern Quebec, and Brazil. She currently works in the Initial Teacher Education program at OISE, University of Toronto. Karen is a PhD Candidate in the Philosophy of Education Program in the Department of Theory and Policy Studies at OISE/ University of Toronto. Her dissertation looks into the theoretical and pedagogical relationships between global citizenship education and multiculturalism in Canada.*

*Cash Rowe (cbrrowe@ucalgary.ca) lectures in the International Indigenous Studies program at the University of Calgary (Canada) on aboriginal health and wellbeing;*

*indigenous and western methodology; and indigenous theory and practice. He is involved in research that focuses on aboriginal population health, aboriginal education and aboriginal governance. Cash is Plains Cree and his family comes from Ahtahkakoop.*

*Paul Tarc (ptarc2@uwo.ca) is assistant professor in International Education at the University of Western Ontario, London, Canada. He has taught in international schools in South America and South-East Asia and a publicly-funded school in Ontario, Canada. His research interests include: globalisation and education, progressive education, critical literacies, teacher education and teachers' work and learning.*

*Lisa Taylor (ltaylor@ubishops.ca) is an associate professor at Bishop's University. Her research and teaching are in the areas of critical literacy, anticolonial and social justice teacher education, critical global education, postcolonial perspectives in TESOL, and transnational feminist literature. She co-edited 'Contested Imaginaries/Reading Muslim Women and Muslim Women Reading Back: Transnational Feminist Reading Practices, Pedagogy and Ethical Concerns' – as a journal and forthcoming as an edited collection*

## Note

<sup>1</sup> The central question of this paper was formulated by Vanessa Andreotti as part of a Global Citizenship Research Fellowship program at the Consortium for Peace Studies at the University of Calgary in Canada in 2010. The respondents were identified for their contributions to the field of GCE in Canada, mostly through a symposium held at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education Conference in Ottawa in 2009.

## References

- Abdi, A., Schultz, L. (Eds.). (2008) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Altbach, P. J. and Knight, J. (2007) The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11 (3-4), p.290-305.
- Andreotti, V., Souza, L. (2008) Translating theory into practice and walking minefields: lessons from the project 'Through Other Eyes'. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning*, 1(1):p.23-36
- Armstrong, J. (1990) The disempowerment of First North American Native Peoples and empowerment through their writings. *Gatherings: The En-owkin Journal of First North American Peoples*, 1(1), p.143-5.
- Battiste, M. and Henderson, J. (2000) *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Purich Publishing Ltd.
- Battiste, M. (1998) Enabling the Autumn Seed: towards a decolonized approach to aboriginal knowledge, language and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*. p.16-27.
- Bennett, M. (1993) Toward a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In: Paige, R. M. (ed.) *Education for the Intercultural Experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.
- Board of Governors, University of Western Ontario (2009) *The University of Western Ontario Strategic plan for internationalization, 2009-2012*. Retrieved May 6, 2010, from [www.uwo.ca/research/docs/VP/StrategicPlanIntl2009.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/research/docs/VP/StrategicPlanIntl2009.pdf)
- Boler, M. (1999) The risks of empathy: Interrogating multiculturalism's gaze. In: M. Boler, *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. New York: Routledge.
- Britzman, D. (1998) *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Britzman, D. P. (2000) If the story cannot end: deferred action, ambivalence and difficult knowledge. In: Simon, R.I., Rosenberg, S. and C. Eppert (eds.) *Between hope and despair: Pedagogy and the remembrance of historical trauma*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Cajete, G. (2004) Philosophy of Native Science. In: Waters, A. (Ed.) *American Indian Thought: Philosophical Essays*. Malden, MA, USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000) *Provincializing Europe: postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Cooper, F. (2001) What is the concept of globalization good for? An African historian's perspective. *African Affairs*, 100, p.189-213.
- Day, R. (2000) *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Derrida, J. (2002) *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London: Routledge.
- Duran, E. (2006) *Healing the Soul Wound: Counseling With American Indians and Other Native Peoples*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ellsworth, E. (2005) *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Felman, S. (1987) *Jacques Lacan and the adventure of insight: Psychoanalysis in contemporary culture*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts and London.
- Gandhi, L. (1998) *A critical introduction to postcolonial theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gunew, S. (2004) *Haunted nations: The colonial dimensions of multiculturalisms*. London, New York: Routledge.
- James, C. (2008) Re/presentation of Race and Racism in the Multicultural Discourse of Canada. In: Abdi A. and L. Shultz (Eds.) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Jefferess, D. (2008) Global Citizenship and the Cultural Politics of Benevolence. *Critical Literacy*, 2(1), p.27-36
- Jones, B. (2000) Multiculturalism and Citizenship: The Status of 'Visible Minorities' in Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies/Etudes ethniques au Canada*, Vol. 42, (1), p.111-125.
- Joshee, R. and Pashby, K. (2008) *Citizenship Education Policies in Canada: Traces of the Past in the Present*. Paper presented at the 4th Annual CitizEd Conference: Researching Citizenship Education: Principles, Policies and Practice. King's College, Cambridge, U.K.
- Joshee, R. (2009) Multicultural education policy in Canada: Competing ideologies, interconnected discourses. In: Banks, J. A. (Ed.) *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. New York: Routledge.
- King, T. (2003) *What Is It About Us That You Don't Like? The Truth About Stories: A Native Narrative*. Toronto, Anansi, p.121-152.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2000) *Local histories/Global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Nandy, A. (2000) Recovery of Indigenous knowledge and Dissenting Futures of the University. In S.Inayatullah and J. Gidley (Eds.), *The University in transformation: global perspectives and the future of the university*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Okanagan Nation Alliance (n.d.) *Okanagan Nation Declaration*. <http://www.sylx.org/governance-okanagannation-neclaration.php> Accessed: 27 March 2010.
- O'Sullivan, M. and Pashby, K. (Eds.) (2008) *Citizenship education in the era of globalisation*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Paige, R. M. (1993) Trainer competencies for international and intercultural programs. In: Paige, R. M. (Ed.) *Education for the Intercultural Experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Pashby, K. (2006) Citizenship and diversity in the global imperative: What does global citizenship education mean for multiculturalism? Unpublished master's thesis, York University: Toronto.
- Pashby, K. (2008) Demands on and of Citizenship and Schooling: 'Belonging' and 'Diversity' in the Global Imperative'. In: M. O'Sullivan and K. Pashby (Eds.) *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishing.
- Peters, M., Britton, A., Blee, H. (Eds.). (2007) *Global citizenship education: Philosophy, theory and pedagogy*. Rotterdam and Taipei: Sense
- Pike, G. (2008) Reconstructing the Legend: Educating for Global Citizenship. In: Abdi, A. A. and L. Shultz (Eds.) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Pitt, A. and D. Britzman (2003) Speculations on qualities of difficult knowledge in teaching and learning: an experiment in psychoanalytic research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16, (6), p.755-776.

- Richardson, G. (2008) Conflicting imaginaries: Global citizenship education in Canada as a site of contestation. In: M. O'Sullivan and K. Pashby (Eds.) *Citizenship education in the era of globalization: Canadian perspectives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishing.
- Richardson, G. (2008a) Caught Between Imaginaries: Global Citizenship Education and the Persistence of the Nation. In: Abdi, A. and L. Shultz (Eds.) *Educating for Human Rights and Global Citizenship*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Rizvi, F. (2004) Debating globalization and education after September 11. *Comparative Education*, 40(2), p.157-171.
- Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books.
- Schueller, M. J. (2009) Decolonizing global theories today: Hardt and Negri, Agamben, Butler. *Interventions*, 11, (2), p.235-254.
- Shields, C., Bishop, R. and A. Mazawi. (2005) *Pathologizing Practices: The Impact of Deficit Thinking on Education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Shultz, L. (2007) Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*. 53(3), p.248-258.
- Spivak, G. (1990) *The post-colonial critic: interviews, strategies, dialogues*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. (1999) *A critique of postcolonial reason: toward a critique of the vanishing present*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (2003) *Death of a discipline*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Spivak, G. (2004) Righting wrongs. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 103, p.523-581.
- Taylor, L. K. (2007) Reading desire: From empathy to estrangement, from enlightenment to implication. *Intercultural Education*, 18(4), p.297-316.
- Todd, S. (2009) *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism*. Boulder: Paradigm.
- University of British Columbia (2004) *Defining – and Modelling – Global Citizenship. Towards 2010: University of British Columbia Annual Report 2004/05*. <http://www.publicaffairs.ubc.ca/annualreports/2005/citizenship.html> (accessed 27 March 2010).
- University of British Columbia (2010) *UBC Okanagan Strategic Action Plan. 2010. University of British Columbia Okanagan*. [web.ubc.ca/okanagan/.../Strategic\\_Action\\_Plan\\_Feb\\_17\\_201015151.pdf](http://web.ubc.ca/okanagan/.../Strategic_Action_Plan_Feb_17_201015151.pdf) (Accessed: 27 March 2010).
- Willinsky, J. (1998) *Learning to divide the world: education at Empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Young, R. (2001). *Postcolonialism: an historical introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.