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**Aims and Scope**

Indigenous and decolonizing perspectives on education have long persisted alongside colonial models of education, yet too often have been subsumed under broader domains of multiculturalism, critical race theory, and progressive education. In addition to many other unique attributes, Indigenous and decolonizing studies engage incommensurabilities fashioned by (settler) colonialism and our relations within and outside it. By attending to Indigenous worldviews and decolonizing theory as distinct philosophical traditions, this provocative series hones the conversation between social justice education, and Indigenous and decolonizing studies. Timely and compelling, the *Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education* series features research, theory, and foundational reading for educators and educational researchers who are looking for possibilities beyond the limits of liberal democratic schooling.

**Overview**

This series brings together the central concerns of Indigenous and decolonizing studies with the innovative contributions of social justice education. The books in this series have a commitment to social change with a specific material politics of Indigenous sovereignty, land, and relationships. Because the material politics of decolonization and Indigeneity connect and sometimes abrade with social justice educational research and practices, the books in this series will engage the political incommensurabilities that generate possibilities for education. Topics addressed by the series have drawn increased attention in recent years, and the series is poised to speak to ongoing social and educational challenges including education reform, climate change and environmental degradation, school control and decision making, and the very purposes of schooling and education. In the sections that follow, we discuss the domains of Indigenous and decolonizing studies and social justice education in order to describe the ideas which form the foundation for the series.

*Indigenous Studies and Decolonizing Studies*

Writing about the founding of Native American studies in the early 1970s, Elizabeth Cook-Lynn describes the primary commitments of the field as concerned with Indigenous land, Indigenous sovereignty, and the “*endogenous* study of First Nations cultures and history;” (1997, p. 11, italics original) that is, the study of Indigenous lives and issues *by* Indigenous peoples. Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012), Shawn Wilson (2008) Margaret Kovach (2009) and Bagele Chilisa (2011) describe corresponding central commitments within Indigenous studies emerging in New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and Botswana. Contemporary works in Indigenous studies are dynamically diverse and interdisciplinary, yet the very best works attend to those first commitments: land, sovereignty, and Indigenous perspectives.

As an extension of Indigenous studies, Indigenous methodologies of inquiry seek to regenerate Indigenous ways of knowing and research, and craft educational spaces for Indigenous peoples, by Indigenous peoples (Smith, 2012). Many discussions of Indigenous methodologies highlight the role of Indigenous cosmologies, axiologies, and epistemologies in the design and implementation of research (Smith, 2012; Wilson, 2008; Kovach, 2009; Chilisa, 2011). Indigenous research methodologies emerge from Indigenous epistemologies or knowledge frameworks so they are always people and place-specific (Smith, 2012; Tuck & McKenzie, 2015). The same Indigenous research methods may be used across many contexts, but will always need to be tailored to that context to match community needs and understandings of knowledge and knowing.

Indigenous research methods are distinct from other research methods not because they are so vastly different--many Indigenous methods include interviews, focus groups, surveys, archival research and other tried-and-true methods of social science--but because of the theories that guide them. One of the distinguishing features of Indigenous research methodologies is that they are built upon the concept of relational validity or “relational accountability” (Wilson, 2008, p. 77). In other words, what is most “important and meaningful is fulfilling a role and obligations in the research relationship—that is, being accountable to your relations” (Wilson, 2008, p. 77). Creating and maintaining respectful and mutually beneficial relationships between researchers and Indigenous communities (even when the researcher comes from the community) is of utmost importance, in part because Indigenous peoples have sometimes been mistreated and misled by academic researchers, both in the distant and recent past (Smith, 2012; Wilson, 2008; Tuck & Guishard, 2013). Theories accountable to these relations between land, sovereignty, belongingness, time and space, reality and futurity shape Indigenous research methods (i.e., Goeman, 2013; Byrd, 2011; Salmón, 2012).

Decolonization studies are informed by Indigenous theory, history, epistemology, and futurity. Decolonization studies emphasize the ways that colonization and decolonization are time-specific and land-specific (Fanon, 1963; Tuck & Yang, 2012). Theories of colonialism have largely focused on what is sometimes called exogenous domination (Veracini 2011), exploitation colonialism, or external colonialism--three names for the same form. In this form of colonization, small numbers of colonizers go to a “new” place and dominate a local labor force in order to send resources back to the metropole, for example the spice trade that impelled the colonization of India by several different European empires. Exploitation colonialism, its nature, consequences, endgame and post-possibilities have been the focus of (what would become) the field of postcolonial studies for the past fifty years. Though settler colonialism has been resisted and systematically critiqued by Indigenous philosophers since its outset, it has only been in the last two decades that *settler* colonialism has been more comprehensively theorized in academe, mostly via the emergence of the field of settler colonial studies. Settler colonialism is a form of colonization in which outsiders come to land inhabited by Indigenous peoples and claim it as their own new home (Tuck, McKenzie & McCoy, 2014; see also Hinkinson, 2012).

In settler colonial contexts like the United States, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand, theories of decolonization bring together critiques of settler colonialism, borders, and conceptualizations of antiblackness. That is, settler colonialism in the United States, for example, is the context for the destruction of Indigenous peoples to acquire land, and the enslavement of people from the continent of Africa to as units of capital for trade, for labor and for disposal (Smallwood, 2007). Thus, decolonization from settler colonialism in the United States will require a repatriation of Indigenous land and abolition of slavery in all of its forms (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Since the technologies of slavery and land appropriation are reapplied in novel ways to new lands and bodies, understandings of empire (Byrd, 2011), borders (Calderon, 2014), queerness (Morgenson, 2010), disability (Erevelles, 2011) labor and antiblackness (King, 2014) elucidate the features of settler colonialism.

Afro-pessimist theories and conceptualizations of antiblackness consider the ways that settler colonial structures require the invention of race, the specificity of blackness as criminal, landless, and forgone. Such analyses seek to understand how antiblackness determines relationships to the state, land, geography, and other peoples (in the tradition of Wilderson, 2010; Spillers, 2003; McKittrick, 2006). Theories and conceptualizations of blackness that engage the possibilities in blackness for agency, futurity, fugitivity (Harney & Moten, 2013; Moten, 2014), monstrosity (Kaplan, 2007), and relationships to Indigeneity (King, 2013; Tuck, Guess & Sultan, 2014) are particularly relevant to theorizing decolonization within settler colonial contexts.

Decolonizing studies at the border attend to how coloniality shapes and severs human and nonhuman relationships across land, nation-state, waters, and across time (Calderon, 2014). These efforts learn from analyses at the intersection of Chican*@* studies and Indigenous studies, Pacific Islander studies and Indigenous Studies, Black studies and Indigenous Studies, diasporic studies and Indigenous studies, and critical Muslim/Arab studies and Indigenous Studies.

Decolonizing studies, when most centered in Indigenous philosophy, push back against assumptions about the linearity of history and the future, against teleological narratives of human development, and argue for renderings of time and place which exceed coloniality and conquest.

*Social Justice Education*

Whereas Indigenous and decolonizing approaches are attentive to relational validity as described above, social justice education is concerned with catalytic validity (Lather, 1991; see also Fine, 2008). That is, what is valid in research is that which resonates with people’s lives, and informs their power to make change. Social justice education in this respect has a general commitment to social change, even though that change is not necessarily decolonizing. Nonetheless, the drive to create theory and research that matters to people’s lives is relevant to decolonizing and Indigenous studies. The contributions of social justice in education have broad implications for pedagogy, curriculum, schooling, educational policy, and social movements.

Critical pedagogy is one site of radical critique of education, rooted in sometimes Marxist (McLaren, 2003), sometimes postmodern (Giroux, 1991) desires for social transformation. Current scholarship on critical pedagogy interrogates pedagogy not simply as effective classroom practice, but as a source of praxis that has a present purpose and future purpose toward change (Picower, 2012; Au, 2012; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008). Postcritical pedagogy (Lather, 1995) is concerned with challenging and deconstructing the patriarchal tendencies of critical pedagogy, especially tendencies which install barriers for everyday people to speak for themselves (p. 180)

Overlapping with critical pedagogy is curriculum studies (Pinar, 1995; Malewski, 2010) which arose from examinations of how schooling as well as other state institutions inculcate people for their place within capitalism. On the surface, curricular content is taught in schools, but the deeper lesson entails a “hidden curriculum” (Apple, 2004) that normalizes class, gender, sexuality, citizenship, and race. Thus, curriculum studies is fundamentally concerned with articulating how the disciplinary procedures in schooling connect to unequal relations of power in society. Critical race scholars in education have taken the class-centric, poststructuralist analyses of curriculum studies, and fractured them through the fundamental difference that difference makes at the intersections of race, gender, and sexuality. Signithia Fordham (2014) examines how Black student success in school is predicated on a taking up “*the burden of acting white*” (p.98, emphasis original). By highlighting the psychic costs of Black success, Fordham troubles the frameworks of social (class) reproduction (e.g. Bowles & Gintis, 1976; MacLeod, 1995) that can imply social (class) mobility as the end of anti-oppressive education. Rather, blackness and middle class habitus are dissonant identities that do not resolve, not even over generations, as it might in the case of white lower-to-middle class mobility. These analyses of race (gender, sexuality) might be seen by some as a development in, or reconceptualization of curriculum studies (Jupp, 2013). However, Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández (2006) forwards the idea of “browning” of curriculum studies as a refusal of the linear narrative of curriculum studies as ‘originating’ from white fathers of critical theory, then progressing towards a multicultural inclusion of non-whiteness into the curriculum studies. Browning is a kind of stain that resurfaces, that calls to attention the continuing reassertions of white supremacy and colonialism not only in curriculum, but in curriculum studies and thus the theorizations of how power operates and how change occurs. Browning gestures towards the possibilities for Indigenous and decolonizing studies to refuse settler colonial replacement (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013; see also Calderon, 2014), that is, the re-assimilation and re-incorporation of Indigenous theory under a patrilineal critical theory.

Beyond pedagogy and curriculum, educational research also seeks to understand the role of institutions, especially schools, to compel or constrain social change. Social change is most conventionally conceived of in educational research as, how can we make schools (and society) less unjust? or how can we improve schooling outcomes? These approaches to change might be best described as “harm reduction” (Jacobs, 2009) and expansion of “public good”. Harm reduction models seek to alleviate the consequences of white supremacy and colonialism - by treating their symptoms as historical inequities to be mitigated. Expansion treats the idealized white, middle class, unrestrained citizen-consumer as a uninterrogated standard for the empowered social actor, and thus the social, cultural, and economic benefits of whiteness as public goods to be gradually expanded to non-white peoples. Such approaches to change are often framed by the premise of “gaps” in achievement and wealth to be narrowed. Scholarship on social transformation, by contrast, challenge these paradigms of reducing harm and expanding good, by insisting that the distribution of harm and good reflects a fundamental social structure of which schools are a part - and it is that structure that must be transformed. By refusing notions of gaps in achievement and opportunity (Ladson-Billings, 2006), such scholarship works to uncover debts: the actively accumulating cost of colonialism that accrues to racially Othered bodies in order to produce (settler) white wealth and privilege.

A lens of social transformation critically examines the relationship between change and institutions, but does not necessarily assume institutions of schooling to be vehicles of social change in and of themselves (Anyon, 2014; Noguera, 2003). Anyon (2014) examines the “radical possibilities” of connecting social movements to school transformation. Her concern is how to organize meaningful relationships between educational practitioners, learners and community members in effecting social change. Similarly, Noguera (2003) is interested in how to “break the cycle of poverty” - a cycle that is raced and classed - and he looks at schooling as one of multiple institutions that must be transformed to do so.

As such, educational research unravels the tangles of complicity, contradictory relationships with the institution, contradictory relationships with the state (Dimitriadis, 2003; Camangian, 2013; Patel, 2013a). This dis/entanglement attempts to render an understanding of agency within and despite structures (Willis, 1990), for researchers and the researched communities both. Thus, critical educational research intervenes into poststructural analyses that reify the disciplinary power of institutions and the sheerness of hegemony. Such scholarship is animated by agency, by contradictory desires for access to (Patel, 2013a) and for escape from (Fine, 1991; Tuck, 2012) states and institutions.

**Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education**

Now that we have identified the most salient features of Indigenous and decolonizing studies and social justice education, we turn to their intersections, and implications. This discussion is intentionally brief because this is the terrain of the proposed series-- we have chosen three exemplars to demonstrate what becomes possible in bringing Indigenous and decolonizing studies into conversation with social justice education and educational research.

*Red pedagogy.*  Sandy Grande (2004), drawing upon McLaren (2003), describes the importance of a revolutionary critical pedagogy for Indigenous education. In particular, Grande highlights how critical pedagogy is a *collective process* that utilizes a Freirian dialogical learning approach that is *critical* of the underlying structures of oppression, *systematic* in its inquiry into the theory and practice, *participatory* in involving communities members and organizations in change making, and *creative* in employing popular texts and people’s cultural productions to re-read society (Grande, 2004, p.25). Grande writes, “Such principles are clearly relevant to [Indigenous communities] and their need for pedagogies of disruption, intervention, affirmative action, hope, and possibility” (p. 26). Grande observes that non-Indigenous revolutionary pedagogies fail to consider a fundamental difference between revolutionary democracies and Indigenous sovereignty (see also Brayboy, 2005). This difference made evident in critical pedagogy’s frequent promotion of practices that foster an empowered critical citizenry for greater participation and integration in the nation-state (Morrell, 2008; Dewey, 1997), in contrast to Indigenous approaches that seek self-determination from a colonizing state (Smith, 2012; Grande, 2004; Brayboy, 2005; Abdi, 2011; Coulthard, 2014). Grande describes a “red pedagogy” as one that attends to decolonization in its material politics, in order to recognize and nurture Indigenous practices of present and future change.

*Decolonial participatory action research.* Consistent with concepts of sovereignty and decolonization is education research that centers the expertise of youth and communities about the neighborhoods and institutions they inhabit, and the saliency of that expertise in making policy and social change (Cammarota & Fine, 2008). Participatory Action Research (PAR) describes one set of methodological approaches that attempt to accomplish this ground and grassroots knowledge production. That people come to know things through their lived lives and that knowledge matters, is often attributed only to PAR. Yet educational researchers develop this kind of positionality in terms of their participation and in terms of the theory of knowledge through a range of methodological approaches, such as critical ethnography, public science, collaborative interviews, participatory performance, community mapping, to name a few (Guishard & Tuck, 2014). These different methodologies deconstruct the power of research and researcher, in order to construct knowledge that is valid for empowered communities. Decolonizing participatory research approaches make explicit how knowledge is territorialized (Simpson, 2007); namely, the university is settler colonial in its acquisitions of ‘data’ on Indigenous and non-white communities (Tuck & Yang, 2014), in its framing of these communities as pathologically Other (Patel, 2013b), and in its theorizing of how change ought to happen to these communities (Tuck & Yang, 2014). Thus the acquisitive ethics of research, the archives of data, and the theorizations are part of an academic knowledge territory. Decolonizing participatory methods draw limits to this territory, by refusing to hand over anything and everything to the academic enterprise, by drawing attention to power’s code of ethics (Tuck & Guishard, 2013), by re-presenting the taken-as-natural knowledge territories of Indigenous thought-worlds (Smith, 2012), and by “theorizing back” at power about its abuses in the guise of change (Guishard & Tuck, 2014).

*Culturally responsive and sustaining education for Indigenous students.* Although culturally responsive education has been a concern for Indigenous education since the emergence of colonial boarding schools (Brayboy, 2005; Brayboy & Castagno, 2009; Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006), and for Black education (Walker, 1996), Chican*@*/Latin*@* education (Solorzano & Yosso, 2000), and “urban” education as a general marker for minoritized communities of color (Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995), the impact of Indigenous epistemologies that engage the metaphysical, the communal, the intergenerational, and the past, present and future possible has been profound in recent scholarship (Villegas, Neugebauer & Venegas, 2008). Django Paris (2012) proposes a need for a “change in stance, terminology and practice” beyond what is commonly called culturally responsive pedagogy to “culturally sustaining practice” (p.93). Such a stance focuses on not so much on the translation of schooling into culturally responsive materials for the purposes of achievement, but positions education as the vehicle for sustaining cultural knowledges that have otherwise been targeted for extinction. In this way, Paris’ work draws from Indigenous philosophies of education.

Research methods, particularly those driven by an ethics of community participatory design, have developed greatly through different Indigenous understandings of reciprocity and intergenerational relationships. For example, inspired by the Mother Earth Walks that began in 2003, community members and Indigenous academic researchers who were members of the Chicago inter-tribal American Indian community created an intergenerational community research project that would bring together more than one hundred Indigenous community members to design and implement innovative science learning environments for Indigenous youth and community in Chicago (Bang et al., 2014).

**Timing and Audience**

In the past twenty years, around the globe, Indigenous and decolonizing studies have grown dramatically. Doctoral and Master’s Programs in Native American, American Indian, Maori, Aboriginal, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native Studies and been established in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. In the past few years, several relevant journals have been founded, including *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* (Open access, 2012), *Settler Colonial Studies* (Open access now subscription, 2011), *Critical Ethnic Studies* (Subscription, 2013-4), and *Native American and Indigenous Studies* (Subscription, 2013). The Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA), was founded in 2007, and held its 8th annual meeting in Austin, Texas in June 2014.

Some of the most exciting work in Indigenous/decolonizing studies is being done by scholars from education, and many of the most germane and provocative ideas in education are being produced by Indigenous and decolonial scholars. Though Native American studies and Indigenous studies have traditionally been engaged by disciplines such as history, anthropology, art history, humanities, and archaeology, NAISA’s annual meeting now regularly features the contributions of scholars in education. Likewise, major education associations including the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) and their international counterparts have highlighted the work of scholars in Indigenous education in major plenary sessions, journal special issues, and working groups. Every other year since 1987, the World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education (WIPC:E) meets, bringing several thousand academic and nonacademic educators, researchers, teacher educators, and community members to discuss issues of Indigeneity and education. Further, memberships of the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas Special Interest Group and the Indigenous Peoples of the Pacific Special Interest Group in AERA have grown exponentially in the past decade.

In part, the increased attention to Indigenous and decolonizing issues in education can be attributed to the reach of several high-impact books, including Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s 1999 *Decolonizing Methodologies* (Zed Books), and Sandy Grande’s 2004 *Red Pedagogy* (Rowman & Littlefield). Both books now/soon have second editions which expound upon earlier ideas in light of the growth of the field. But the increased attention can also be attributed to the ways the field uniquely responds to educational concerns related to culturally responsive education, diversity and multicultural/multilingual education, environmental education and climate change, school dropout, and teacher education. People are paying attention to what Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education have to say.

Emerging scholars, early and mid-career scholars, and renowned scholars alike have produced widely-read books at the intersection of Indigenous/decolonizing studies and education (See Table 1).

Table 1 Selected titles at the Intersection of Indigenous/Decolonizing Studies and Education

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title | Author/Editor(s) | Date | Publisher |
| Rethinking Columbus | Bigelow | 1991, 2003 | Rethinking Schools |
| Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience 1875-1928 | Adams | 1995 | University Press of Kansas |
| Decolonizing Methodologies | Smith | 1999, 2nd edition 2012 | Zed Books |
| Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought | Grande | 2004, 2nd edition due 2015 | Rowman & Littlefield |
| Power and Place: Indian Education in America | Deloria and Wildcat | 2001 | Fulcrum Press |
| Capitalists and Conquerors: A Critical Pedagogy against Empire | McClaren | 2005 | Rowman & Littlefield |
| To Remain an Indian | Lomawaima and McCarty | 2006 | Teachers College Press |
| American Indian Education: A History | Reyhner and Eder | 2006 | University of Oklahoma Press |
| Indigenous Knowledge and Education: Sites of Struggle, Strength, and Survivance | Villegas, Neugebauer and Venegas | 2008 | Harvard Education Press |
| Indigenous Storywork | Archibald | 2008 | UBC Press |
| Indigenous Educational Models for Contemporary Practice Volumes I and II | Nee-Benham | 2008, 2000 | Routledge |
| Alaska Native Education | Barnhardt and Kawagley | 2010 | Alaska Native Knowledge Network, University at Fairbanks |
| Education, Indigenous Knowledges, and Development in the Global South | Breidlid | 2012 | Routledge |
| Decolonizing Education | Battiste | 2013 | Purich |
| Indigenous Youth and Multilingualism | Wyman, McCarty, Nicholas | 2013 | Routledge |
| Beyond the Asterisk: Understanding Native students in higher education | Shotton, Lowe, Waterman and Garland | 2013 | Stylus Publishing |

As Table 1 indicates, these books are being published more frequently and by a variety of presses, including important volumes from Routledge. Yet, to date, our extensive searching uncovered no other book series dedicated to the exciting synergies between Indigenous and decolonizing studies and education.

For these reasons, we believe that the proposed book series is optimally timed. Interest in Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education has grown steadily over the past two decades with more rapid growth in the past five years. There are no competing series now, but it is only a matter of time before one is established. As authors who participate in the associations, journals, and programs described above, our role as series editors will be to apply our expertise and engage our networks to ensure that the series is at the cutting edge of Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education, indeed shaping the field for future generations of scholars and practitioners. The proposed series is poised to influence the trajectory and scope of the field.

The series’ primary audience will be students and academics in the aforementioned graduate programs, professional associations, and journal readerships. This series will include titles that might otherwise (less effectively) get subsumed under multicultural education, critical education, or social justice education, and will draw readers interested in those topics. Books in the series will primarily comprise academic texts, with some volumes geared toward practitioners and other research users. The series will include a transdisciplinary range of texts that cover multiple methods, formats, and topics in education, which share in the larger project of articulating decolonizing and Indigenous studies in education. As the series progresses, we intend to publish books in the following categories:

* Empirical research
* History and archival research
* Research methodologies, methods, ethics
* Pedagogy
* Curriculum
* Teaching, Teacher education
* Theory, Conceptual arguments
* Out of school education models
* Collaborations--communities, tribes, universities, researchers
* Edited volumes of education-relevant collected works by renowned Indigenous philosophers including Oscar Kawagley, Vine Deloria Jr., Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, Beatrice Medicine and Gerald Vizenor
* Educational policy and law
* Educational leadership
* Cultural production, new media, and reclaimed educational models

We anticipate that volumes in the series will be adopted in undergraduate and graduate courses in Native American Studies, Indigenous Studies, ethnic studies, educational foundations, educational leadership, curriculum studies, multicultural studies, research methods, and educational policy. Targeted adoptions might occur based upon the specific topics or cultural sites in each volume. As the series progresses, we anticipate publishing volumes authored by scholars writing in the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, and perhaps from Brazil, Taiwan, South Africa, Tibet, and other territories. Thus, additional targeted adoptions might be appropriate based on location.

**Potential volumes in the series**

This series will feature the authored and edited work of established and emerging scholars. Volumes currently being solicited or in progress include:

***1) Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education***

*Edited by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Eve Tuck, & K. Wayne Yang*

This edited volume features original chapters which help define and imagine the exciting interstices between Indigenous and decolonizing studies and education. As one of the early volumes of the series, it will provide a dynamic narrative of the emergence of Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education as a field, and also serve as launch pad for future conversations. The book builds upon the proliferation of scholarship since co-editor, Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s foundational book, *Decolonizing Methodologies* was published in 1999*.* Participating authors include those at the forefront of theorizing, practice, research, and activism in Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education.

The increased attention given to Indigenous and decolonizing studies comes with problems and possibilities, as evidenced by the problematic ways in which “decolonization” has been used metaphorically for diverse social justice efforts on one side (Tuck & Yang, 2012), and the possibilities created by educators who have resisted that metaphorization by articulating the challenges of solidarity across power and difference (see attached book prospectus, Gaztambide-Fernández) on the other. Nonetheless, the very uptake of decolonization as both an analytic and as a desired future (Mignolo, 2012) within education, and the attention to Indigenous studies that necessarily comes with it, has led to exciting new directions in thinking.

This edited volume attends to the productive edges and overlaps between Indigenous *and* decolonizing *and* education studies. It contours a foundational framework for scholars, educators, and cultural workers interested in furthering the commute of ideas across these edgy intersections, organized around the following themes:

*Introduction*. A charting of the trajectories of Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education since the publication of *Decolonizing Methodologies*. Overview of the book.

*Interstices of Indigenous and decolonizing and education studies*. Analyses of the congruent and competing ideas converging to shape this field.

*Decolonizing place and land education.* Discussion of Indigenous and decolonizing interventions on understandings of place in education and place-based education.

*Decolonizing educational social movements*. Rethinking the claims and imperatives of education as a civil right from the perspective of Indigenous social justice.

*Decolonization and Black optimism* (Moten, 2014). Discussion of decolonial thinking vis-a-vis the various turns in Black thought (Carribbean, North African, South African, Nigerian, Black American) and the impact on education studies. Includes a robust conversation exploring the intersections between antiblackness and settler colonialism taking place on the blog of the journal *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*.

*Decolonizing diasporic education*. Examination of the tensions between critical studies in education that center diaspora and Indigenous critiques of settler colonialism. Whereas migrations of diasporic people are often driven by militarism, transnational capitalism, and empire, they often migrate onto Indigenous lands. Therefore, efforts to articulate decolonizing education for diaspora must begin with a “by asking the central question not only where do people of the diaspora come from, but where have they come to?” (Haig-Brown, 2009, p.5).

*Decolonizing borderlands education*. Reimagining the borders of the nation state and implications for education. Analysis of the material and symbolic shape and location of borders, the construction of border-crossers as criminal, and a new theorization of separate sovereignties on shared territories.

*Decolonizing educational policy.* Conceptualizing educational and social policies which seek to redistribute land and resources so that schooling takes on new meaning and possibilities.

*Decolonizing futurities.* Setting forth a new set of purposes for schooling and education, purposes aligned with Indigenous educational models (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006). Considers the impacts of Indigenous theorizations of the future for education studies.

This edited volume aims to energize scholarly discussions of Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education in order to prompt contingent collaborations, ethical coalitions, and decolonized theories of change.

***2) Decolonizing Solidarity: Power, Difference, and Pedagogy***

*Authored by Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández*

Since the publication of Paulo Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in 1968, solidarity has become a catchword within critical educational projects. However, these projects rarely provide a definition of what solidarity means, what it entails, or what it might demand from those who claim it. In a recent posthumous text, titled *Pedagogy of Solidarity,* we ironically come no closer to a precise understanding of solidarity, either for Freire or for critical educators who have followed his work (see Freire, Araújo Freire, & de Oliveira, 2014). This is not to say that the use of the term solidarity is somehow inadequate or incorrect, but rather, that it leaves unanswered important questions about what precisely critical educators mean by solidarity and what solidarity entails. The proposed book will consider these questions in depth, tackling the challenges as well as aiming to articulate a clearer and more robust *pedagogy of solidarity*.

Through a radical decolonial rethinking of *solidarity*, this book will offer a way to imagine and pursue modes of human relationality that might constitute new forms of resistance to, as well as healing from, the coloniality of present conditions. To recover the notion of solidarity as a profoundly pedagogical project and to re-situate it within decolonizing and anti-racist education projects, it is important to recognize that solidarity is not an innocent idea and that it cannot be readily assumed to yield a critical orientation toward human relationality. In fact, almost two centuries after emerging as a central idea within the revolutionary movements of the modern European era, solidarity has risen to become a popular term beyond critical education, in the landscape of contemporary participatory politics. At the click of a button, internet users can express “solidarity” with causes about which they know little and with people they have never met. Solidarity is also used as a slogan in political rallies and mobilized by politicians, celebrities, and other public figures wishing to identify with particular causes and on one side or another of political issues. It operates as a rallying call in all kinds of circumstances, from natural disasters to economic collapse; from global protests to local actions; from diasporic movements to Indigenous reclamations. In all these forms, solidarity is often claimed as an objective position that entitles the claimer to act and it is evoked as an affective register that positions the claimer as righteous. Whether to claim shared conditions and interests, or to evoke human compassion or empathy across differences, this *rise of solidarity* is evident in a wide range of sometimes disparate – perhaps even contradicting – projects (see Gaztambide-Fernández, 2012; Pensky, 2008; Scholz, 2008).

To be clear, the characteristics of this *rise of solidarity* are neither spontaneous nor natural, but the outcome of complex dynamics of colonization and the resulting diasporas and genocides produced by United States and European imperial expansionism. The modern world view, instantiated through the “event” of the encounter between Europeans and Arawak-Taínos in 1492, persistently imposes particular conceptions of what it means to be human and defines what counts as cultural difference (Wynter, 1995, 2003). White supremacy, capitalism, and hetero-patriarchal order violently enforce colonial modes of human relationality, fabricating subject positions through intersecting and interlocking discursive regimes of gender, race, class, place, sexuality, and ability, among others. As more and more people come into contact with one another, while simultaneously being dispossessed of their ontological relationships to land and to each other, these subject positions are largely enforced—yet sometimes contested—through the manifold human encounters that are the definitive marker of the complex social world at the turn of the 21st century. Given the broad trajectories of the concept of solidarity and the political and social histories that have shaped its use and its broad idealization, it is not surprising to see that it is used for so many purposes, to refer to so many different kinds of circumstances and relationships, and that it ultimately seems to lack political force. In this context of increased economic inequality, persistent racial violence perpetrated by an increasingly militarized police-state, and continuing attempts at the elimination of Indigenous people, reconsidering solidarity as a profoundly pedagogical project is not only warranted, it is imperative.

The book will reframe solidarity as a profoundly pedagogical endeavor. This means that solidarity, like pedagogy, must always be intentional and responsive to the interests and desires of particular groups in particular contexts. As such, solidarity, like pedagogy, must be understood relationally, by attending to the particular positionalities and the dynamics of power that make contingent relationships intelligible. This relationality means that solidarity, like pedagogy, is always entangled in ethical dilemmas that often cannot be resolved beyond the contingencies of particular circumstances. Such a pedagogical articulation of solidarity would counter the general tendency to claim solidarity in order to actually disguise a lack of engagement or commitment across difference. As such, and as the book will argue, considerations of solidarity are especially meaningful at the intersection of decolonizing and Indigenous studies and education because of the often-overlooked pedagogical implications of solidarity claims.

As a way to reconstitute human relationality in educational projects committed to decolonization, *Decolonizing Solidarity* will proceed through a threefold analytic strategy that will constitute the main argument. First, the book will present a decolonial excavation and reading of the colonial roots of solidarity, following its trajectories as a concept through a number of political projects and conceptual elaborations. Second, it will re-articulate the notion of solidarity in order to highlight its profoundly pedagogical character, through an understanding of solidarity as transitive, reflective, and relational, in order to speak directly to questions related to decolonizing educational projects. Third, the book will describe the details of a pedagogy of “creative solidarity” that aims to ground educational projects committed to struggles over land, membership, and movement within the particularity of the continental land mass known to the Kuna people as the Abya-Yala (also called The Americas).

The book will be organized into five chapters, each grounded in discussions of conceptual developments, cultural texts, examples of social movements and community-based participatory research. To ground the discussion, the book will also describe the Youth Solidarities Across Borders (YSAB) project, a youth Participatory Action Research project that brings together students from different cultural and ethnic communities to engage in social action research with a focus on building solidarity across groups of urban youth. This particular understanding of pedagogy will be woven throughout the text in order to demonstrate that solidarity is, always and already, profoundly pedagogical; that there is no solidarity without pedagogy.

***3) Indigenous Urban Education: Educational change with/in communities***

*Authored by Megan Bang*

In 2003, two Anishinaabe grandmothers, along with a group of Anishinaabe men and women and allies, walked around Lake Superior in order to bring attention to water pollution of lakes and waterways shared by Anishinaabe, the United States, and Canada; the Great Lakes are the largest freshwater ecosystem in the world. Participation in the water walks and the messages of the water walks inspired a community research project that would bring together more than one hundred Indigenous community members to design and implement innovative science learning environments for Indigenous youth and community in Chicago (Bang et al., 2014).

Participatory design research methods actively counter the ways in which educational decision-making and pedagogical practice, have been stolen, imposed, and legislated away from communities by and for the authority of powerful state institutions and their deputies. *Indigenous Urban Education* details the work of a Chicago-based research collaborative including elders, parents, and youth members of the inter-tribal Indigenous community to design learning environments that would meet the present and future needs of their community. The book describes the ways in which the research, educational models, curriculum, and theories of change have emerged, considers their impact to date, and provides ideas for other communities and researchers also wanting to engage in participatory design research.

To do this I specifically take up in the context of teaching and learning about the natural world. Learning about the natural world is a critical necessity given the socio-scientific realities (e.g., climate change) that are currently, and will continue to, shape the lands and life that land supports. I mobilize a construct, *nature-culture*, which as a linked construct, arguably grounds much if not all of human activity and figures centrally in core ontological and epistemological frameworks across and within different knowledge systems and the ways in which learning environments reflect and facilitate specific nature-culture relations. In formal schooling, science education often serves to enact and impose normative nature-culture relations driven by Western intellectual traditions. Science education often involves lessons about land that oscillate between constructions of uninhabited lands ripe for territorial acquisition and scientific enterprise or inhabited lands as no longer Indigenous and in need of remediation and paternalistic intervention. This oscillation is made possible by the denial or erasure of Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies. Science education is one site in which narratives about land that erase Indigenous history and presence are transferred from generation to generation. Science education is complicit, if not a key tool, in the reproduction of settler colonial understandings of place.

How can participatory design methods interrupt and transform science education? I explore this question in the context of an on-going research project with/in an urban Indigenous community working to (re)storying our relationships to Chicago as altered, impacted, yet still, always, Indigenous Lands –whether we are in *currently* ceded urban territory or not. In chapter 1, I develop the context for this work and a story of Indigenous Chicago. This chapter both includes a narrative of Chicago from a long view of history and the current calls for science education. In chapter 2, I explore the configurations of participatory design research we engaged in and explore the implications of these. A critical dimension of the work was making visible the impacts of settler colonial constructions of urban lands as ceded and no longer Indigenous and concomitant views of naturalized settler futures (Tuck and Yang 2012) on our community and especially our youth. Further I detail, lessons learned and the impacts of the shifts of our design processes and consider critical dimensions of decolonizing participatory design research. In chapter 3, I explore several of the learning environments that were developed and implemented. Extending chapter 3, chapter 4 will focus specifically on the core models of learning and the range of foundational practices that emerged across these learning environments. Chapter 5 explores the impacts on children, families, teachers, facilitators, designers, and researches in engaging in participatory design and implementation. Chapter 6 explores the ways in which we engaged in analysis and report of our research. This chapter is especially focused on the forms of participatory analysis that emerged in our work. In Chapter 7, I explore the implications of this work and the role and constructions of urbanity in the unfolding Indigenous Diasporas and the education of Indigenous children and youth.

***4) Sustaining Indigenous Educational Movements: Together & In Our Particular Places***

*Authored by Malia Villegas*

This book discusses the emergence and sustainability of Indigenous educational movements at the crossroads of “one size does not fit all” and “what are the best practices for all.” As a tribal citizen and appointed tribal leader on my village tribal council working at the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) – the US’ oldest, largest, and most representative organization serving in the broad interests of tribal governments – I find myself responsible to help steward a “unified” policy agenda. Yet, tribal sovereignty is based on the notion that tribal nations decide for themselves what is best – they self-determine – which means we could (and often do) observe hundreds of distinct, diverse approaches to community planning and decision-making. As Native scholar Tsianina Lomawaima notes, the battle for power at the core of Indian education in the US comes down to sovereignty, which manifests as self-government, self-determination, and self-education (2012). Figuring out how to proceed at these crossroads is essential for building sustainable movements in education that create the conditions for the continued practice of Indigenous cultures and lifeways. However, the best option may be to push back against the choice between best practices for all and one size does not fit all by troubling the idea that unity requires diminishing diversity and advancing sameness. Indeed, the key to resisting lies not in gaining Indigenous *power over* educational decision-making but fostering *power with and through* Indigenous cultures and ways of being in the world.

In addition to using literature on social movements and Indigenous knowledge in education, *Sustaining Indigenous Educational Movements* addresses research on higher education – where tensions exist about the role of diversity in the higher education school population and work force. This book advances how we think about sustaining Indigenous educational movements at a systems level by emphasizing key elements of diversity, culture, and ethics in educational systems. Systems thinkers have increasingly emphasized the importance of diversity in particular in large-scale sustainability efforts targeted at corporations and the US healthcare system (e.g., Nivet, 2011; Page, 2008). In many ways, emphasizing diversity requires a parallel investment in transforming institutional cultures and fostering distinct ethics.

Informed by the work of Native scholars like Angayuqaq Oscar Kawagley (2006), this book argues that diversity and unity are not oppositional goals. Kawagley would often say that Arctic peoples needed to come to a firm understanding of who we are and where we come from because of the responsibilities we have in our lands and places; but that we also needed to be in relationship with peoples from other places because they have their own responsibilities, and what happens in one region affects those in other regions. In some ways then, (bio)diversity is both excellence and relatedness (rather than unity). NCAI’s Board recently set an expectation that staff develop regional data and analyses to promote greater understanding across NCAI’s 12 regions rather than solely featuring national trends. This is one example of how our leaders are embracing both diversity and relatedness.

The idea that diversity stands in the way of unity is one that prevents leaders from fostering more strategic investments in Indigenous education. Instead of trying to identify solutions that work *regardless of* community differences, this book emphasizes strategies which are based in the particular and in our places, so that investments can have far greater impacts. By exploring how a concept of relatedness promotes more sustainable educational policy and practice, *Sustaining Indigenous Educational Movements* examines how to leverage diversity and unity toward more meaningful community outcomes. It will describe a series of investments in Indigenous education in order to demonstrate the strategic importance of culture and to promote new ways of thinking about scale, impact, and sustainability in Indigenous education. I use the term “investments” intentionally here to evoke the critical connection many tribal leaders see between education and economic sustainability of their communities, as well as the commitment required on the part of Native people to invest in ongoing processes of dialogue, planning, and coordination to sustain dramatic improvements in Indian education. In some instances, these investments may look like self-education such as is possible through tribally-controlled school policy and curriculum; in others it may look like adaptation of education models developed for non-Native communities like Jemez did with Montessori (Romero-Little, 2010); and in others it may look like demanding that existing systems of schooling become more culturally-centered.

An introductory chapter frames the volume by describing current policy discussions, debates, and vacuums/silences that impact on Indigenous education investments in the United States. Specifically, I highlight the ways conversations about violence against Native children, young men of color, people with disabilities; Native culture and language; poverty, climate change, data, and jobs constrain and enable strategic investments in Indigenous education. The next chapter argues that Indigenous education movements that are sustainable must include elements of genealogy, strategy, and impact. The next four chapters describes four approaches to investment in Indigenous education in relation to what extent they include these elements and the resulting sustainability. Featured investments include: the effort to graduate 500 Māori doctorates in five years in Aotearoa/New Zealand; the national effort to transform the culture of schooling in Australia following the Apology to the Stolen Generations; Alaska Native teacher training initiatives in Alaska over two decades; and culture and language immersion efforts developed by tribal communities across the United States. A concluding chapter provides policy recommendations for Indigenous communities seeking to foster more strategic investments in education.

***5) Unsettling Learning from Linearity***

*Authored by Lisa (Leigh) Patel*

In this proposed book, I unpack the implicit linearity that hamstrings most of schooling and educational research in settler colonial societies. Drawing from media, published research and reports and connecting to other work on coloniality and education, I provide a largely theoretical argument about linearity as a colonial epistemology. *A step in the right direction. Two steps forward, one step back. The five stages of grief.* The idea of stages and steps, of a unidirectional teleology, are so ubiquitous that they seem natural, yet they are merely a reflection of a colonial worldview. Education in many areas of the world is deeply shaped by this grip of linearity, most frequently manifested through language of progress and gain such as ‘closing the achievement gap,’ or making ‘adequate yearly progress.’ Linearity is invoked so consistently in discourses of schooling and education that other ways of framing learning and educational research are overlooked or forgotten. For example, in U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan’s address to the 2013 meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Duncan justified his (failed) high stakes accountability policies with the discourse of linearity: accountability 1.0 will be replaced by “accountability 2.0”, yet he was looking forward to “accountability 2.2” and “accountability 2.3 [sic]”. Duncan’s comment drew unsolicited laughter from the audience. Yet his tone-deaf failure to critically account for the damages of his policy was equally matched by AERA respondents’ failure to challenge his discourse of linearity and its profound mismatch with the nature of learning. Much of this lost opportunity to fully challenge the not-so-underlying theory of linear learning and human growth is due to a muted understanding of the colonial view of learning and society that governs formal educational policy, practice, and research and overshadows the nature of learning itself.

Even a light scratch on the surface rhetoric of linearity reveals not a natural phenomenon but a society so stratified that it deeply needs and protects gaps, for space between strata of human existence and research tactics to measure those gaps. From the first breath of colonial invasion in these and other lands, categories have been created, maintained, and protected to justify segmented and sequestered ownership and wealth for a few (Wynter, 2003) and corresponding material and figurative violence upon many others (Harris, 1993; Smith, 2013). In education, these linear categories and strata have only gained steam in discourses of ‘accountability’ that have largely served to further punish children not born to white settlers (Castagno & Brayboy, 2009). The linear frame of education has increased sovereignty of the settler colonial state across the policies of Democrat and Republican presidents, each political party making abundant use of concepts such as adequate yearly progress and ranked achievement to further entrench capital and land holdings for a few.

To best address the possibilities and imperatives of decolonization, we must confront how thinking through linearity tacitly and explicitly refreshes the logics and material structures of coloniality (Wynter, 2009) as well as look to examples of pedagogical design and epistemes that do not define themselves through colonialism. While other scholars in educational studies, largely thinking in concert with the complexity sciences (e.g., Davis & Sumara, 2006) have posited the limits of linearity as an epistemic frame for science, I excavate the contours and impact of linearity as a colonial construct on schooling and educational research. Linearity certainly corrupts social science, but also exacts specific material consequences on the social science concerned with learning and education.

Drawing on examples from education such as those described above, and as well as extra-educational examples, such as the legalization of gay marriage as proxy for equitable access to civil rights, I deconstruct frames of linearity most often used in schooling and education, including progress, gaps, steps, grades, stages, and development. I explain how linearity offers bankrupt theories of change (Tuck, 2009) through explanatory tropes like ‘steps in the right direction’ that function to reseat settler frames of learning. I demonstrate how this constant resettling of coloniality obscures ruptures and breaks that hold more potential for destabilization and decolonization as well as stewardship of learning itself.

The core nature of learning defies linear logic. As seen in many projects of survivance and self-determination, learning that is designed and stewarded outside of coloniality embraces holistic, interdependent, impermanent, transformative and even rebellious states of being (Battiste, 2013). Throughout the book, I complement critiques of linearity with examples of learning for “struggle, strength, and survivance” (Villegas, Neugebauer, & Venegas, 2008), such as the Wampanoag Language Reclamation Project, the learning and intelligence found in migrants’ everyday lives (Patel, 2014), and learning in nonhuman life forms. I discuss learning as knowing and unknowing, as constant coordinate-setting, as fundamentally interconnected, circular, cyclical, intergenerational, and perhaps more than anything else, incommensurable to lines.

Through both format and content, *Unsettling Learning from Linearity* will speak to the genealogy and materiality of learning, using writing as a method of tracing coordinates of purpose, history, context, and needs.

***6) Social Studies and Everyday Empire***

*Authored by Dolores Calderon*

In this book, I bridge Native studies and education to examine the entrenched nature of settler colonial ideologies in social studies curriculum and pedagogy. By doing so, I aim to expose the largely ignored ways settler colonial epistemologies, ideologies, and practices are conveyed through educational technologies such as textbooks, standardized tests, and other normalized classroom pedagogical tools. Understanding settler colonialism as an ongoing project is a key aspect of decolonizing studies in education. Thus, this book provides educators with a series of working concepts designed to help identify settler colonial logics.

*Social Studies and Everyday Empire* examines the necessity of using *coloniality* as a theoretical framework in curriculum studies and research to understand how the dominant forms of settler colonialism persist in the United States. Theorizing coloniality allows educators to examine how settler colonialism shapes the discourses and practices of education as a modern European project. Furthermore, conceptualizing coloniality in educational research moves us toward truly engaging in decolonizing projects in education. This book examines curriculum and pedagogy in order to trace how settler colonialism manifests itself in the everyday lives of schools. Moreover, as a decolonial project, the book will analyze social studies curriculum (including Common Core directives) and attendant pedagogies in order to make apparent to readers the manner in which curriculum and pedagogy function to produce and maintain settler futurity (Tuck & Yang, 2012). It will also examine social justice-based strategies for inherent reliances on settler colonial logics. The book as a whole presents an approach to curriculum studies and analysis that moves away from decolonization as metaphor (*ibid.*) towards a material decolonization that makes explicit the subjectivities, ideologies, and practices of settler colonialism.

Many current critical approaches in education that maintain deficit/anti-deficit binaries that are at odds with decolonizing approaches. *Social Studies and Everyday Empire* will excavate the particular epistemic locations in social studies curricula which are produced by settler colonialism, and reconfigure them to suggest alternatives. This book contributes to the growing dialogue around issues of coloniality in education and offers concrete tools for educators to begin the task of decolonizing the often invisible markers of settler colonialism, making room for truly decolonizing approaches to take root.

In chapter one I offer a conceptual roadmap of *coloniality* in education, centering settler colonialism, and putting in conversation Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives on settler colonialism. In chapter two, guided by the theoretical framework of coloniality, I examine social studies curricula (standards and texts) to identify settler colonial logics such as settler nationalism. In chapter three, I move towards pedagogy to show that simply showing how curricula are drenched in settler colonialism is not enough without equal emphasis on pedagogy. Here, I focus on social justice pedagogical approaches (such as multiculturalism and other asset based approaches) to show how their orientations maintain settler colonialism, paying attention to approaches in social studies pedagogy. In chapter four I offer pedagogical and conceptual tools that educators can use to expose, highlight, and work against settler colonialism. In chapter five I conclude pointing to decolonial curricula developed by indigenous groups and allies, describing how without decolonial pedagogical approaches offered in the previous chapter, use of these curricula, might end up reifying settler colonialism.
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