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ABSTRACT

The intention of the study is to come into a better understanding of the way in which the Diasporic body comes to know and understand its subjectivity within the governing contemporary public sphere. I suggest that this knowledge is diverse and that it can assist us to re-conceptualize learning in the context of schooling and education. I am interested in this seemingly mundane thing of ‘blackness’ and the way in which the signifying power of ‘blackness’ has come to constitute the conditions of possibility for the formation of a certain humanism. I trace somewhat abstract historical trajectories in order to better understand how contemporary everyday Diasporic life comes to be classified, organized, self-regulated and inscribed through particular intersections of race by way of gender, ableism, class, and sexuality. I seek to ascertain ways in which race is interpreted as the ‘Truth’ in order to impute the ethic of colonialism onto the Diasporic body.

With this study my interest concerns understanding my lived experiences within the context of Diaspora and about how I come to make sense of race/racism/blackness through the cultural location of the colonial West. I am seeking to understand how, at certain moments, abject bodies of the Diaspora become predisposed to socialize in specific ways through these protean subjectivities. My interest involves coming to know critical pedagogies
immanent to African Diasporic spaces that are germane for re-imagining schooling and education. I am interested in the school as a Diasporic space, the pedagogical and instructional implications for the teacher/educator, and about the ways in which meaning is made of Diaspora. I am suggesting writing Diaspora for schooling and education presents alternative ways of making sense of one’s subjectivity, citizenry, identity, about coming to know and understand how belonging, power and privilege come to be inscribed within the governing nation-state.
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This study is dedicated to all those who seek to better the human condition.
CHAPTER ONE: POLITICS OF DIASPORA – AN INTRODUCTION

Within schooling and education Diaspora has emerged as a pedagogical site with which to critically engage the politics of colonization. Moreover, the concept of Diaspora has been a geography in which the variant bodies, spaces, and lived experiences of the ‘Other’ have come to be theorized through counter narratives. Scholars such as Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Sylvia Wynter, James Clifford, Trin Minh-ha, Gayatri Spivak, Dionne Brand, George Dei, Kobena Mercer, Rey Chow, Robin Cohen, Lawrence Grossberg, Caryl Nelson, Carole Boyce Davies, Avtar Brah, Jana Evans Braziel, Rinaldo Walcott, Katherine McKittrick, Himani Bannerji, Sunera Thobani, Sherene Razack, Bonita Lawrence, David Scott, Stephen Dufoix, Richard Iton, Michelle Stephens, and Michelle Wright have been taken up with concerns about identity formation through race, gender, sexuality, ableism, religion and class, to questions about citizenry, transnationalism/transatlantic movement, nation-state, globalization, belonging, decolonization, Indigeneity, dislocation, enslavement, hybridity and subjectivities of modernity.

Deriving from the Greek word *diaspeirein*, *Diaspora* is a discursive construct that historically speaks to the experience of dispersion. (See Dufoix 2008; Braziel and Mannur 2003; Cohen 1997.) However, from the onset let me say my interest with the Diaspora is less with the etymological construct, or about the historical ways in which a particular Diaspora comes to be constituted. With Diaspora, I am thinking of transatlantic, transocean movement from Africa, Caribbean, Euro-Americas and Britain. My interest concerns understanding my lived experiences within the context of the Diaspora and about how I come to make sense of race/racism/blackness through the
cultural location of the colonial West. My interest involves coming to know critical pedagogies immanent to African Diasporic spaces that are germane for re-imagining schooling and education. I am interested in the school as a Diasporic space, the pedagogical and instructional implications for the teacher/educator, and about the ways in which meaning is made of Diaspora. I am suggesting writing Diaspora for schooling and education presents alternative ways of making sense of one’s subjectivity, citizenry, identity, about coming to know and understand how belonging, power and privilege come to be inscribed within the governing nation-state.

**Learning Objectives and Research Questions**

My learning objectives for the study concern the way in which Caribbean-Diasporic peoples come to understand race within the public sphere of the nation-state. It concerns the ways in which African-Diasporic peoples come to know the need to wittingly or strategically de-race themselves to maneuver through their everyday socio-political terrain. My learning objectives are being thought through the following research questions:

- What are the ways in which the Caribbean-Diaspora comes to understand and experience race?
- By what means does the experience of race organize and inscribe the identities of the Caribbean Diaspora?

Moreover, with this study I am interested in this seemingly mundane thing of ‘blackness’. I conceptualize blackness through particular encoded discursive fields with historical specificities to colonization and plantation life that locates the material on the African body. I am thinking of blackness as immutable yet protean as it becomes
entangled through race, culture and knowledge production. I am interested in the way in which the signifying power of ‘blackness’ emerged from enslavement. I am questioning how ‘blackness’ has come to constitute the conditions of possibility for the formation of a certain humanism, a certain modernity, and in particular how ‘black’ discursive fields inform Caribbean Diasporic life, how Caribbean identity and the ensuing identifications, power relations and privilege come to be configured. I would like to trace these somewhat abstract historical questions in order to better understand how contemporary everyday Diasporic life comes to be classified, organized, and inscribed through race. The intention of the study is to come into a better understanding of the way in which the Diasporic body comes to know and understand its subjectivity within the governing contemporary public sphere and how this diverse form of knowledge can re-conceptualize learning in the context of schooling and education. I am more seeking to ascertain ways in which race is interpreted as the ‘Truth’ (Foucault 2007; 1980) imputes the ethic of colonialism onto the Diasporic body. I engage the intersections of race, such as gender, ableism, class, sexuality and religion in order to understand how racism when internalized, brings a form of self-regulation onto the Diasporic body, the how and what are the ways racialized knowledge comes to discipline the regulation of meaning making within the Diasporic experience. Succinctly, Diasporic experiences both at the individual level and at the totality of ethnic difference as organized through the race to modernity is of interest. I am inviting a reading, which allows for different bodies of the Diaspora to in some way come to make sense of their Diasporic subjectivities as imbued through the governance of the Western state, to, in a sense, recognize how, through the conditions of the Diaspora, they come to be integrated within their respective communal spaces; to be
cognizant of how contemporary socio-cultural conditions come to configure, generate and transpose subjectivities of the Diaspora. How at certain moments bodies of the Diaspora become predisposed to engage, to socialize in specific ways through these protean subjectivities, to understand how these everyday dispositions become nuanced through cultural attitudes, expressions, perceptions, desire, fear, and fantasies as embedded within the daily sociality of the Diaspora (Bourdieu 1991; Hall 2000). These dispositions are framed in the context of power by way of how these dispositions come to be embodied historically and concurrently situated through hierarchized forms of currency as racialized through culture.

**Diaspora and the Making of the Subject: Implications for Schooling and Education**

Let me say a bit about how I am working to conceptualize these quotidian moments of the Diapsoric-subject. I am interested in the variant modes and procedures of subject formation in which different bodies of the Diaspora come into subjectivity through particular identifications, how these different bodies come into identity through popularized desires which materialize in everyday performances, or should I say how these different bodies come to accept these identifications as being performed through a constellation of histories as a continuity. My interest is with knowing how race and culture concomitantly produce performative desires that form the conditions of existence for the Diasporic-subject. I am thinking of the Diasporic-subject as an embodiment through time and space, one in which the subject comes into being through socio-historic-cultural processes, one in which the subject comes to be constituted through particular sensibilities as interwoven by way of difference immanent to Diasporic-cultures and as shaped through the uncertainty of Diasporic movement. I attempt to release the tension of
a historical, homogenous, singular, immutable read on the Diasporic-body. In doing so, I amplify a dialectic relation formed with the oppressor and the Diasporic-subject. I am attempting to classify this dialectic relationship through the signifier *the*, that the oppressor within the colonial west reads and writes in a monolith, colonial narrative onto *the* Diasporic-subject. With the colonial West, I am thinking of a particular disciplinary regime as institutionalized through the capital of neo-liberal discourse and the attendant rhetoric of progress. Yet, the Diaspora presents complexities. With its shifting terrains, contoured historically through different bodies, the Diaspora as configured through the local and the global materializes through uncertainty in ways in which the Diasporic-subject and its ensuing relationship with its social world speaks to the infinitude of possibilities of what it means to be human. I am intrigued more so by the way in which the Diasporic-subject has become autonomous through the continuous absorption and withdrawal of local stories, traditional narratives, which inevitably come to propel the ordering of thought, the sociality, the peopling as imbued through the transferring of ideas as embodied through Diasporic relations. But what is the meaning of this Diasporic-subject/Diasporic-body? Or, put another way, what is the process of becoming this Diasporic subject, a process that has formed the central theme of this study?

Althusser (2001) reminds us that, “ideology hails or interpellates concrete individuals as concrete subjects” (Althusser 2001: 118). In that, ideology transforms the human, the individual, the body, peoples into subjects. Davies (2000) aptly notes, “the experience of being a person is captured through the notion of subjectivity as constituted through discourses. Integral to these discourses are desires, specific histories, fragmentation, contradiction, discontinuities and embodied ways of knowing, that
importantly the individual is constituted through the discourses of a number of collectives as is the collective itself” (p. 57). My interest concerns how these desires, discontinuities and embodied ways of knowing become shaped through the Diaspora and simultaneously become organized and configured through the governing Eurocentric cultural terrain of the West. Concomitantly, this historical process transforms the body into what I am referring to as the Diasporic-subject. Hence, with the concept of Diasporic-subject, I am thinking about how the body of difference within everyday sociality, comes to desire, accept, resist and disrupt hegemonic patterns of knowledge production about citizenry and belonging within nation-states by way of embodied knowledge as embedded through specific local histories.

Diaspora as experienced through a particular peopling speaks from histories as parlanced through a constellation of changing and unchanging moments. To have to ontologically pin the Diaspora through a sum genealogy speculates about the possibility of specific reified histories, which qualitatively conjures the materiality of the subject that inevitably ought to historically trace the constitutive processes of the Diaspora. The Diaspora could be conceptualized through the sensibilities of movement, which through time contours the Diasporic-subject as abject; as that which, through the inception of the axiomatic Enlightenment subject, has been historically prohibited. Yet, the Diaspora is given life through these axiomatic abject embodied realities that determinately speak through the subjectification of personhood to circumscribe the continuous making of Diasporic-being. In that, through artifactual moments, the Diasporic-subject communicates through the cultural abject and the cultural permissible to be embodied as some wholesome content, this being, the articulated act of negation within the everyday
contemporary of the Diasporic-subject. To this extent, Diasporic relations come to be
syncretic in ways that speak to this sense of sedimented, pure modalities of culture as
enmeshed through the autonomy of the everyday dialogue. Through this relationship with
the Diaspora, the Diasporised subject as oriented through the schema of the ontogenesis,
and the phylogensis, comes to retrieve ontological-and-socio-culturally produced
discourses of its everyday Diasporic-experiential. This retrieval ultimately acts to posit
particular sensibilities of identity in ways which speak to the interconnectedness of the
subject, identity, and culture through specific histories, that being specific historical
conditions of the body, and about how these moments come to govern the production of
subject. In that, the subject is about race, the subject is about gender, the subject is about
sexuality, the subject is about coming to making sense of able-bodiness, about how these
moments come to centre, decentre, fragment, regulate and produce the said subject.

With the possibilities and constraints of advanced capitalist geographies of
schooling and education, the Diasporic-subject comes into subjectivity through the
discursive constitution as imagined by public-sphere socio-cultural practices. Through
these processes the question of agency, or, the agentive subject emerges (Davies 2000;
Weedon 1997). For this study, I am interested in a socio-cultural reading of the subject, in
particular, the subject, coming to know and understand these historical discursive racial
formations of the Diasporic-body. I am more concerned within the context of schooling
and education with understanding how through the Diaspora, the national subject
emerges and continues the project of civility as her/his own within the context of the
white settler nation-state, and how this process aids with entrenching North-South
imperial relations. Remembering that the subject is about embodied knowledge as
ontologically embedded within cultural artifacts of the Diaspora, be it from flags to national anthems (see Stoler, 1995), I am interested in how these symbols become bound to the production of a particular type of citizenry, a particular type of nationalism that materializes the Diasporic-body into this sovereign-subject.

This study invites a particular reading of race, to come to understand how the Diasporic body becomes a cultural artifact for the production of its relations. In doing so, I write through the historical cognizance of my lived contemporary, in which the Diaspora becomes thought through several social fields, as these social fields take up different forms of resistance contingent to specific relations of power. Inevitably, these relations of power residing within the Diaspora are vested historically. That is, they are related historically through space and time, through different geographies of land and peoples, not limiting to a unitary space. Indeed, in the context of schooling and education, Diasporic scholarship has become saturated with the naming of the body, in particular the process of struggle in coming to name the experience of the subject. Yet, this is a process of struggle that encapsulates the disavowal by both subject and state alike, which in its irreducible mode, this process of struggle of coming to name the experience of the subject speaks to the variant forms of power circumscribed through Diasporic interactions. Invariably, these determining forms of power interpellates the said Diasporic body into subjectivity through a colonial interposition of public sphere discourses which come to be marked, read and inscribed as a nomenclature of ‘Truth’. Subjection through the constellation of the Diaspora, becomes implicated through complex polities of the local and the global; economic consequences, class struggles all steeped within the historical tropes of racism. I think it is important to say I am thinking of Diasporic-
subjection as bound through local and global geographies, as subject to the repudiation of economic and ideological state violence (Foucault 1983: 212; Althusser 2001) which works to determine certain forms of subjectivity that materialize into abject or put another way, tangential culture as positioned within the possible spaces of public sphere peopling.

**Historical Background of the Study**

The purpose of the inquiry is not to challenge the way in which this category of Diaspora has been historically conceptualized, that is to say, what constitutes some valid displacement, dispersion, exile, exodus, or movement of a given people. I am more concerned with the way in which different Diasporic bodies come to socialize, through certain communicative strategies and contemporary mannerisms, the particular modes of interacting that facilitate the everyday engagement of peoples in a new place and space. When I speak about Diaspora, I do not mean in a sum total way dislocation of a people, though in some sense dislocation is what is experienced, nor am I speaking about a totalizing experience of exile, though these are all part and parcel of the Diasporic experience. In a sense then, I am not speaking about the Diaspora as a sum classifying system, while at the same time I am. Yet, working with Diaspora as process, I am more thinking of the movement of people to different geographies, that is a particular transatlantic movement from Africa to the Caribbean to the West, a movement whereby people come to know themselves through the margins of their contemporary public sphere. I am more concerned about subject-identity, citizenry-sovereignty and the relationship with the state and in what way this sense of nationalism comes to be approached through the Diasporization of peoples.
As discussed later and concerning the relevance for schooling and education, I would like to broach the Diasporic experience by thinking through an anti-colonial framework (Fanon 1963; Memmi 1991; Cesaire 1972; Nkrumah 1970; Cabral 1970; James 1989; Dei 2000; Dei and Asgharzadeh 2001; Rodney 1972; Robinson 1983; Senghor 2001). I am less interested in offering a historical account of travels over the ocean or what constitutes a legitimate Diaspora, or why one moves to a different geography, or to historically trace the trajectory of migration of particular peoples. At the same time I recognize this approach forms some of the limitations and possibilities of the study.

Conventional schooling and education have placed this discussion in the field of Diasporic studies (see also Brah 2003; Chow 1993; Braziel and Mannur 2003; Dufoix 2008; Cohen 1997), where the central questions concern, identity, place, time, home and culture to name some. The theme of Diaspora has also crystallized within the field of cultural studies (see also Hall 2005; Gilroy 1993; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Grossberg, Nelson and Treichler 1992; Gilroy, Grossberg and McRobbie 2000). While this field of the Diaspora forms the backdrop of this inquiry, I am centering the historic specificity of race, in order to understand how Caribbean Diasporic peoples make meaning of their lived experience. I am primarily concerned with the experience of race/blackness as foregrounded through the Diaspora. I write from a place where I too have undergone this thing of Diaspora. Having a birth place in the archipelago known as the Caribbean, and having spent my formative years there, the Diaspora in and of itself seems to be like home, that is, there seems to be this always already way of knowing, in and through the moment of interaction, this engagement with time and space, of different bodies and
geographies, of coming to make sense of past and present alike. In this study I am engaging in more of a dialogical process. I draw from the polities of my Diasporic experience, to writing as method, to the uncertainty of coming to make meaning. I write with a particular piece of passion, a particular will of ‘developing’ personhood, of obtaining the intellectual tools to survive within the broader socio-cultural-political landscape of the West. With this endeavor, and as a starting point, I am thinking through my Diasporic experience in order to understand the socio-cultural terrain. The study then is more oriented to an autoethnographic approach.

Throughout the study, I have struggled with the question of what it means to engage the inquiry through the particular location of one’s lived experience, of one’s personal memory, where the data coincide with the location of the researcher? I struggled with not having to do formal interviews. I struggled with coming to know and understand the ways of the study through the process of writing. On the whole, the study is meant to engender critical discernment concerning race as contextualized within the everyday Diasporic public sphere life. With this study I am interested in the ethical and moral know how of the Diaspora, the implicit go-to register (Foster 2007) that informs daily living. I am concerned with the many ways whereby this registrar comes to be cryptically and discursively encoded through race. I would like for one to question the relationship between one’s body and that, which is experienced through Diasporic realities. I query this relationship through questions concerning the location of subject, questions concerning historic specificities, questions concerning geographies of race, such as, class, gender, sexuality, dis/ability, law and religion (see also Edwards 2001; Patterson and Kelly 2000; Dei 2006; Mercer 1994; Gilroy 1993).
Locating the Subject: What Brings Me to This Study?

In this section, I recall some of my personal narratives from my journal entries which palimpsest my Diasporic journey, and further grounds the study through the sense of embodied ways of knowing. I write from my diary entries, which are embedded in deep emotions. I write through these personal stories, personal memory to foreground the human and the subject within these narratives. Embedded within these personal stories are sites of loss, healing, resistance, decolonization, spirituality, sites of coming to know, sites of recovery. These personal narratives I position as contrapuntal to the dominant historical tropes of social science research, as offering possibilities for schooling and education through autoethnography. These personal stories speak to the following questions: Where does knowledge reside? How do we come to know and understand knowledge? And what knowledge counts?

I begin with my arrival in Canada. I still remember the first day I came to Canada. It was a cool day in July. I remember thinking of Canada as a big air-conditioned room. Little was I then. Much time has passed since that first day. Young, spirited, anxious, eager for a new beginning, I had no inkling then, of how this new beginning would mold my thoughts, of how Canada would come to shape my life. Coming from the Caribbean, Canada was quite a change. Trinidad was home. I still remember climbing the mango tree in our yard to pick fresh mangoes. Back then this thing of being organic was not as popular as it is now. For the most part, I would think the vegetation in our yard would have been organic. The concern then was not about what chemicals per se were used when planting. It was more about living off the land. In my village, in the Southern part of the country, planting the land was very much a way of life. It was part of the
community. I did not realize how close I was to the mango tree until I moved to Canada. In my newly found home, I have always been looking for this mango tree. I soon came to learn that I did not mean mango tree in some physical sense. But it was more so of what this tree represented, of what this tree meant, of the memories it conjured. Food has always been that way to me; it brought a certain closeness to home. Not only food had this effect, but also language, the particular diction in which we articulate, as well as music. There is something about food, language and music, the historic origins and how I have come to identify with a particular space and time, a particular geography as home. I think it is a question of how one comes to know a place as home through cultural memory and the cultural artifacts that allow for place and time to come to be known as home.

I arrived at Pearson International Airport as an International student. I am not sure then if the plan was to return or if it was to settle in this newly found place. I started off in what was then called Grade thirteen. The goal was to attend university and study some science. Education was supposed to be the way out, the way out of plantation life. Back then foreign students were allowed to work if, and only if, a Canadian could not fill the position; needless to say few work permits were given to foreign students, though if work were to be found on the site of campus, a work permit was not needed. During my undergraduate years and for some time after, I spent a lot of time on the track and in the weight room. Working out, running track, doing weights made for comforting moments. Track and field, lifting weights came to be more than leisure or recreation; it was my solace; it was a way of life; it was home away from home. It was in this space that I was able to find part-time work on campus in the Faculty of Physical Health and Education. I
was stationed in the athletic centre where my duties moved me from working in the weight room, to the fieldhouse where the indoor track was located. I enjoyed this time very much. It was a time I could be reflexive, a time I could dialogue with myself. I thought a lot about why it was that certain places were more well off so than others. I thought about how I grew up accepting that this was the natural order of things. I was not yet equipped with the language to critically engage in some meaningful discussion to come to better understand these thoughts. I accepted my reality as some metaphysical archetypal design, as the way it ought to be. I had these conversations over and over with myself in the campus weight room. See, the campus weight room has been a dear place to me, for it is in the weight room that I started noticing how certain bodies were engaged. There, for the most part, I was trying to make sense of my social space, thinking how bodies were read and what meanings were always already presupposed and ascribed onto particular bodies. I started noticing who spoke with whom and how they were spoken to. What left an impression then was how the hyper-fit black male body was given value within the space of the weight room. What stood out too, was whose voice had authority when it came to being the expert on training, whose voice had agency concerning exercise technique, whose voice had currency concerning training methods, and whose voice was taken seriously when it came to other issues such as, politics, law, and medicine. I noticed which bodies were desired and soon understood which bodies you ought to speak about, and which bodies you ought not desire. I became aware of how black masculinity, how black femininity come to be desired, the time, place and in which spaces these bodies come into well-measured possibilities of being animated. I became aware about how body, voice and agency came to be constitutive of the human condition,
that these moments were very much embedded within the colonial inscriptions of race as
imbued through gender, sexuality and ableism. Coming from the weight room into social
inquiry, I was not thinking about writing for the academy. It was about wanting to
understand the different social exchanges in my everyday life. It was about wanting to
understand how race became entangled in these seemingly neutral conversations. It was
about being en-abled with the critical sense to make meaning of particular
communicative exchanges among the different bodies that I came to cross paths with
daily.

Deciding to pursue the M.Ed and later the Ph.D for me emerged from the
countless conversations I had with myself in the weight room, about coming to know,
coming to understand the moment of recognizing racialized currency, of recognizing
what body is deemed desirable, of what it means for a particular body to understand in
any given moment how that same body comes to be accorded with power, how that body
recognizes self as agentive. I understand these moments as being complex and deeply
entangled with social relations of power. I often thought about, what then are the
provisions in which these instantaneous ways of knowing particular spaces become
dependent on bodies of difference? I want now to bring attention to the different
theoretical frameworks at work in talking about race and the Diaspora, to talk about how
these frameworks accord academic privilege and how we come to make sense of the
Diasporic experience differently through these theoretical locations.
Diaspora and Local Schooling and Education

But why did I ever leave Trinidad in the first place? Why the need to seek a life abroad? What is it that Trinidad did not have to offer? And why Canada? Growing up in Trini, as we would say, foreign was always romanticized, and by foreign I am not talking about Africa or India, foreign was the United States, Canada or Europe. Neither Africa nor India were anywhere in the picture. Despite the vibrant Pan-African/anti-colonial movements with names such as C. L. R. James, George Padmore and Stokely Carmichael being historically involved (all nationals of Trinidad); Frantz Fanon and Aime Cesaire from the neighboring Martinique; Caribbean scholars as Derek Walcott, Edward Brathwaite, George Lamming, Wilson Harris, Edouard Glissant, and Walter Rodney; political and spiritual leaders of India, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru; these names were more on the shelves or in the textbooks. These names were not on the lips of Trinidadian youth. The presence of national secondary exams, that of O and A levels in Trinidad had a lot to do with this. The colonial will was vibrant within schooling and education. For the most part what was taught in secondary schools was rooted in a Eurocentric landscape. Trinidad and Tobago, as a time and place was said to have emerged through plantation life, at least that was how it was taught in the classroom, starting from the one who has been popularized as the great hero, the great savior, Christopher Columbus. Indigenous peoples who lived previous to the colonizers’ entry were historicized as nomadic, as not having a community, living as “cannibals”. They were identified as savages, barbaric, uncivilized. Indigenous peoples were said to be non-human. For the archipelago known as the Caribbean, the advent of modernity supposedly sprung with the arrival of the colonizer. Indigenous peoples needed to be saved, to be
rescued. I think, for the most part though, today, through a re-reading of history, a retelling of the colonial narrative, it is uncontested among scholars that what happened was really a form of extermination of Indigenous peoples. Today Indigenous communities are far and few, their ways of knowing, histories, spirituality all void from the classroom. From C.L.R. James to Indigenous peoples, these names did not resonate in my local classroom experience, neither in the everyday village talk. When they appeared, they appeared in a particular way that did not yield a sense of identification or belonging. One could not find oneself in those stories. These lessons were told as if they were fictional characters, as if they existed *out there*, ready to be cast for the next Hollywood hit movie. One did not inculcate a critical way of understanding colonial relations; the concept of imperialism was void from my local classroom conversations. For the most part my day-to-day life occurred in an antihistorical setting. Colonial education did not allow for classroom conversations where the Caribbean was discussed within the broader context of historic colonial relations, concerning Africa, India and Europe, in particular England, and the governing monstrosity of enslavement and Indentureship. And, when discussions did occur, they were not from a decolonizing perspective. It was as if Trinidad and Tobago, and by extension the Caribbean, were distinct independent geographies of time and space. Colonialism never occurred for some text-books, and for the ones where this was mentioned, it was told as if it happened a long time ago, not affecting the here and now. Instead the colonizers’ lands, colonizers’ culture, colonizers’ knowledge was exalted, glorified for all eternity. The future of the Caribbean, then, was a highway destined to the country of relic, all in the hands of the newly freed locals well-equipped with their *Independence*. 
Coming to Canada the classroom experience was congruent to my Trini experience. I found it difficult to negotiate with the Western text. I had problems locating my experiences in them. I imagined that coming to live with newness would present a number of challenges, the act of having to understand different cultural ways of knowing, of trying to make sense of what it means to belong, of the experience of home. At first every moment was a moment of nostalgia. I think I was trying to understand each and every experience, every exchange, and every interaction through some childhood memory. It was if I never left. It was if I needed a duplicate, a replica of home, an insular experience to make sense of things, the simultaneous recognition of joy and sorrow. So what then is this longing? What then was my need to identify with a particular place through different spaces, through different geographies, be it culture, language, food, music?

I am from a rather small village from the southern part of the island. The Caribbean region was deemed to be ‘Third World’, underdeveloped, with arms open wide, longing to be transformed by and into Modernity. In Trinidad, language, for one, had a lot to be desired. One needed to speak the Queen’s English to be proper. One needed to speak the Queen’s English to come into some form of modernity, to be accepted into public life, to be accepted into the belly of colonial education. Patois or dialect was not appropriate, was not formal, and therefore not for certain places. Writing, for one, did not allow a place for patois or dialect. This was entirely taboo for writing. Patois/dialect was more reserved for recreation, leisure or informal time. Colonial schooling insisted on the formal pen for classroom work. Colonial curricula endowed a way of learning whereby thought, reason as it shaped itself through the patois/dialect, as
it emerged from conversing, had to then go through this legitimizing procedure, that is to say to reinscribe, to recode itself resulting in this normative act of translating. Translating everyday thought now, to some acceptable piece of writing became like an everyday *ritualized practice*. As a student I was required to demonstrate expertise, intellectual capacity, to belch out thought through this idealized form of writing. But, where then did thought reside? And how did I come to know self through this experience, that is, through this transformative procedure of having this organic way of knowing framed within the likes of some idealized print?

Mind you, local theatre was vibrant within the respective communities. Much of the work there cast itself through the telling of local histories by means of folklore. It was a space where the organic tongue was allowed room to come into a particular relationship with self. It was a place where local peoples could struggle with their experiences and tell their stories through their Indigenous medium, their Indigenous voices. It was a place where local peoples could communicate through their Indigenous tools to build their *houses*. In a sense it was a place where Indigenous and local peoples could come together and foster a kindred community, a kindred spirit through their way of knowing. At the classroom level, theatre lived out everyday in my schooling, though often it would stop abruptly when the teacher walked in, and then we, would all resort to the quiet good-disciplined student performance. I still remember thinking about why we could not have a teachable moment that mirrored the outside classroom talk, the fun of the recess and lunchtime periods. Instead, this experience residing outside the classroom, was replaced by the ever-canonised Shakespeare, Mark Twain and Harper Lee. My argument here is not to dismiss these works in their entirety, but instead, to question the, *what* and *how* of
what is being taught, that is to allow for the curricula to engage with some of these Indigenous ways of learning, these outside the classroom conversations in order to reread the colonially positioned text in a way where Indigenous and local peoples can come to question their experiences, their myriad relationships with the different forms of colonialism and imperialism (Said 1994, 1979; Bhabha 1994; Ahmad 2008; Smith 1999; Churchill 2009; Dua 2008; Dei 2008c; Kincheloe & Steinberg 2008; Semali & Kincheloe 1999). I want to find different ways whereby the local language, the local parlance, the local voice, from patois to dialect, (the place where thoughts reside,) could come to articulate/theorize themselves within the classroom texts. In a sense, then, I want to understand Diasporic-voices as pedagogical possibilities.

My own voice has been important to me. My voice has housed my thoughts, my language, my culture. My voice is in a sense an artifact of my history. It plays an integral role in coming to understand my embodied experiences in Canada where cultural difference becomes tangentialised through colonial histories. Historically, the invention of Canadian Nationalism has coalesced through the cultural paradigms of the British and the French, from the National Ballet, to language - English and French - to the Opera, to the material good of Whiteness (Brand 1998; Thobani 2007; Razack 2004). Present was the absence of Aboriginal peoples’ ways of living. Beyond the mention made in the citizenship manual, the one newcomers or immigrants would have to study in order to prepare for the almighty Citizenship Test, Aboriginal heritage was noticeably absent in the media and classroom texts, in that, print told the story from the location of the colonizer. The history of Canada has come to be represented, come to be known, through a masculine Euro pen, despite Diasporic movement. With the declaration of Canada as an
official multicultural nation, there is this sense of moral panic within the public, from media to print, how to now insert this Diaspora within the Canadian mainframe, how to write oneself out of historical amnesia, how to write the multicultural body out of its criminalized geography.

Yet, multiculturalism in the context of the Western nation-state is quite entangled within imperial histories and Diasporic relations. I am interested, in particular with the transmission between North-South geographies. How are the Caribbean, Africa, Central America, and South America located in relation to Western geographies? What are the historical landlord-tenant relations? What we do know is that these geographies are not mutually exclusive. They are not disjointed sets, to say compartmentalized, these geographies are very much dependent on each other, but the terms of these relationships are questionable. If these geographies are inter dependent, that is, they work in tandem with each other, how then do Diasporic relations become organized? I am concerned here with these Diasporic relations, how they come to be reified in everyday local relations, and the ways in which race comes to be implicated in them.

**Locating the Discourse: Politics of the Author**

In recalling my personal narratives, I have been thinking about the ways in which race/blackness come to be reified through these Diasporic-spaces, through these cultural artifacts (Dei 2008a; 2008b; 2005). I am thinking about how I come to make sense of the Diasporic-subject through different interpretations of race, as race becomes embodied and reified. How does one come to make sense of the Diasporic experience differently when articulated through different theoretical frameworks? What are the ways in which space comes to be reified through race? How do we come to recognize space as ethnic? I
am thinking, therefore, through race, in particular the white-black dialectic, to understand how spaces of Euromodernity become localized to a particular Diasporic identity. I am interested in the ways in which ethnicity come to be discursively deployed to situate, and at the same time, stabilize Diasporic bodies through particular theoretical conjunctures. What are the different theoretical frameworks at work here in articulating these Diasporic identities? For example, What are the points of divergence and convergence when the category of ethnicity is discussed through the different theoretical locations of anti-racism, multiculturalism, black feminist theory, cultural studies, Diasporic studies, feminist theory, anti-colonial theory, queer theory, disability studies, afrocentric studies, and post-structuralism?

**Situating the Chapters**

The remainder of this work is organized as follows. Chapter Two concerns method, in particular, autoethnography as method. In this chapter I discuss the *What, How and Why* of doing autoethnography, the ethics of collecting and dialoguing with the personal memory of the researcher as data. Here, I am asking the following questions: What does it mean for the lived experiences of the researcher to be the central source of knowledge? How does the researcher come to choose a given period, a given moment, a given story as a relevant sample? And how do particular texts and cultural artifacts come to be data? I talk about the key research questions and discuss the different experiences that have brought me as researcher, to these research questions, and, importantly, I articulate the limitations and possibilities of autoethnography as a method.

In Chapter Three, I engage with a selection of literature to review previous and current discussions concerning the African Diaspora. As already explained, I am not
taken up with the how and what constitutes a said Diaspora. Instead what I am bringing to the inquiry here is an attempt to locate the contemporary discussion concerning the African Diaspora within schooling and education. Importantly, I want to understand the different discursive frameworks in which this African Diasporic experience is discussed and how, and in what ways it comes to articulate a particular Diaspora and the Diasporised subject. With this chapter, I recall the geographies of blackness as they emerged through Pan-Africanism and how these geographies have come to articulate the experiences of the African Diasporic body. I am concerned with the ways Diasporic experiences formulate and communicate a particular subjectivity as being, insofar as I historically trace the contours of blackness through Pan-Africanism, to frame the humanism of the black Diaspora.

In Chapter Four I work to disentangle the theoretical tensions between the post- and the anti-colonial. I consider the way in which race/blackness come to be positioned/discussed within these conversations and the manner whereby the Diasporic subject comeS to be constituted differently through these theoretical frameworks of the post-and the anti-colonial. I engage in a discussion concerning race, heterogeneity, ethnic/ity absolutism, essentialism, historical origins, blackness, culture, mutability, reductionism, collective histories, shared experiences, plantation materiality and racism. I dialogue with these discursive entanglements to make sense of the politics of the different discursive frameworks within schooling and education. I trouble what it means to speak about the experience of racism from a critical race theoretical perspective or from an anti-racism discursive framework or from cultural studies. I trouble what it means to speak about the experiences of racism by foregrounding ethnicity. How do these theoretical
moments provide for the provisional conditions that accord privilege to the racialised pedagogue within the halls of academe? I tinker with how these discursive conditions of positionality come to constitute what Spivak calls an *epistemic violence* (Spivak 1988) within academe. I also draw from Gramsci (1971) to think about the tacit institutionalized *war of discursive positions*. In recognizing the way in which institutions allow for particular racialised scholars to engage in discussions concerning the embodied experiences of racism, questions concerning identity, ethnicity, culture and Diaspora, I am asking how do these particular discursive frameworks as they co-reside within institutions come into discursive authority. Might we talk about the politics concerning the *epistemic saliency* of discourse (Dei 2005) and the influence of scholars to align or co-opt their work within the dominant discursive? How do these moments speak to the experience of the oppressed? What are the methodological implications concerning which body can do research and research for whom? What is at stake when one’s personal memory is, not to say lost, but written out of the public archive, or written in a particular way that primarily accords the author discursive currency, discursive positionality within the contemporary academy.

Chapters Five, Six and Seven concern disentangling the relationship between race, identity, culture, nation-state and the production of a particular Diasporic subject. Here, I am interested in understanding the ways in which Diasporic bodies come to materialize a form of modernity through communicative exchanges as governed through the nation-state of the Euro-West. I interpret communicative exchanges as a series of installed procedures, ritualized practices which govern the said Diasporic-subject. I want to make sense of how these communicative exchanges, as informed through race, form
differentiated moments of survival, resistance, self-determination, desire, abjection, alienation and development of the Diasporic-subject. I am interested in how the Diasporic-subject comes into the moment of recognizing the historical colonial experience of Euro-modernity. Some of the questions framing these chapters are, How do everyday artifacts come to be revealed and shaped through the temporal discourse of Euro-modernity? What are the ways in which the colonizing paradigms of Euro-Enlightenment come to encode a particular form of knowledge onto the Diasporic-subject, as the subject lives itself within the public sphere of modernity? I draw on Fanon’s Diasporic experience within colonial territories and personal memory. I speak through an autobiographical voice as active vantage points, more so to “recall” the past into the present moments and to hone a communal dialogical spirit.

In the final chapter, I engage in a reflexive discussion of the central themes of race, Diasporic-subjectivity, modernity, culture and identity. I speak about the ambivalences of the Diaspora and some of the tensions regarding future-past-present and the historical perception of time. Ultimately, I am seeking a peopling that transforms the human through schooling and education.
CHAPTER TWO: WRITING AUTOETHNOGRAPHY THROUGH DIASPORA AS METHOD

Introduction

When I think of doing autoethnography, I sometimes think of food. I think of the various methods of cooking. I think of the different ways of coming to prepare food: the myriad menus, the many recipes, the numerous ways of knowing taste, the copious methods of readying ingredients. Doing autoethnography, then, for me is in many ways like preparing a meal. Yet preparing a meal comes with choices and when desiring taste there are certain consequences if approached through a particular method. Similar to preparing food, doing autoethnography involves a host of ingredients. I am particularly interested in autoethnography as an approach that interprets Diaspora as method. In what follows, I ground autoethnography within the existing literature. I conceptualize autoethnography within the context of writing by way of locating Diaspora. In doing so, I try to find different ways to reveal the challenges, limitations and possibilities of writing autoethnography as a research method. I want to interpret how different bodies of the African Diaspora come to know and understand their embodied experiences. With this in mind, I broach Diaspora as a site of interest to understand how Diasporised bodies, through histories of blackness, different subjectivities and political locations, come to be implicated through the approach of autoethnography. I engage in conversations concerning Diasporic Indigeneity to reveal some of the consequences and implications for knowledge production/validation and dissemination of this tangential body of knowledge. I therefore, write through an integrative discursive framework to interpret the entangled intersections of Diasporized subjectivity by way of race, class, gender,
sexuality, ableism, and religion. I locate Diasporic Indigeneity as a site of contestation counter-hegemonic to dominant forms of qualitative research methods. As a vantage point I write through my local stories, my Indigenous cultural memories of the Diaspora to offer possibilities for autoethnography as a research method. By way of dialoguing through autoethnography, I write through personal subjectivities to articulate pedagogies that subvert dominant social science research methods within schooling and education.

What is Autoethnography: Possibilities and Limitations of the Diasporized Subject

Autoethnography is a difficult term to pin down. Autoethnography is conceptualized differently by a range of scholars (Ellis & Bochner 2000, 2002; Ellis 2009, 2004; Denzin 2001, 1997, 1989; Denzin & Lincoln 2000; Van Maanen 1995, 1988; Chang 2008; Cole & Knowles 2001; Reed-Danahay 1997; Wolcott 2004; Roth 2005; Brandes 1979, 1982; Hayano 1979; Adam & Jones 2008; Jones 2005). Ellis and Bochner (2000) speak of autoethnography as “an autobiographical genre of writing and research that displays multiple layers of consciousness, connecting the personal to the cultural” (p. 737). Reed-Danahay (1997) interprets autoethnography “as a form of self-narrative that places the self within a social context --- [that] it is both a method and a text” (p. 9). Ellis (2004) notes that, “autoethnography refers to writing about the personal and its relationship to culture” (p. 37). The much-referenced Hayano (1979) suggests that autoethnographers “possess the qualities of often permanent self-identification with a group and full internal membership, recognized both by themselves and the people whom they are a part” (cited in Danahay 1997: 5). For the purpose of this study, however, I am drawing from Cole and Knowles’ (2001) interpretation that “an autoethnography places the self within a sociocultural context. [That] unlike autobiography, which is focused on oneself for
purposes of self-representation and / or self-understanding, autoethnography uses the self as a starting or vantage point from which to explore broader sociocultural elements, issues, or constructs” (p. 16). In a local sense then, I understand doing autoethnography as thinking through my lived experiences to critically interpret the historic-sociocultural spaces in which I engage daily. I write through autoethnography to understand the way Diasporic identities come to be formed through racializing procedures. In doing so, I am writing through my lived experiences to critically dialogue with these experiential moments. Still, autoethnography, as Chang (2008) tells us, is not simply a study about the lone subject, given the myriad discursive embodiments of everyday sociocultural spaces. Chang considers three possibilities of doing autoethnography:

i) Investigating yourself as the main character and others as supporting actors in your life story ii) Including others as co-participants or co-informants in your study and iii) Studying others as the primary focus, yet also as an entry to your world. (Chang 2008: 65)

With this study, I am taken up with the third approach to autoethnography, in which my personal experiences are utilised to guide the research without centering on myself. In this approach to autoethnography, “the self opens a door to an investigation but remains outside while others are in the spotlight as main characters or participants” (Chang 2008:66).

For me, as I write autoethnography through my Diasporic-subjective position, I am aware of the politics of selectively drawing on personal memory, and the consequences, implications, and complexity for knowledge production when writing through alterity (Ladson-Billings 2000; Chetan 2004; Pinar 2000). I recognize the location of my Diasporic-subjectivity as part and parcel of the meaning-making process for social science research. We know historically that social science research have been
organized and installed through proclaimed neutral, objective, bias-free knowledge (Marcuse 1991; Horkheimer and Adorno 2002; Foucault 2007; Popkewitz 1997; Denzin and Lincoln 2000; Baronov 2004; Scheurich and Young 1997). I recognize experiential moments as part of the meaning making process for social science research. I am cognizant of the way in which these experiential moments come to be informed, the political implications of the many ways of coming to know and understand our experiences and the necessary incompleteness of our understandings and articulations of our experiences. I acknowledge the particular care with writing Diaspora through subjecthood, the political, ethical and moral responsibility of being researcher. Writing through autoethnography means writing through deep concerns, deep emotions of pain, suffering, melancholy, loss, rage, anger, joy, happiness, disappointment and sorrow. Writing through autoethnography also allows me to dialogue with this embedded Diasporised knowledge as entangled through a complex web of emotions and concerns. It means coming to know and understand these experiential moments of the Diaspora. It means coming to know and understand subjecthood differently (Richardson 2000; Ellis & Bochner 2000, 2002; Ellis 2009, 2004; Denzin 2001, 1997, 1989; Trifonas 2003; Kincheloe 2005; Pinar 1994). Writing through autoethnography is countervailing to the dominant historical tropes of social science research. It challenges the dissemination of so-called value-free, neutral, objective forms of knowledge and works to shift the governing edict of what it means to do ethnography. Writing through autoethnography is always-already a site of contestation for research and knowledge production. Autoethnography as method is about embodied knowledge. Autoethnography is about self-reflexive data. For me, autoethnography as method is about writing/thinking through
Diasporic ways of knowing my reality, through personal histories and memories, through reading of particular texts for “they preserve thoughts, emotions, and perspectives at the time of recording, untainted by your present research agenda” (Chang 2008: 106). With subjectivity, the body, personal memory and Diasporic experiences congeal to form the contentious relationship of researcher/researched.

Doing autoethnography is distinct yet at the same time part and parcel of ethnography. Cole and Knowles (2001) note, that “ethnography is used to describe both the way of studying human life, [that ethnography is a] systematic investigation through a process of intensive and extensive participant-observation, participation, and interviewing within a designated cultural group” (p. 17) (See also Denzin and Lincoln 2000; Pratt 1986; Marcus 1986.) In writing autoethnography by way of Diaspora as method, data is not systematically set out before it is engaged, rather the researcher comes to know, to identify the data through a particular relationship with the broader sociocultural context as governed through the research process. Ultimately, the experience of the researcher-subject becomes the central resource from which the data is interpreted.

I conceptualize Diasporic Indigeneity through a particular Diasporized time/space in which the body becomes constituted by way of the governing form of localized knowledge. To recall, “‘Indigenousness’ may be thought of as knowledge consciousness arising locally an in association with the long term occupancy of a place” (Dei 2000: 72). (See also Smith 1999; Semali and Kincheloe 1999; Kincheloe and Steinberg 2008; Dei 2008, 2000). With long-term dwelling, I am thinking of Diasporic Indigeneity as embedded through a particular geography of time and place. The task here for Diasporic Indigeneity as Ladson-Billings (2000) mentions, is coming to recover the self through
“ontological alterity”. With *ontological alterity*, I am thinking of the way the Diasporic subject through experiencing the governing contemporary settler nation-state epoch, comes to know, recover, disentangle and understand, by way of having historical lineage to a particular geography through time and space, knowledge immanent to the local body of Diaspora. Diasporic Indigeneity then is not fixed, not easily pinned down, but Diasporic Indigeneity forms itself through the flux of the episteme. Diasporic Indigeneity is transformative. Diasporic Indigeneity is about interconnectedness. Indigeneity is about intimate relations with the cultural reservoir of Diaspora. Indigeneity speaks to embodied ways of knowing through local attachments and placements, while Diaspora represents movements out of/away from place. With Diasporic Indigeneity I am thinking of embodied ways of knowing through local attachments and places that have been translocated through time and space by way of the Diaspora. Writing autoethnography by way of Diaspora as method moves beyond the rigid systems of inquiry that traditional ethnography calls for. Diaspora as method is subjective, political and laden with passion and emotions. With Diasporic Indigeneity, I am thinking about language. I am thinking about the oral, about the vernacular. I am thinking of a *portable, transnational, counterpublic pedagogy* embedded within the writing (Davies 2008). Writing autoethnography through Diasporic Indigeneity is about writing through histories and contemporary practices of the vernacular. It is about writing and thinking through my local articulation (patois, dialect) as embedded within the lived experiences of blackness. It is about working with *epistemological uncertainty* of the different vernacular articulations. The challenge for autoethnography is with coming to understand what it means to write through a particular vernacular ethos, that is, writing through vernacular
theory to broach the relationship between the *is* and the *ought*, when vernacular theory becomes constituted through a different syntax and sentence structure.

In her account of the pitfalls of doing autoethnography, Chang (2008) warns about being over-focused on the self without critically engaging the overarching socio-cultural context. She contends that there tends to be a concentration on personal stories without historically tracing relationships with political bodies. Broadly conceived power and privilege as ascribed through race, class, gender, sexuality, religion and ableism tend to be on the periphery of the narrative rather than centered through the self. Chang further notes the way data tends to be limited to recalling personal memory and insists on the ethical politics of including other bodies through the narrative of self (Chang 2008: 54).

Autoethnography allows the researcher to be grounded holistically in the knowledge-making process. Autoethnography is personable, approachable and departs from the rigid contours of academic writing. Autoethnography is deeply embedded within the voice of the Diasporic-subject. Autoethnography allows the researcher to come to know and understand his or her subjectivity as contoured through the nation-state and Diaspora. Autoethnography is self-transformative through self-reflexivity (Van Maanen 1995, 1988; Reed-Danahay 1997; Wolcott 2004; Roth 2005; Brandes 1979, 1982; Hayano 1979; Jones 2005). Autoethnography is about coming to know and understand the humanism of the particular lived subject. It is about understanding the relationship of freedoms and unfreedoms, the liberal and illiberal tensions, which come to entangle and envelope what it means to be human through the web of local histories. Ultimately, autoethnography is affirming of local ways of understanding the Diasporic experience embodied through personal memories/histories.
Learning Objectives and Research Questions: Coming to Know Method

Coming to write this chapter on method has been difficult. Firstly, I needed to ponder, really, what is the relationship between methodology and method. This uncertainty of mine with method in relation to methodology was coming to be a growing concern. It caused me grief for I thought it was keeping me from writing. I wanted to get going with the reading, the sorting of the different texts, the organizing of chapters; *the what goes where* exercise of writing. I knew the issues that were troubling me, though understanding them was a task. It is that which brought me here, the how I arrive question, the need, the want, to be able to articulate these moments, to able to make some meaning of these repeating experiences concerning the inter-related questions of culture, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, dis/ability and identity. But how was I supposed to present this work? How would the study materialize? Should I do a biography, a phenomenological study, grounded theory, ethnography interviews, case study, or let us say participatory action research? This decision was most troubling. I knew, however, I wanted to write from my experiences, from what I have been through, those socializing moments that puzzled me. I knew that I wanted to engage from within, to write from my personal stories to write back to the governing social context. I had to return to my learning objectives which speak through my central research questions where I am concerned with the experience of race, where I am thinking about the way in which Caribbean Diasporic peoples come to understand race through their lived public sphere, about how African Diasporic peoples come to understand the need to wittingly or strategically de-race selves to maneuver through their everyday socio-political terrain. To reiterate my research questions are:
What are the ways in which the Caribbean-Diaspora comes to understand and experience race?

By what means does the experience of race organize and inscribe the identities of the Caribbean Diaspora?

Returning to my research questions reminded me of the ways in which my research interests come to be grounded through my experiences, through my memories, through my innate ways of knowing. It reminded me of how in a sense I was really engaging in a study of my subjecthood.

During my course work, I thought a lot about method. I thought of method as a process, method as a particular experience, method as pedagogy. Throughout the study, I wanted to have this sense of method grounded within the writing, grounded within every page of the text. Needless to say, whenever in classes, the matter of writing as method (see also Richardson 2000; Min-ha 1989) came up, I perked up immediately. Writing, I found, was quite challenging. Coming from a background where, for the most part, my undergraduate time was spent trying to solve equations, coming into this writing process was and still is, a slow and very much a cautious approach. Reminiscing, I think I can say, my writing was very impersonal, a writing that literally wrote out, practically excluded my voice, my experiences, my personal memory. Taking up the I, the we, the us was just not acceptable. I had to write with this neutral, objective pen, to tell the story from the outside, not to contaminate, not to be biased with my experience. Writing then, had a certain “purity”, a certain posture that claimed, in its tacit way, “innocence”. I was always trying to put a face to what I was reading. I tried to imagine what my author looked like. To think of schooling and writing then was to think of writing as free from a
body. Daily, in secondary school in Trinidad, and later within the undergraduate walls of Canada, I searched for my surroundings, my way of life in class readings. Yet, as I was drawn in by the foreign, by the alien pen, and as I continuously searched for my-self, curious to find my voice, the need to find myself tucked somewhere within the writing, somewhere within these stories, I found I became more and more urgent with the need to write from personal observations, from personal location.

As I write through my personal voice, from the I, as the readings say, *embodied writing*, from personal memory, from personal observation. It took me a while to gain the confidence to write from personal observations, memory and experiences. What then does it mean to engage qualitative research through thinking about society in terms of race, Diaspora, nation-state, modernity, identity and culture? What does it mean to write from and through these locations where, in a sense, I am writing back, where, in a sense, I am writing from a different and simultaneously from the same place? As I mentioned moments ago, writing for me has been very difficult and continues to be a difficult process. From the numerous writing exercises given in classes, to personally writing to myself, to writing for leisure, to therapeutic journal entries, the writing process has been comforting yet unsettling and tedious. From joy, to being burdened, to having to take up a position of solace, writing nevertheless has accompanied me throughout my thesis journey. What I want to convey in this writing is conversation, in particular internal dialogue between mutually engaged parties. I want the reader to be prompted to search through their own experiences, to think through their Diasporic experiences to engage with the writing, to find shared or similar moments and come to better understand these moments, to be able to write back in a particular way that involves these memorable lived
experiences. You might ask well what exactly are these memorable moments? But I am not asking to rank our social exchanges with each other, that is, to quantify the experience. No, of course not. What I am asking, however, is for us to search our feelings, to search for the way we come to know and understand ourselves through a particular time, moment, experience with a friend, loved one, or time at work, school or a certain time or point in our lives which has stayed with us in a particular way, or come to mark, give us meaning be it through a form of psychic injury, happiness, love, or joy. The point I am making is that we all come to know or understand these moments without have to go to elite institutions of learning, without having to read a particular text, where so few have the opportunity to do so. These innate moments of knowing, of marking is what I wish to speak to.

**Coming to Know the Data through Writing Autoethnography**

As I write, the data, in and of itself, is unfolding. So, coming to know the data is a process, in that, data is part and parcel of method, data is about coming to make meaning of the Diasporized subject. As I write this chapter on method, I am not in a place to come up with a comprehensive list of steps/items to say here is the data, or here are the particular processes for data collection; in fact, the data as embedded within Diaspora has such uncertainty. If I were to begin to summarize, in one sentence, my approach to data, I would say at the moment I am negotiating the contours of Diaspora through writing autoethnography as method. But there is no guarantee here these moments selected are some pure, absolute, ideal moments becoming the right fit. Such is the challenge when it comes to doing qualitative research through autoethnography, for human relations are not some rigid, finite variable ready to be plugged into some homogenous equation where
only in a matter of time, some eager expert body rushes to solve. We all know that human relations are filled with incommensurable moments, some of which are love, joy, sorrow, the unknowing, pain, pleasure, the sensual, the erotic, and spirituality. The challenge here though, is coming to understand these incommensurable moments under the secure, expert name of research (van Manen 1997).

Yet, I am writing now through a different sense, a different place of knowing and unknowing. Might this writing be easily dismissed as imaginative, as fluid prose-like fiction, that it be a personal narrative? I say dismissed because of the historic demeanor of research. Historically, the posture of research has been fraught with being absolute, objective, neutral and unbiased. ‘True’ knowledge had to be in the form of the scientific, serving a particular interest, serving a particular purpose, revealing itself by means of a sum shared rigid universalized methods of query. I guess what I wish to point out here is the dominant relationship between knowledge deemed as science and knowledge deemed as arts or humanities based (Foucault 2007; Pinar 1994; Kincheloe 2005; Dei 2005; Okolie 2005). Instead, as a method I write through Diasporic Indigeneity, through personal narratives to offer countervailing ways of knowing.

I remember secondary schooling in Trinidad. I was attending one of the well-known schools, prominent and prestigious. Today, I understand that historically this school was a missionary school, strategically installed, ad hoc, as an instrument of colonialism. Classes were all streamed from the beginning. Students deemed bright were all placed in the special stream for the hard-sciences, as it was called then. At the same time the ones who were deemed slow were geared towards the arts and humanities stream. Knowledge/intellectuality was steeped in the sciences. Histories, geographies,
literatures, narratives on the whole were all interpreted as lesser forms of knowledge. These categories of knowledge, these narratives came with their own sets of problems. For the most part, they were written through the imagination of colonial Euro-geographies, as embedded through Euro-Enlightenment writings. So from Columbus to Michelangelo, the humanities were saturated through the aestheticisation of the Euro-pen. Civilization was an experience exclusive to Europe. Colonized peoples came to be known through biological forms of racism. Local knowledge, local languages were institutionally dismissed as inferior. In a sense then the colonized world had no histories.

But let me return to this concept of “dismissed” in relation to personal narratives of the Diaspora. Foucault’s (1980) *insurrection of subjugated knowledge* is important here, in that, how is qualitative research constituted through story, personal narratives, folklore and proverbs? That is, through bodies of knowledge placed tangentially to standardized educational philosophies? This also leads to the question, what body of knowledge constitutes research? Or, put it another way, how do we come to know a particular piece of writing as knowledge? With this question of what is knowledge, I often wonder about the need for me to write this piece. Why is it so important for me to tell my story? Why is it so important to be able to articulate and materialize my thoughts, my conversation with Diaspora? I have pondered and quarreled, to bring these moments, to have them culminate in a textual manner, as if to bring to life, my experiences, to in some way warrant some form of legitimization through writing. That is to say, to understand in the moment what cultural attitudes come to be performed, to have the tacit implicit understanding of the cultural encoding of a particular space, to be able to interpret the governing body of cultural knowledge which spatially resides in a particular
communicative exchange, onward now to this humanism which rewards itself from and through particular geographies, particular geographies where supposedly the *wretched of the earth* reside (Fanon 1963). Yet, at the centre of this conversation is the lived experience of the *wretched of the earth* and what comes to be embedded within this experience. I want to engage with these moments to understand how they come to be interpreted, in a sense from the subject location of the *Other*. I want to engage with these moments to understand how the many interpretations immanent to these *Other* bodies come to make meaning of their own experiences. In a sense, I am taking up a dual position, if I might say, and I must admit, I have struggled with this quite a bit, the question of, what does it mean to be the researcher from the location of researched, or what makes this study about Diaspora qualitative research? And, what methods and theoretical frameworks might I engage to approach these moments? These moments of mutual dependence, these moments of coexisting, of being codetermined through specific historical conditions, of coming to exist through a series of cultural practices as interthread through race, ethnicity, religion, sexuality and dis/ability. But how do I retrieve these moments? How might writing as a strategy help me to think through, to sort these local-interactions, to identify and to sift through a particular communicative exchange as being culturally infused, as being laced with racial epithets? How might writing help me to think through, to bring to the surface deeply embedded codifications of race, codifications that quietly inform local everyday communal exchanges? I am also interested in how one comes to recognize these racialized moments, moments of recognition if you will, of being endowed with a particular way of knowing, of one being
able to, in a sum innate way, to sense the cryptic workings of race, of one being intuitive of the myriad racializing procedures within a given space.

To approach this inquiry through writing, I think, entails speaking/writing from a specific historic location, from local subjectivities, from a personal location, from personal politics, from an integrated discursive framework, from, with and through the experiences of Diaspora. For me it would involve speaking from the archipelago known as the Caribbean. It involves speaking from the rural southern village in Trinidad known as Esperance. It involves speaking from “2 Beckles Street South”. It involves speaking from the canefields. It involves speaking from as (Fanon 1963) would say the wretched of the earth. Yet, out of these plantation enclaves, emerged a resounding constellation of language, more so, this constellation comes to be filled through a particular series of different dictions. But behind this grain of diction is this well-fixed, well-placed space, of the sum historic colonial idealized language. Speaking from these oral geographies is in a sense continuously speaking back to the colonial will; it is in a sense a counterinsurgency from the local. What does it mean, then, to articulate from this sense of plantation diction as a material good? What does it mean to have to write through this materiality of language as it emerged from plantation histories and as being situated as some definite human condition? Daily, this experience of having to write through the interstices of plantation disjunctures and oral-textualisms, has been quite troubling. To this end, writing through this idealized medium of English, is to some extent, like writing in a foreign language. In that, it is a sort of translation of thought, having to be brought to life through some acceptable medium.
Yet, as I write from, with and through the myriad experiences as engendered through Diaspora, I am faced with the question of, what are the material and discursive conditions of personal memory? I am left thinking about how the experience of a particular material good is recognized as a piece of artifact (Hodder 2000). I am left thinking about the ways in which personal memory comes to be located as data? I have had many conversations with students concerning method. The one question that repeatedly came up was that of data. That is, they would ask where are you getting your data from? Or, how are you going about your data analysis? Needless to say, I was moved when I read Hodder’s (2000) piece concerning the “interpretation of mute evidence,” where he suggests that “evidence endures physically and thus can be separated across space and time from its author, producer, or user “ (Hodder 2000: 703). Part and parcel of doing autoethnography means being attentive at any given time to surroundings, to everyday social interactions. One of the challenges here for the autoethnographer is teasing out, if we want to take up this thing of evidence, the ‘in what way’, or how the Diasporized subject comes to know a particular moment, a particular experience as speaking to or resonating with the body. Be it having an innate sense, or being intuitive, or if we want to talk about spirituality, we have this trust, this firm belief of knowing or of framing a particular time of space as meaningful, as of telling us something, as of speaking back to us. But how does the Diasporised subject come into the material conditions of Diaspora? How does the Diasporised subject pedagogically recognize the material conditions of that experiential moment which is incommensurable (van Manen 1997)? Of not being able to, in a sum tangible way, determine as an assured given, some quantified value of one’s lived experience.
Let us think about the always-present question: ‘What is the experience of race’? And attend to the tacit ways in which we come to identify and understand the racialization process in our everyday lives, to attend to the ways in which one can sense ‘blackness’ beyond its phenotypical configurations. To be able to retrieve deeply embedded codifications of ‘blackness’ in any given space, to be on familiar terms with the embodiment of ‘blackness’, be it absent or present. We must ask then, how do spaces come to be codified, named, organized, represented and acknowledged? In that, spaces are not encoded without a body. Be it past, present or future, spaces come to be encoded through an embodied historical materialism. What I am concerned with here is, how do these embodied historic material conditions come to exist and inform our everyday lived experiences? How does, the Diasporised subject, be it through innate/intuition, come into such political/critical interpretive strategies to engage the ensuing public sphere? How, against the particulars and universals of race, the myriad binary coordinates of the human experiences, existentially come to exist through historic-specific constellations of blackness? How does the Diasporised-subject know and understand when the particular space, interaction, communicative exchanges come to be nuanced through colonial meanings of race and simultaneously engender a particular performative citizenry, that culminates into desire as a way of knowing the self? What then is this, materiality of desire, this materiality of longing? Notably here, I am thinking of desire/longing immanent to the Diasporic subject in the context of Western geographies. The challenge here for authoethnography is not only to interpret these incommensurable moments of desire immanent to the experience of Diaspora, but also to interpolate these incommensurable moments into some textualized medium from which the
autoethnographer/researcher can draw. Such is the challenge for writing autoethnography through Diaspora as method, when data is not readily accessible from, textual documents, cultural artifacts, memoirs, photographs, video imaging, self observation, or when data is not retrieved through the formal communicative exchange of interviews. I struggle to write from these spatio-temporal moments deeply tucked away in Diaspora, so my own life, past and present alike, my personal memory of the before, then and now form the material provisions for this thing called data. I draw particularly from memorable pedagogical moments as vantage/starting points from which to critically interpret my lived social environment. I want to speak from my local socio-cultural histories, that is, to think through these histories, these personal lived moments as a raw resource, as a reservoir for data. I understand these socio-cultural histories as sedimented within enslavement, as shared by racialised bodies and informing embodied experiences of racialised peoples. In this way I write through this shared embodiment to understand other diasporic subjects and their experiences.

With this approach I want to understand how different Diasporic bodies come to be equipped with, or, let us say strategically, maneuver, through the cosmopolitanism of Euromodernity by way of negotiating within their tapestry of selected cultural attitudes, choice of expressions, ways of knowing, speech patterns, the how-to-act moments, the everyday variables that the ‘Othered’ body comes to know and understand (Hall 2005; 2007a; 2007b; Giddens 1991; Trifonas 2005; Appadurai 1996; Anderson 1991; Foster 2007).

Admittedly, my struggle with writing blackness is having to pin down the material substance of this data. In fact, I put off writing this chapter many times, as I
struggled with what ought to be from what ought not be selected from my personal memory. How would my selections reflect in the writing? How would I write up such a moment? I often asked myself, why this moment and why not that moment? I often wondered about how I come to identify with certain moments as revealing, as pedagogical. I often thought about, how do I come to know particular social interactions as constitutive of meaning making? Yet, as these everyday epistemological questions embody the Diasporic experience, I am left thinking about where knowledge resides, knowledge as being distinct from the textualized moment of academic hallways. I am left thinking about being cognizant of having to come to identify the embodied ways of knowing a particular moment, a particular space as race.

**Data: The Lived Experience of Blackness**

With much of this study, I am taken up with making meaning of the material embodiment of ‘blackness’ in the context of Diaspora. Regarding the materiality of, as Fanon would say, *the lived experiences of blackness* (Fanon 1967) as data, first let me share my concerns here. I recognize ‘blackness’ as historically emerging through the nomenclature of the colonizer. From Africa, to plantation, to Diaspora, there exist a certain fixed category designated to a certain Diasporic body, that through this thing of ‘blackness,’ a particular humanism is experienced, that this colonial nomenclature forever provides the human conditions for particular Diasporised bodies. I am asking, ‘What then is the experience of this human condition’? And how does the human live with and through such conditions of Diaspora?

As researcher, as autoethnographer, I am writing through the subjective experience of Diaspora, through the experience of resistance, of having to write *from,*
with, through and against this colonial nomenclature of blackness. For it is not simply, as this national Diasporic-subject posits, some guarantee to have to theoretically dispense with this colonially imbued category of blackness. The interpretation, the classification of this phenotype as having permanently being attached to my body, to the human, as a conveyor of meaning to my lived experience is real. I am more interested in the experience as engendered through the interpretation of this historically imagined space of ‘blackness.’ Notably, here, this experience, in and of itself, has its own materiality, in that the primary interest of mine is not about being preoccupied with the question of race being real or not. This has been discussed time and time again, that is, to say there is no such thing as race or to be Against Race (Gilroy 2001). I am more concerned with the experience of race, the real lived material conditions of ‘blackness,’ in a sense the need to recognize these moments as they become reified in the everyday conversation of Diaspora. I am interested with knowing and understanding how this moment of recognition becomes a reified process. To trace these local historical moments, I think, would call for a type of dialectical movement, which allows me to speak/interpret as researcher and simultaneously interpret my local experience and through this interpretation to think about the broader historic-socio-cultural context. Writing autoethnography by way of Diaspora as method allows me to position at the centre of the inquiry, my lived experience as it forms dialectical relations within existing local governing Diasporic configurations. With autoethnography, I am seeking to better understand how ‘blackness’/whiteness/race/racism, when internalized, promote a particular formation of identity. I am attempting to move beyond Du Bois’s:

*peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others --- One ever feels his twoness, -An*
American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body (Du Bois 1989: 5).

Instead I am thinking about how these warring ideals come to form the governing ethical and moral principles for the Diasporized subject. What are the ways in which this internalization of colonial forces comes to mitigate self-regulating tendencies onto the Diasporized body? We also need to be mindful that the ‘black’ body comes to know an ethic by a particular means of surveillance that inculcates historic-socio-cultural colonial edicts as belonging to the body.

Within the public sphere of the West, stories come to be told/written in ways whereby the nation-state maintains ownership of the narrative. For far too long, nation-state has been masquerading as neutral, free of bias, as being impartial, as being without a politic. So location of Diasporic-subjectivities, location of voice, location of narrative, and the variable acts of naming in the context of nation-state is of some concern to this study, that is, the method of writing, the location of the preferred image, and the mode of orientation of thought immanent to the nation-state. I want, from the study, to conjure up ways in which the high theorizing of one’s lived experience can be re/presented/written for/and from the everyday context, where local voices ought not find themselves in the audience being spoken about, instead the local voice becomes an active participant within the writing. For me, writing here is about reclaiming voice and about writing oneself into being. One of my concerns with Diaspora is this relationship with the Diasporic subject and the nation-state, and how this relationship promotes and constructs contemporary ways of knowing civic forms of citizenship. Now, as a Canadian citizen, I often ponder about my relationship with the nation-state. I often think about the different moments when I come to operate as this instrument of the state, complicit of dominant relations on
some body. I want to write-from and speak-from these entangled moments, to think of my subject-position, my subjectivity as being formed through the primary constructs of race, culture, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, ability, religion and class. I want to think about the myriad forms of colonialism, the “foreign and local” underpinnings of imposition and the way my social environment comes to be governed through the different appearances, shapes, permutations of everyday colonial interactions. Take for example the different passports of the West and the way in which it accords privilege onto Diasporic bodies, and think of the complexities/complicities of transnationalism and the governing relations with the Southern countries. To think of the way in which this Western passport becomes an organizing principal artifact, which simultaneously determines and installs a specific working currency, or specific working boundaries, on the Diasporic body. With the Diasporic body becoming more and more implicated with the complicity of the capitalist West, and as the benevolent humanitarianism of the neo-liberal agenda is mouthed, I want to think of the ways in which these partitioned spaces, these legitimized boundaries of the Western state come to be accepted within the Diaspora through particular pieces of writing, from journalism to the academic text, from electronic public images to recognizing the different ways in which citizenship come to organize the everyday social space. How, then, and what are the ways in which the public/social spaces of Diasporic peoples come to be constituted? What are the variants involved? And how does the peopling of the Diaspora come to recognize and know the variant as such? Importantly, here is that I want to think through my lived experiences of, to say, acquiring citizenship, of having to take this oath, of having to pledge allegiance to the Queen. To understand the broader socio-cultural issues as they relate to schooling and education, governance
and state formation, development and imperialism, to citizenry and identity formation to the quality of human condition. As such, I am depending on the personal. I am depending on my personhood to pen my thoughts, from personal narratives, life history, to autobiographical stories. Needless to say the study is more subjective, where my experiences are the central mode of interpretation. That is, the researcher, interpretations, data, experiences share the same locus. For me, autoethnography is about researching who you are (Coles and Knowles 2001). It is about understanding myself through the complex lived experience of race/racism.

One might ask, how do you safeguard against a bias-filled writing, all contaminated, all injured through the different experiences of race? To this I say, as have many who have written before, writing is not neutral, innocent or apolitical. All writings are political having an invested interest with consequences and implications (Denzin and Lincoln 2000; Smith 1999; Guba and Lincoln 1994; Dei 2005; Gubrium and Holstein 2000; Ladson-Billings 2000; Clifford 1986; Okolie 2005). At the same time, I join other scholars working for equity and social justice to be compelled to push back against writing as a form of scientism, that is knowledge becoming legitimized through particular procedures of standardized inquiry. We are well aware that historically the trope of positivism has saturated the social sciences and educational research philosophies, that writing denotes objectivity. Today, within schooling and education, conventional educational philosophies continue to organize contemporary classroom curricula, continue to inscribe the everyday socializing processes for youth as it plays out in the context of schooling and education (Marcuse 2009a, 2009b; McLaren and Farahmandpur 2005; Apple 1995; Giroux 2001; Bourdieu and Passeron 2000). I want this writing to
speak to the local everyday communicative moments of the Diaspora from posture of stride, clothing, choice of words, way of speaking/diction, to food, and music, to coming to engage with sport, dance, technology, to the choice of courses in schools. These are some of the interactive moments in which I want to think of the experience of blackness and how my, and different identities, come to be formed through these lived material, political, subjective conditions. So, regarding the safeguard concerning a bias-filled writing, I want to critically interpret these lived moments in the context of the current historical social conditions, to be self-reflexive about my location as researcher, and simultaneously as subject of the research, to be self-reflexive about my personal narratives in order to understand the broader socio-cultural context of subjectivity.

Today we know social thought is not constructed in some pure, pristine, utopian context. Social thought is very much filled with the pre-supposed, or having been filled and mediated with/through previous experiences. We are all bringing to our present day communicative moments, experience/knowledge from the before. Humanism, as we have experienced today, involves different socializing processes. To say that ‘to be human’ is to be social, is a bit of an understatement. One quality of the human that I am working through throughout this thesis is spirituality, the authentic being, the archetype-body. And how does one come to recognize this spiritual being? In a sense it is about coming to know and understand a particular body as being distinct from the everyday discursive practice. Spirituality is about embodied ways of knowing. From my post-structuralist readings I recognize that spirituality can be a contentious site. I think if we are attempting to have an honest conversation concerning the different humanisms we experience, we have to speak about the limits and possibilities concerning the existential subject as being
formed through multiple socio-cultural conditions. What about this thing of *ontological lineage/ontological primacy*, of having to work with this concept of the *primordial*, and historical traces of memory? (Fanon 1967; Sekyi-Otuo 1996; Senghor 2001; Dei 2010; Gordon 1995). How do these moments become dependent on the particular body, being the dominant body or the racialised/minoritised body? And also how do these bodies independently become co-dependent on particular variants of the land, the ocean and the time and space of the transatlantic? We have to speak about, as Marcuse (1991) mentions, when the deepest level of intuition and our innate ways of knowing are always already pre-conditioned through the dominant epistemes of Euromodernity. And as Chomsky and Foucault (2006) have discussed, the relationship concerning innate ways of knowing as codetermined through the social environment.

As principal investigator, I bring a history of embodied knowledge. I am, however, mindful of the underlying assumptions that guide my collection of data. I am mindful of particular orientations that form my reality. I am mindful of the ethical and moral values that I am bringing to the study, that is, the problematic of my racialised embodied experiences being laden with particular values and understandings which invariably constitute the data. I am mindful of the way these moments come to congeal through a series of colonial histories and as of having centered and continuing to shape and inform my present identity. So again, in more ways than one, I am writing to not necessarily undo these moments, but I think I more so want to unlearn these colonial imbued ways of knowing and understanding my everyday lived social. This speaks to the life-long journey of decolonization.
Writing Blackness Through Autoethnography

I have slowly come to embrace this thing of being a researcher, despite the complexities, contestations embedded within this colonial nomenclature. As researcher, I am driven from and through my experience of race. Yet subjectivity concerns race, as race becomes constituted through a myriad of complex discursive classifications entangled through the humanism of Euromodernity. Subjectivity is always already embedded within the governing imprint of colonial modernity as interwoven through the complexities of gender, ablesim, race, religion and sexuality. I am thinking of the Diasporic-subject as subjectivity comes to be performed and desired through the conjures of gender, race, heterosexuality and masculinist ableism. I am asking: Is the colonial ableist gendered subject the archetype of race? What, then, are the implications for critical qualitative research when writing autoethnography through colonial subjectivities of blackness? And what are the ways in which the Indigenous-body comes to know, understand and dialogue concerning the historical colonial ableist-subject? How might we understand the ontological ableized-subject through Indigeneity and the colonial encounter? By way of an anti-colonial interpretive framework how might we understand the Indigene through the Diaspora and as emerging through the human conditions of colonial modernity?

I have a passion for social change, social justice, and equity. My heart lies with peoples who have been oppressed because of color, peoples who have been oppressed because of this thing called race. My heart in particular lies with people who have violently been determined as sub/less than human because of the determinants of gender, class, disability, religion and class. Place and time are very important to me and in many
ways place and time come together to shape and inform this writing, so from my village in Southern Trinidad to Metropolis Toronto, these memories of dwelling, of home and away alike, these interstitial moments come to provide intersubjective readings of home and belonging. Through this web of intersubjective readings, one of the challenges I am facing concerning autoethnography is with identifying pedagogic sites, and by that I mean coming to recognize how in a particular moment I come to know the way in which knowledge comes to dwell. Take for example, how do I know to come to think of a particular moment as being informed through historical colonial readings of race? How do I come to ground a certain communicative exchange in the context of historical racial underpinnings? Indeed as researcher, this calls for daily engagement, being cautious, aware, alert, paying attention to the everyday talk and coming to write back, to think through these moments and then to return, to have to write up in the name of research and scholarly publication. My concern here is with the ethical and moral questions for autoethnography, that these conversations will be utilized in the name of data collection and research, that is to say, it is not as if one is being self-reflexive through personal memory, it is to knowingly engage in personal conversation with the imperative of satisfying research needs without informing the interlocutors of my intent.

I remember reading *Regarding the Pain of Others* by Susan Sontag (2005). Her words touched me in a way where I must say concerning my data collecting methods, I have been pushed to slow down a bit and maybe try to poke some holes with my approach. Sontag spoke about the globalizing of suffering and the way photography is utilized to turn a moment into something that can be possessed. She also spoke about exploitation of sentiment, pity, and compassion (see Sontag 2003: 80). These words have
stayed with me since, and I am left asking, am I as autoethnographer, the imperial photographer? Am I willingly entering, or say participating, in conversations to retrieve or consume personal narratives, one’s emotions, and private feelings, those that are kept well protected, well hidden within someone’s memory? Am I exploiting those sentiments, as Sontag (2005) would say, that one is not willing to easily reveal through intimate stories, and in the moment that it is divulged, these intimate stories become confiscated and textualized in the name of research and knowledge. Through autoethnography, I have readily available access to draw from and interpret my experiences. My intention is to deliberately move away from such tropes of positivism as fieldwork, empiricism, sample size, and data, instead I am thinking of these moments of being experiential where I have the embodied agency. I want to have a dialogue with these experiential moments by thinking through what I am locating and for the purpose of this study as artifacts. I must admit I have had a difficult time coming to pin down, to disentangle temporal moments as being an artifact. Even coming to understand these moments, to have the capacity here now to write, to be able to articulate such a statement has been quite a journey. As aforementioned, I have put off writing this chapter many times because I was/am struggling so much with this concept. I think I was trying to find an artifact in the sense of retrieving a set of material objects over the course of time. Now, I am more thinking of artifacts through the materiality of race/blackness more so through the process whereby I come to understand the tangible and intangibility of my experiential lived moments (Hodder 2000). It becomes, then, the question of how I recognize race/blackness through various objects, through different bodies, through different moments in time, through different places. It becomes, then, too, about what are
the ways in which I come to interpret a given experience through colonial codifications of race. It is about the coming to make tangible, to make material sense of these spatial moments in a way that comes to archive subjectivity as a governing artifactual trope through my experiential contexts of race/blackness as immanent to histories of colonial time and space.

**The Material Artifact of Blackness**

Autoethnography is historically specific to the subject, in that the data is augured in and through the lived experiences, personal narratives, and personal memory of the body. One of the challenges for autoethnography then is retrieving the data, the coming to know, understand, make sense of these locally inscribed moments, how these experiential moments come to be represented in a tangible way. To help with identifying these experiential moments, I am thinking through Coles and Knowles’s (2001) articulation of artifact. They speak about an artifact as not only being a “physical object that it is something that can be handled and observed, that it usually has a temporal quality, meaning that it ‘speaks’ of actions at a particular time and space” (Cole and Knowles 2001: 85). They go on to speak about artifacts as principally telling about one’s life. Yet in considering artifactual tropes and being the subject of the research, of interest here is my local history in the context of being located in Toronto. In a sense, then, it is about being cognizant of how these constitutive moments come together to shape and inform my interpretive framework, to be cognizant of how these constitutive moments come to guide my thoughts, my writing, my reflexivity about autoethnography. As a
result, the writing in some sense becomes embedded with these artifactual moments, unfolding in and through self-reflexivity (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). Needless to say, I am not working with a sum formalizing principle of procedural methods, instead I am trying to understand why a particular given moment stayed with me, trying to understand how such a time and place come to be laden with emotions and subjectivities, trying to move beyond the conventional classroom to make sense of learning, in particular an embodied form of learning and to understand the way this embodiment resonates with me today. With embodiment, I am thinking of the innate, intuitive ways of knowing, the tacit ways we all come to know and understand our daily experiences (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992; Moustakas 1990). Part and parcel of the experience of autoethnography is having to write through these innate, these intuitive, these tacit moments of knowing. This in and of itself is an experience. So regarding historical methodological steps concerning validity, reliability, objectivity and this bias-free scholarship, I am not pinned to these historical procedures within social science research.

Writing autoethnography through Diaspora as method is about being present, being transparent, and being accountable and responsible. It is about being present in a way that gives from within the human. It is about giving up the utmost private moments, it is about writing as if for the moment one can suspend the restrictions of academic writing. I would imagine there are some ethical concerns here regarding the privacy of others and what one can share through these intimate moments. Ultimately writing autoethnography through Diaspora as method is about transformation, transformation in a particular way, which starts from within.
Politics of Autoethnography

Maybe instead of asking why autoethnography, I ought to reframe the question to, how did I come into writing autoethnography through Diaspora as method as a way of making sense of blackness? I think in my own way, I have been doing autoethnography for a while now, and by a while now, I mean beyond the formal sense of education, in that, in some way, I have been thinking through my personal experiences/memory to try and make sense of my local or broader surroundings. If we are speaking from colonial geographies, those spaces we come to know problematically as Third World, those spaces where entrenched are histories of enslavement, militarized-violence, pillage, those spaces where embedded are histories of destruction as being willed through Euromodernity, then I think one would want to make sense of this geographic-impoverishment, this form of impoverishment whereby peoples with colonizing histories have come to know as some birthright. For me, I have been trying to make sense of my schooling in Trinidad. Schooling which for the most part taught me about everything but locally specific histories. Writing autoethnography is about thinking through my many interactive moments, thinking about my conversations and the thoughts of different peoples, expressing how they understood their experiences, speaking about their politics, their orientation to culture, their understanding of race, their understanding of how a particular moment was racially informed. So throughout the writing of this dissertation, I am being accompanied by this personal memory of the Diaspora. I am thinking of this personal memory of the Diaspora as it comes to congeal itself into different forms of artifacts for the convenience of data gathering. As I write, I am not attempting to write a particular formal script of the Diaspora. Instead I approach autoethnography as if autoethnography
were a pastiche, being mindful that the human experience collectively works in and out of tandem. I am mindful that the human experience is relational, not independent of bodies. I am mindful that we exist with each other, not in some formula like, straight-line method seeking some pristine utopia of harmony. Insofar as I am acknowledging the myriad intersections, the interwoveness of how Diasporic-Indigenenity come to socialize, recognizing the interplay of difference embedded in the human experience, the ensuing entanglements, the different power arrangements as they come to be classified through to say race, ethnicity, culture, ableism, sexuality, gender and class. I am not positioning these classificatory arrangements in some hierarchal order, but at the same time, I am saying for the purpose of this inquiry, given my specific history is embedded in colonialism, race takes up the central location for me to critically engage my lived experience in order to understand my circumscribed social context. Hence, I am working to critically engage the different intersections of race, in that, I am working with the intersections of the human experience and in particular, locating blackness as a material artifact, as a vantage point to come to dialogue with these intersectional entanglements. I want to work with the embodied ways of knowing, those knowledges formed through the experience of being racialised-minoritised/oppressed, to converse with the different practices which come to shape and form the Diasporic-subject, to come to identify the limitations and possibilities concerning the politics of Diasporic-Indigeneity within the Western metropolis.

Too often enough, these embodied ways of knowing from racialised-minoritised bodies come to be discarded, or swept to the side, determined as not having some contributing value towards the meaningful production of knowledge. But who gets to
decide what is meaningful, and what exactly is this thing called knowledge? In many ways I am writing back to these historically institutionalized augured constructs of what defines knowledge. In so doing, and through autoethnography, I am committed to the processes of decolonization and the importance for finding anti-colonial ways of knowing, keeping in mind that central to anti-colonial ways of knowing, is coming to know through the embodied experience of racialized-minoritized bodies. Writing autoethnography is not only about interpreting and speaking from personal memory in order to understand the experience of the Diaspora within the governing social context. It is not only about telling one’s story. Writing autoethnography ought also to engage with a critical interpretive framework. It ought to be imbued ethically and morally. The caution here is that these ethical and moral principles might be in some tacit way colonially informed. One of the questions I am struggling with here, is that, given the different ethno-cultural bodies that come to know and understand differently, how do we come to make sense of some governing ethical and moral principle on society and whose principle are we talking about? Writing the autoethnography, I must consider the different ethno-cultural communal ways of knowing, the many historic specificities of colonialism and the manner in which these ethical and moral principles come to be formed in and through these historic specific colonial epistemologies. The question of essentializing is important here, that is, to strategically essentialize or not (Gunaratnam 2003; Dei 2005; Razack 1998; Spivak 1987; Bulmer and Solomos 2004). Much has been written on strategic essentialism, and by strategic essentialism I am thinking about the limits and possibilities of reading particular bodies through fixed discursive scripts as contextualized through colonial geographies of time and space. I am thinking about the social conditions of
existence, the relationship concerning the historic material restrictions of modernity, and
the way in which power and privilege come to determine the location and simultaneously
dislocate particular bodies. That is, we know how to act, or address the conversation, be it
through innate ways of knowing or understanding through intuition. I want to counter
those colonial narratives that come to reduce racialized bodies. Hence, part and parcel of
this process of naming the materiality of day-to-day colonial artifacts, such as blackness
is acknowledging those binary encoded meanings, which cryptically script the different
geographies of race, keeping in mind the limitations, possibilities, and implications of
approaching this human experience through these textualized frames.

Writing autoethnography is to consider race/ethnicity/culture, in that writing
autoethnography implicitly means working with and against essentialism, it is to
wittingly dialogue with colonial narratives as if it were some spatial Truth system.
Writing from, with, and through autoethnography is not without risks and perils for
coming to know and understand the Diasporzed subject. One has to think about questions
concerning privacy, one has to ponder how much personhood to reveal, how much of
one’s emotions and feelings ought to be expressed in the writing, what stories to tell,
what stories not to tell, what time period to include in the study. Writing autoethnography
through Diaspora as method means dialoguing with one’s feelings. It means writing from
places embedded with emotions. It means working with memories of pain, memories of
rage, memories of violence. It means dialoguing through honesty. It means
acknowledging power and privilege. It means recognizing the need to open up spaces for
racialized bodies. It means all bodies being committed to social justice, to social change,
be it the privilege, the dominant or the oppressed.
In thinking about race/racism through autoethnography, in coming to do antiracism work, and anticolonial theorizing, these are not distinct moments (Fanon 1963; Memmi 1991; Césaire 1972; Du Bois 1998; Nkrumah 1970; James 1989; Rodney 1972; Dei 1996; Dei 2003; Dei and Kempf 2006; Dei and Asgharzadeh. 2001). I understand these approaches as being part and parcel of each other, as being constitutive of every lived struggle and political practice. I am positioning an anticolonial theoretical framework also as an interpretive prism for collecting, interpreting and making sense of the data. I think these approaches share more in terms of imbrications, intersections, or of being coterminously interlocked, than they differ, or can be articulated as distinct moments. That is, to do antiracism research, to engage with anticolonial praxis, is about thinking through one’s lived experiences. It is about embodied knowledge. It is about coming to know the self within the governing socio-cultural context (Denzin 1989; Ellis 2009; Dei 2005; Kincheloe 2005; Roth 2005; Pinar 1994). If autoethnography concerns itself with thinking through the lived experience of the Diaspora in order to make meaning of one’s governing social reality, and if the central question is, ‘what is the experience of race?’, then I think these moments, these approaches are not disjointed, compartmentalized or fragmented, but exist co-constitutively. Yet, deciding on a particular methodological framework is not without consequences, implications, risks and perils, especially if one announces that the framework of choice happens to be an antiracist discursive framework. Historically, autoethnography has been positioned with a particular discursive authority and since then has accorded much discursive currency, at the same time schooling and education have not necessarily been theoretically friendly.
towards antiracism education. In many ways taking up an antiracist discursive framework locates one peripherally within the academy. Such are the complexities when we take up these things called research, schooling and education. We always need to remember that these classifications are social moments; that these classifications are about human beings, that these classifications are experiential, that research, schooling and education are about the human coming together to learn. I can relate to the term learner. I can relate to this concept of lifelong learning for all. Yet, doing autoethnography involves coming to know and coming to disentangle the politics of the researcher. If we are doing autoethnography, and we are talking about how the subject experiences race/racism/blackness, then, for me, autoethnography must engage in dialogue with the theoretical framework of, anti-racism or anti-colonial. I say for me, because I recognize the multiple theoretical positions in discussions of race. Different bodies accord different experiences in which a particular body may come to choose a particular methodological framework. Yet this methodological framework is partial, not neutral or without a politics. Every methodological framework is embedded with its politics, the concerns though are more about the consequences, the implications for taking up such a methodological position within schooling and education, and what are the ways in which these theoretical frameworks accord methodological currency to the researcher. We also need to remind ourselves of the way knowledge comes to reside within publication houses, to remember what is deemed knowledge and how this knowledge comes to be positioned/classified hierarchically through publications, keeping in mind that anti-racism/anti-colonial knowledge is augured in and through the human experience. I am also thinking about how this knowledge, this human experience as revealed through
publications and research comes to be treated as abject by particular archives of knowledge, or be it particular publishing houses. So be it the body of the dominant, or the body of the racialised-minoritized, one has to engage with these ethical and moral questions. Take for example, what does it mean for the dominant body to do autoethnography and let us say to have to write about the experience of race? What is at stake and what are the challenges? This is one of the questions posed through the framework of antiracism. If I am embodying this classification of researcher, then as researcher, and as the colonial-subject, I must question how I come to know and make sense of my experiences of race/racism. I must be cognizant of my underlying assumptions of coming to know and understand these interactive moments that concern race. Yet experiencing race in the Caribbean and experiencing race in the West can be simultaneously diverging and converging moments. When talking about the politics of race, I think there is a particular geographical difference that we need to consider, that is, to come to know race in the Caribbean and come to know race in the heart of the Euro-modern West is not some constant experience. We have to think about the inter and intra ethno-cultural relations. We have to think about the aestheticization of hue; we have to think about how acceptance, power and privilege are accorded to the varying embodiment of shadism.

Given the archipelago of the Caribbean, a particular geography colonially determined for the designated plantation body, be it through African enslavement or Indentureship, a particular geography that comes to be governed by this same local body, how does one come to understand their governing reality. If we are thinking about the experience of race here, where the dominant body is not necessarily the historical portrait
of the colonizer, how do we make meaning of exploitative relations that come to be racially imbued by local peoples? How do we make sense of internalized forms of racism though historical colonial narratives that local peoples come to take up as if it were their own? Understanding these moments through autoethnography, through Diasporic Indigeneity does not necessarily mean or call for the telling of stories, in that some may engage these violent histories through silence. See the experience of racism is always already a violent experience for all bodies alike (Fanon 1963). In the context of the West, the experience of racism can be a painful site of spiritual injury; it can be a painful site of ungrieveable loss (Butler 1997), a place, a memory of suffering. Yet many have sought to deal with these violent occasions through silence, for historically silence has been a way of life for racially oppressed bodies. Silence has been more of a specific strategy to negotiate one’s newly found terrain, be it assimilation or integration, the matter of “survival, recovery, development, and self-determination”(Smith 199: 116) is real for peoples who have emerged through historic lineage to colonized bodies.

We know now that historically with the modernist project, social-science research was everything but ethical or moral. In fact, being ethical, being moral, meant conclusively producing a particular type of subject, a particular type of human. For me growing up in Trinidad, I have come to understand how my blackness became positioned in relation to the global. I understood the relationship with blackness and the proximity to inferiority. One did not have to take a critical course on race to have an expert opinion on these spaces. Coming to better know and better understand the colonial logic that drives the will of these racialized spaces, for me is part of my decolonization process, part of the never-ending journey of coming to always have the need to make some sense of this
experience of race. Yet, I often think about decolonization for whom. For me, decolonization is about dialoguing with the present, past, future alike. Decolonization is about being reflexive through the experiential self, and as Smith (1999) says, lending to healing and transformation. Decolonization is about thinking through personal memory to a politics of action. Decolonization ought to be for all. I want to write self-reflexively as a strategic method to decolonize. I want to write autoethnography, to transform the subject by way of decolonizing. I fill the need to write my experience into text, to claim agency through writing. If I am speaking as autoethnographer, as researcher, I am claiming epistemological authority. I am writing from, with, and through my experiences of blackness. In doing so I am not applying a particular method, or theoretical framework to analyze my narratives, my stories, personal reflections and observations. I am very much trying to move from these terms of applying this to that, as if it were some homogenous equation to solve by coming to some known exact determinants, or some exact digit. The lived experience of blackness is filled with unknowns, with uncertainty. The human experience cannot be plugged into some readily available equation waiting eagerly to be solved, to quantify the limitations of quantitative research, of positivism, of coming to quantify through hypotheses, of coming to draw a sum definitive conclusion.

Thinking through race and talking about racism today are difficult tasks that sometimes involve rage. Often enough, racialized peoples silently have to endure the prohibition of their rage by themselves, and as bell hooks reminds us, this prohibition of rage by the colonial-subject, accords privilege onto the racialised body and allows acceptance into particular classed circles (see hooks 1995, 1992). But rage is real for the racialized subject. Rage is more than reacting to the suffering, violence and pain of
racism. Rage is a way of life for those racialized bodies that have come to experience oppression. Rage, in fact, is a lived memory for those minoritized bodies that have been racially oppressed. I believe rage cannot be written out of research (hooks 1995; Johal 2005). Doing autoethnography means writing from a particular place where rage resides. Doing autoethnography means writing, speaking through rage, through melancholy, through loss, through suffering, through injury, through happiness, through content (Denzin 1997; Ellis 2004; Ellis and Bochner 2002). Doing autoethnography means writing, speaking from all these different entangled moments, these deeply interwoven experiences, and at the same time working to claim a space of discursive authority for blackness.

I must say, however, that this piece of writing was very much a form of healing for me. It helped me to identify and to think through my desires, and fears. Writing through autoethnography helped me come to realize that blackness is always already a lived-work in process. Yet blackness is complex and deeply embedded within histories of enslavement, resistance and questions concerning nationalism, Pan-Africanism, citizenship and identity. Central to this discussion are issues about race, ethnicity and culture. In the following chapter through a selected reading of the literature, I attempt to locate the contemporary discussion concerning the African Diaspora within schooling and education. In doing so I want to understand the different discursive articulations in which this African Diasporic experience is discussed and how, and in what ways, does it come to articulate the Diaspora and the Diasporised subject.
CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter works to interrupt the discursive loci of the Diaspora as entrenched through themes of dislocation, exile, home, lost and belonging. I write to re-situate its discursivity in the context of schooling and education by way of a particular approach which intervenes and simultaneously pushes us to think of the material, that of nation-state and the performative that of citizenship, as reified formations of the Diaspora. By way of dialoguing through a certain Diasporic reading, I seek to review a selection of literature to engage conversations concerning blackness, Pan-Africanism, culture, identity, ethnicity and the Diaspora to frame some of the underlying theoretical discussions that foreground schooling and education.

Black Studies Movement and Pan-Africanism:

Implications for the African Diaspora

Black Studies emerged through counterinsurgent discursive movements within the public sphere of schooling and education. Sylvia Wynter’s (2006) account of the inception of the Black Studies Movement, in her, *On How We Mistook the Map of the Territory, and Re-Imprisoned Ourselves in Our Unbearable Wrongness of Being, of Desetre: Black Studies Toward the Human Project*, recalls how the Black Aesthetic and Black Arts Movement gained their impulse through the anti-colonial work of the Civil Rights Movement. Wynter notes, that through these anti-colonial moments came a call for a black university and black institutions, that of the National Association of African-American Research, the Black Academy of Arts and Letters, the Institute of the Black World, the New School of Afro-American Thought, the Institute of Black Studies in Los
Angeles, and Forum 66 in Detroit. Through these anti-colonial moments we saw the materialization of Black Studies within white academic institutions. These anti-colonial moments were organized primarily by activists, impelled in particular by Stokely Carmichael’s (Kwame Ture’s) push for Black Power, which simultaneously converged with the riots following the death of Martin Luther King, Jr. The early years of Black Studies (1961-1971) as emerging through the *insurrection of subjugated knowledges* (Foucault 1980), from anti-colonial activists, saw a call for Black Nationalism and Pan-Africanism. Black historians such as Chancellor Williams, Carter G. Woodson, Booker T. Washington, W. E. B. Du Bois, William Leo Hansberry, John Henrik Clarke, John Jackson, Benjamin Quarles (see Asante and Mazama 2005) to J. Saunders Redding, Darwin T. Turner, Richard Barksdale, John Hope Franklin, Richard Wright, Ralph Ellison, Alain Locke, Anna Julia Cooper, Maulana Karenga, Angela Davis, bell hooks, Michele Wallace, Henry Louis Gates Jr, Houston Baker Jr, and Cornel West to name some (see Henderson 1996: 61) in their struggle for equity, worked to re-write colonizing historical narratives of African peoples. Throughout the early 1970s, the Black Studies program at Yale enveloped writers such as Larry Neal, Amri Baraka, Toni Morrison, June Jordan, Jay Wright, Sterling Brown, Robert Hayden, Dorothy West, Alice Walker, Paule Marshall, James Baldwin, and Ishamel Reed (Henderson 1996: 58). Notably, Yale, a predominantly white institution, housed a Black Studies Program that sought to undo hegemonic Euro-colonial narratives of African peoples. It also worked to emancipate Black Studies from its own limiting colonial ideologies, keeping in mind the colonial being about foreign or local imposition (Henderson 1996; Dei 2006). If the project then is about extricating Black Studies from its immanent colonizing position, it
means de-mapping and re-contouring the epistemic terrain inclusive of the heterogeneous relations producing blackness.

Today, Black Studies, as it speaks to the politics of the racialised subject has become a site of contestation in that Black Studies have been the progenitor of African-American Studies, Cultural Studies, Ethnic Studies, Afrocentricity, British Studies, Black British Studies, Black Feminist Studies, Black/African Diaspora Studies, Diaspora Studies and Transnational Studies. We must remind ourselves that historically, these bodies of thought are epistemologically rooted in anti-racist/anticolonial resistance struggles and, as Henderson (1996) noted, these bodies of thought must discover their “formal and vernacular traditions – indigenous principles and methodologies that reflect the geographical and historical specificities of blacks in the United States” (p.63).

Importantly, Henderson (1996) tells us, that “to examine Black Studies in its ethno-historical dimension is necessary and proper, yet to describe it as simply nationalist is both reductive and ahistorical – that Black Studies in its formative stages – had to be insistent upon its integrity and distinctiveness. To criticize it, then, for promoting a naïve and essentialist nationalism is to deny the historical and political contingencies of its very inception” (Henderson 1996: 64). Yet, Black Studies has this complex cartography. To epistemologically have to re-write its histories, its geographies, is quite a tangled task.

Indeed, this study intervenes at a particular moment through the articulation of an uncertain sense of blackness that speaks not only to colonial inscriptions, but also to the institutionalized hegemonic production of countervailing knowledges by the ‘Othered’ body and the particular performatives, desires, communicative practices, attitudes, values, and expressions (Bourdieu 1991; Said 1979) as nuanced through the internalization of the
**historical racial schema** (Fanon 1967). What interests me is the epistemological difference within and between these countervailing bodies of knowledge, from Black Studies, to African-American Studies to Diaspora Studies, about how they have come to be institutionalized and classified in relation to dominant scholarship and concurrently differentiate themselves within the text of blackness. My concern is about how different experiences of blackness come to contour and mark the epistemic terrain of the scholarship and how, in particular, particular kinds of black bodies/black scholarship become privileged within the academy.

Central to Black Studies and its progenitors are the ontological question of the Negro and the project of making the Negro human. What does it mean to be human? Or put another way, how African-Diasporic peoples come to be human has been historically encumbered through transatlantic colonial determinants by way of the land. This relationship with the land, being human and blackness is the interest of Katherine McKittrick (2006) in her *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle*. McKittrick gives an interdisciplinary analysis of black women’s geography’s in the black diaspora. Her intention is with thinking of the black subject through a diasporic framwork that utilizes the spatio-temporality of history, thus allowing for an engagement with particular narratives that speak *from, with, through and against* black subjects in history, to make possible a black sociality that has been portrayed as ungeographic (McKittrick 2006: x). Though a reading of transatlantic enslavement, McKittrick delineates the ways in which black women shape and challenge colonial geographic racial-sexual arrangements. In doing so, McKittrick notes that:

Transatlantic slavery incited meaningful geographic processes that were interconnected with the category of “black woman”: this category not only
visually and socially represented a particular kind of gendered servitude, it was embedded in the landscape. Geographically, the category of “black woman” evidenced human/inhuman and masculine/feminine racial organization. The classification of black feminine ity was therefore also a process of placing her within the broader system of servitude---as an inhuman racial-sexual worker, as an objectified body, as a site through which sex, violence, and reproduction can be imagined and enacted, and as a captive human. Her classificatory racial-sexual body, then, determined her whereabouts in relation to her humanity. (McKittrick 2006: xvii).

McKittrick centers her discussion on black woman’s humanness and black woman’s femininity through the way in which past and present spatial organizations of blackness come to be enclosed through contemporary geographic encumbers. Critical to her argument is the sensibility that black womanhood is not static or ahistoric, that instead the continuities/discontinuities, ruptures/conjunctures that work to construct black womanhood tells us how black women have placed themselves and resisted the monolithic system that benefited from their difference. Importantly here for McKittrick is a geographic reading of the female black body, rather than apprehending her solely through race, class, gender, sexuality. The idea of movement and how particular bodies come to be authenticated through this process place McKittrick’s black womanhood into an “alterable terrain” which allows black women to avow “their sense of place, questions of “race,” or race/class/gender/sexuality, are contributors to the where of blackness, rather than the sole indicators of identity/experience” (McKittrick 2006: xviii).

**Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies**

I begin this section with a particular moment in which British Cultural Studies, as situated in the context of schooling and education at the Centre for Contemporary Culture Studies, emerged through a series of contentious histories, which gave way to discussions concerning gender and race in particular. Stuart Hall (1996) in, *Cultural Studies and its*
"Theoretical Legacies," reveals how Cultural Studies came into formation through different theoretical moments. Hall strategically locates Cultural Studies as a discursive formation with no singular origin, suggesting instead that it is a discursive formation that articulates itself through different histories, and methodological and theoretical positions. In pointing to the boundaries of Cultural Studies, Hall notes that, Cultural Studies is a project “always open to that which it doesn’t yet know, to that which it can’t yet name” (Hall 1996:263). Hall begins his history by tracing the theoretical positioning of Cultural Studies through Marxism. Marxism, according to Hall, as a theoretical interpretive framework, endowed the discussion with questions concerning power, historic specificities of capital, the omnipresence of class, and about the discourse of culture. Yet Marxism was by no means a panacea for society, economy, culture and polity, for as Hall mentions, “the things which had imprisoned Marxism as a mode of thought, as an activity of critical practice (were) its orthodoxy, its doctrinal character, its determinism, its reductionism, its immutable law of history, (and) its status us a meta-narrative” (Hall 1996: 265). Problematically, Hall asserts that through Marxism, British cultural studies was always-already about an engagement with a problem, which emerged and expanded itself discursively through the means of reductionism, economism and questions of false consciousness, that immanent to Marxism was a particular Eurocentric belief, which positioned capital as organically being formed from within, and as being endowed independently with its own transformative capacities, independently of conquest and colonization (Hall 1996).

With the intervention of Gramsci, Cultural Studies found an alternative way that allowed for a contemporary engagement with Euromodernity. Gramsci’s, writings though
part and parcel of Marxism, was able to broach quotidian debates about culture and the ontological, about the intervention of historic specificities, about the link to hegemony and the myriad forms of imperialism, and the governance of coloniality, or as Hall puts it, *the discipline of the conjunctural* (Hall 1996).

Hall (1996) traces discursive shifts in Cultural Studies from Hegel and Marx, to Gramsci, and to the feminist intervention within Cultural Studies. The latter worked to rupture historical/traditional narratives of understanding culture, as feminism imputed the personal as political in ways which worked to undo the theory and practice nexus. Feminism further revised the concept power beyond the binary confines of State-public sphere hegemonic relations, and understood that questions concerning gender and sexuality were immanent to the conceptualization of power. Feminism centered the subject as being subjected to particular power terrains, and importantly, according to Hall, feminism imported a psychoanalytical reading into Cultural Studies. These feminist interruptions were broached through, as Hall notes, “the discovery of discursivity and texuality” (Hall 1996: 270). Cultural Studies absorbed the discursive terrain of semiotics, structuralist and post-structuralist schools of thought, and engaged particular interpretations of text and texuality, through different readings of the social that inculcated heterogeneity as constitutive of identity.

**Re-Reading Diaspora through Nkrumah, Garvey and Du Bois**

Presently, in conventional schooling and education, public sphere conversations concerning Diaspora have come under discursive surveillance, in which Diasporic bodies, in particular bodies historically located as the ‘Other’, come to be articulated in ways that place these ‘Othered’ bodies as secondary to the history of the colonial nation-state.
Indeed, the constitutive make up of the nation-state is deeply entrenched within colonial violence and Indigenous sensibilities, yet as the nation-state continues itself through imperial space and time, belonging for the Diaspora comes to be positioned and marked through Euro-Enlightenment inscriptions. With this in mind, I am seeking to retrieve a sense of the Diaspora beyond the parochial nuances that repeatedly shape the Diasporic-subject through secondary forms of citizenry. In doing so, I want to have a conversation which speaks to the experience of Diasporic-African peoples, in the context of being transnationally located to Africa, Britain and to the Americas. I want to trouble the way in which these transhistorical experiences have been historically framed through particular theoretical frameworks. I am asking, how might we begin to understand questions of what it means to belong for all bodies differently? A particular understanding that moves beyond the Ethnocentric vinculum that posits the humanism of the Euro-body and the ‘Othered’ subject as always already ontologically contrapuntal and coterminous. An understanding that dialectically speaks to the experience of belonging, through historical acts of movements and the ontological primacy of “the moment of origin”. As a starting point, I want to consider the Diasporic-African subject as located within the Americas emerging from Africa through the Civil Rights and Black Power encounters. I want to consider how such a Diasporic-subject came into subjecthood through the unfreedoms of liberation and emancipation as the Diasporic subject comes to enact possibilities of what it means to be human through experience of a particular form of citizenry as constituted in and through blackness. I want to understand how through, different articulations of the African Diaspora, blackness comes to understand citizenship.
I begin with a particular reading of Kwame Nkrumah’s, W. E. B. Du Bois’s and Marcus Garvey’s engagement with the African-subject, Pan-Africanism, sovereignty, belonging and citizenship to draw attention to the different articulations of the Diaspora and the Diasporised subject. In particular, I underscore Nkrumah’s Pan-Africanist-nationalist subject as localized within Africa; Garvey’s transnational subject as constituted through transatlantic movement; and Du Bois’s integrative Diasporised subject as localized within imperial America. I feel we must read these anti-colonial activists simultaneously to understand the historical interpellations of citizenship, the limitations and possibilities of the malleability of blackness, and the particular Diasporic conditions on the African body as transplanted to the Americas. With Pan-Africanism, I am thinking about the political consciousness of liberation experienced among African peoples concerning the human condition of post-plantation life. In a sense, I am taking up Pan-Africanism as an approach to understand how the Diasporic-African subject negotiated the imperial contours of the contested terrain of the sovereign subject (Stephens 2005: 12). I understand Pan-Africanism as shared embodied experiences that speak holistically to the historical, cultural and spirituality of African peoples. Pan-Africanism is deeply embedded within colonial enslavement of African peoples. It is a way of thinking that orients itself through resistance, struggle and social justice for African peoples. I am thinking of Pan-Africanism as temporal. I am thinking of Pan-Africanism as an anachronistic interruption to colonial governance, which situates through space and time, liminal Diasporic sensibilities that integrate the Diasporic-subject through contrapuntal pedagogies. I am suggesting that Pan-Africanism is a particular articulation of the Diaspora. I would imagine then that Diaspora constitutes in
a circumscribed way the nation-state and invites inclusivity that governs the historical classifications of Euro-colonial modernity and the transplanted African subject.

Nkrumah’s engagement with Pan-Africanism called for a sense of *consciencism*, which spoke to a collective experience about shared histories of colonization of African peoples. Nkrumah’s Pan-Africanism was about liberation/emancipation, and solidarity for a United Independent Africa through the process of decolonization. He insisted that only through an African personhood, one embedded within Indigenous consciousness and African cultures, would a unified Africa be possible (Nkrumah, 1970; Poe, 2004).

Nkrumah came into presidency of an independent Ghana through a revolutionary Pan-Africanism. Where Nkrumah’s politics of Pan-Africanism differed from Garvey’s and Du Bois’s was through the call for “self-government now” (James 1992: 356). However, with the newly found Independent Ghana, Nkrumah’s struggle was with the question of nationalism, about collectively educating the masses regarding the politics of colonization and the need for self-determination through a transformation of consciousness by way of decolonization. Indeed, this was why Nkrumah’s Pan-Africanism government fell, for at the heart of emancipation within Africa is the imperial sensibility that seeks the invested interest of colonialism, a sensibility that simultaneously unites and divides African peoples. This thinking was ultimately what brought Nkrumah’s government down, and to this day this thinking still resides within African peoples (James 1992c; Poe 2004).

Garvey’s practices of Pan-Africanism were quite informed through movement as embedded within the Diaspora. His collection of ships was in a sense, Diasporic instruments fashioned through the imperial signifier of exploration as fetishized through
the will of colonial modernity. Most of the discussion concerning Garvey points to the irreducible moment of Garvey’s essentialized and countersupremacist discourse (Stephens 2005; James 1992d). I engage Garvey through a particular Pan-Africanist reading which situates particular Diasporic sensibilities to articulate possibilities for the Diasporic-African subject to come to know its own sovereignty within the constraints of the present imperial geography (see also Wright 2004; Davies 2007; Chandler 1996).

Garvey was about movement of African peoples, in particular transatlantic movement, which sought the interest of African peoples as centered through the contextualization of Africa. Garvey’s, *Universal Negro Improvement Association* (UNIA) spoke to the necessity of the anti-colonial project, in particular a transhistorical anti-colonial project that worked through the then Diasporic conditions to enable the African subject to the unfreedoms of post-plantation humanism. Garvey’s politics invoked the archipelago we have come to know as the Caribbean, the plantation of the Americas, or should I say, the tangent of modernity, and the “moment of origin” for the transnational African, that of Africa. Garvey engaged imperial space and time in ways that endowed the transplanted African to think of identity beyond the narrow confines of Western nationalism, but more so from a transhistorical perspective. Michelle Ann Stephens (2005), in her *Black Empire: The Masculine Global Imaginary of Caribbean Intellectual in the United States, 1914-1962*, writes as a method, to relocate Garvey’s politics in ways which allows us to interpret not only the local and the global body, but also allows us to interpret the ensuing nation-state itself as being transhistorical and political (Stephens 2005:83). Stephens speaks of a particular Garveyism, which allows for a black self-determination beyond the parochial confines of the sovereign nation-state. This black
self-determination through Diasporic sensibilities posits the sovereign African subject in ways that implicates colonial histories. Stephens reminds us that Garvey’s call to this self-determined sovereign African subject embodied a gendered way of performing nationalism, that nationalism was often enacted through hyper, hetero/phallic, militaristic forms of masculinity, through which patriarchal tropes have been normatized (see also Davis 2006). For Garvey black liberation was not a sole individualistic island thing. Black emancipation meant invoking the Caribbean to work dependently in ways that would allow independent relations from imperial rule. It would allow for a particular black political consciousness that speaks across the oceans of human conquest, to come to articulate a unity concerning the Diaspora and the displaced African in ways that move beyond the colonial entrapments of protean cartographies. Black emancipation endowed unrestricted movement through colonial geographies. Black emancipation involved Diasporic polities of community that embodied the tranhistories of the Caribbean, the Americas and the historical present of Africa. Importantly, Stephens notes Garvey’s method to return the “ownership of the means of production” (Stephens 2005: 103) to local and global spaces of black geographies, a distinct turn from the politics of W.E.B. DuBois.

Du Bois initiated a politics of Diaspora that fashioned a sense of citizenry as localized within the imperialized geography of America. Du Bois, as Stephens (2005) noted, was more concerned with the socio-cultural economic growth of the African subject within these newly found post-plantation territories. Images of Africa were now represented through the potentiality of Harlem. Harlem, in a sense, conveyed the utopia for the African subject. Harlem conjured possibilities for the human to emerge, through,
as Stephens (2005) points to, the domesticity of the African. Supposedly Harlem would bring economic recovery for African peoples, ultimately culminating in a place called home and a way to belong to the past and present United States of America. Of this home, the church played a central role in Du Bois’s imagined utopia. The Black Church was about a pedagogy of hope and anti-colonial struggle. The Black Church situated the necessity for a communal Diasporic-spirit, which embodied movement, which embodied transhistories of political struggle, resistance, which embodied the engagement of African peoples to come to self-determine, to recover, reconstruct, to develop the Diasporic self through the racialised governmentalities of post-plantation colonial America. Du Bois’s Harlem was in stark contrast to Garvey’s sense of the sovereign-self and how one comes to belong. Though both sought the interest of African peoples, for Du Bois, to think of home, to think of Africa, was to think of the present, the here and now, that of Harlem, while for Garvey, home materialized through a dialectical reading of Africa, the Caribbean, the Americas and the African.

Like Stephens (2005), Paul Gilroy cannot be ignored and must be discussed if we are talking Diaspora. Gilroy’s (1987), *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack* and his *The Black Atlantic Modernity and Double Consciousness*, situates transatlantic histories in the *context of Euromodernity*. If we are thinking of what is at stake politically and intellectually with contemporary invocations of Diaspora, I believe Gilroy’s work becomes a necessary site of intervention, a place where we must engage. In his *There Ain’t No Black in the Union Jack*, Gilroy speaks to the lived experiences of the syncrethized African subject, as these synchronous moments become constituted through local and global existential moments. Gilroy carefully reads the way in which the
conditions of Euro-modernity come to be interpreted and embodied by the Diasporic-subject. By way of a particular reading of the Diaspora, Gilroy locates the Diaspora as transnational, cosmopolitan, and constituted through discontinuous histories. Through these discontinuous histories, Gilroy decentres the Diasporic-African subject and instead enacts a multi-centered Diasporic-subject. With this multi-centered intervention, Gilroy invokes a historically specific transnational discourse, which diverges from the origins of the Pan-Africanist experience as emerging from anti-colonial struggles, Black Power and Civil Rights movement. Gilroy’s reading of the African Diaspora through Diasporic sensibilities, begins with the Black Atlantic. Modernity and its discontinuities in a sense, are Diasporic. Constituted syncretically through cultural histories as embedded within Euro-Enlightenment discourses and Afro-traditions as traveled through transoceans of enslavement. Ultimately, Gilroy seeks to relocate the Diasporic-subject in ways which allows for a cultural re-positioning that strategically universalizes the historical contours of modernity, inherently de-linking systems of thought that calls for ontological linearity to primordial origins.

Yet, the cultural politics that emerged through Black Britain, in particular, through the way in which Diasporic identities came into being by way of the imbrications of African, Asian, European and Caribbean moments provide counterdiscursive possibilities of understanding the experience of citizenry as residing within the commune of Black Britain. Deeply implicated within these counterdiscursive possibilities as they situate themselves within Britain are the policies of the State. Immigration, policing, city planning come to be strategically operationalised through a sum national racial register.
The centring and marginalizing of bodies through historic specific readings of race gave way to cultural hegemonic displacements of Diasporic peoples.

Stuart Hall (1997), in his *Subjects in History: Making Diasporic Identities*, while pursuing a “transnational global Diasporic dimension” tells us that central to Diasporic identities are “questions of representation and culture, questions of power, politics and aesthetic production, that race in and of itself becomes discursively produced in ways whereby societal practices come to depend on these meanings as governed through the relationship between power and representation” (Hall 1997: 290). Hall (1997) warns us about the processes of identifications in coming to identify, “the contingent, antagonistic, and conflicting sentiments of which human beings are made up” (p. 292). In doing so, Hall invites a reading that speaks to the limits and possibilities of what it means to call for an end to the essentialized marking to the black experience, ultimately resulting with the end of the essentialized black subject. Hall’s reading begins with what he positions as the “new/post” Civil Rights Black subject, a moment in history where oppressed peoples began to collectively mobilize under the historic socio-cultural context of Black, and the signifier Black was taken up as a polity of struggle by Asian and Afro-Caribbean subjects. Yet, Hall argues that contemporary histories call for a different politics, a politics that more so speaks to the pluralization of cultural difference, a politics that speaks to the movement of peoples within late modernity through which histories of displacement, exile, questions of home and belonging come to be articulated in ways that speak to the consequences and implications of transforming the subject in history, while at the same time transforming the geographies of Euro-modernity. Hall (1997) warns us of the mutability of the Diaspora, that the term itself speaks to “imagine communities”
which at times can be quite closed to particular identifications/identities, that the
Diaspora becomes a site where historic specificities dialectically operate through change
and difference.

**Diaspora and Identity**

Hall, in accounting for two particular forms of cultural identity as emerging
through Diasporic conditions, reminds us that it is more important to think of “identity as
a production, as always already incomplete, always in process, and always constituted
within, not outside representation” (Hall 2000:21). At the same time, Hall problematizes
the way in which this cultural identity comes into being as a positioned subject. In giving
us two ways to think of cultural identity, Hall recalls a certain cultural identity, which
emerged through post-colonial forms of resistance that centered the Pan-African
movement through the Negritude writings of Aime Cesaire, and Leopold Senghor. This
said cultural identity speaks to a “one shared culture, a sort of collective “one true self,”
as circumscribed through a shared history and ancestry” (Hall 2000: 22). Through these
common historical terms the sense of oneness, the truth of the black experience, the truth
of what it means to be Caribbean can be found. Importantly, Hall (2000) points to the role
of these histories for social change through feminist, anti-colonial and anti-racist
resistance groups. Yet, Hall (2000) points to another way of reading cultural identity, one
which speaks to the myriad locations of similarity and also to the many differentiated
moments which constitute “what we really are”; or rather – since history has intervened
– “what we have become.” To speak of identity through singular conceptions is to, in a
sense, dis-acknowledge the ruptures and discontinuities which constitute precisely the
Caribbean “uniqueness” (Hall 2000: 23). Instead, we have a particular subject that
comes into being, that knowing, understanding the self is about becoming, a particular subjectivity that comes to belong simultaneously in the past, present and future, historically constitutive and transformative. Hall (2000) insists that if we are to understand the colonial experience, we must engage this triad positioning of the historical subject to understand hegemonic regimes of representation and the ensuing power/knowledge construction of the ‘Othered’ body. He argues that making sense of the coloniality immanent within cultural identity is about speaking to the points of identification and points of dis-identification, points of histories, points of culture, points of sociality which come to constitute Diasporic identity. These points, however, for Hall are “always constructed through memory, fantasy, narrative, myth, through histories with real, material and symbolic effects” (Hall 2000: 24), not fixed points which speaks to us from the past, as outside of history, waiting to return to through some final, absolute mode of what it means to be human.

For Hall, concerning Diasporic identity, there is no absolute guarantee, but more so a politics of identity, a politics of positioning. In pointing to how Caribbean identities come to be framed, Hall provides us with two vectors to make sense of this sociality: “the vector of similarity and continuity; and the vector of difference and rupture” (Hall 2000:24). Moreover, Hall wants us to think about the dialogical relations embedded within these historical vectors. What does it mean then to be grounded to the past through a particular historical continuity? And what does it mean to speak to the present through the intervention of history, through discontinuous histories as entrenched within colonialism, Euromodernity, enslavement, plantation life, Indentureship, and Euro-Enlightenment narratives? And how do we come to understand difference through these
spatio-temporal moments produced through the intervention of history in which
difference is always already produced in and through its continuity? Yet Hall reminds us
that the cultural inscription within these unsettling Caribbean identities cannot simply be
encapsulated through the binary of Self/Other, but instead ought to be read through a
constitutive historical complexity that through a continuum of ways bring this Caribbean
identity to a particular place, a particular time that identifies combinatorially with the
cultural codifications of the Diaspora. Re-reading Aime Cesaire’s and Leopold Senghor’s
*Presence Africaine, Presence Europeenne, Presence Americaine*, Hall speaks about the
omnipresent Africa residing within the Caribbean, the particular ontological quotidian of
enslavement that governs language, spirituality, religion, food, music, and culture, that:

> Africa, the signified which could not be represented directly in slavery, remained
> and remains the unspoken unspeakable “presence” in Caribbean culture. It is
> “hiding” behind every verbal inflection, every narrative twist of Caribbean
> cultural life. It is the secret code with which every Western text was “re-read.” It
> is the ground-bass of every rhythm and bodily movement. *This* was – is – the
> “Africa” that is alive and well in the diaspora (Hall 2000: 27).

Hall, in placing historical trajectories on the discourse of blackness, places the disjuncture
through particular historical events, from post-colonial Independence, to the Civil Rights
movement, Rastafarianism and reggae music. These events allowed for a certain
understanding of what it means to be Jamaican, of what it means to be Caribbean, by re-
reading the post-plantation experience through a Diasporic transported pedagogy. But as
Hall (2000) notes, the Caribbean is not only laden with the African presence, the
Caribbean is very much at the heart of Euromodernity. He argues that the Caribbean in
and of itself has come to be positioned and overdetermined through the location of
Europe, from underdevelopment to the politics of hue and the interplay with questions of
power and privilege, to cultural representation and the positioning of the black subject within post-Independence geographies. So, for Hall the Caribbean marks the beginning of the Diaspora, one that necessitates an identity that lives with the contingencies of the African, European, American Presence.

In relation to Hall’s discussion about Black Britain, Kobena Mercer, in his Introduction: Black Britain and the Cultural Politics of the Diaspora, calls for a queer Diasporic reading to push against the “homophobia within black communities and the racism in white gay communities” (Mercer 1994:10). Mercer speaks about the importance of coming to voice around themes of black representation, about the making of “black communities of resistance to the ethnocentric parochialism of English art education” (Mercer 1994:14). Mercer highlights the variant ways in which Diasporic conversations can invite or facilitate an understanding of the subject, that moves beyond the narrow confines of a boxed belonging to nation, which speaks to very contained, rigid, performances and desires of knowing ones subjectivity.

The “Whatever” of Black Cultural Studies

In Beyond the ‘Nation Thing’: Black Studies, Cultural Studies, and Diaspora Discourse (or the Post-Black Studies Moment) Rinaldo Walcott boldly argues for a particular “whatever” of Black Cultural Studies, a “whatever” that “refuses the regulating and restricting confines of the “nation-thing” discourse in the context of the study of black peoples.” A “whatever” that speaks to the complex negotiations of Diasporic peoples “between place/nation and transnational identifications which position them in ambiguous relation to both the structures of nation and their narratives and to black people in other places” (Walcott 2003:117). Recalling Deborah Britzman’s “difficult
knowledge”, (Walcott 2003: 18) invites a reading practice which works to disrupt our safe enclaves of knowing, a reading that locates struggle as contextualized through history, and promotes an alternative response (see also James and Mannette 2000). What Walcott does, importantly for this study, is to call for a “theory of post-civil rights black disappointment,” through a Diasporic reading practice embedded within histories, memories, desires, free associations, disappointments, pleasures and investments that we bring to a particular text. Walcott also notes that these Diasporic reading practices not only decode and encode, but also speak to the disavowals and repressions immanent in the histories and consciousness of the Diaspora, and come to be informed through the necessitated transocean/Atlantic movement. Such a reading practice, as Walcott tells us, can tolerate different desires, pleasures and histories. He proposes that such reading practices are, at once local and transcend the sense of being local, allowing for a return and uncovering of other possible ways of belonging beyond this “nation-thing”.

In his Black Like Who: Writing Black Canada, Walcott speaks about the difficulty of writing blackness and attempts to provide particular grammars for thinking blackness in the context of Canada. This process, as Walcott admits, is a strategic process because of the ethical concerns about who is written in and who is written out? In his quest, Walcott chooses to “pay attention to diaspora networks and connectedness as opposed to an explicit national address” (Walcott 2003: 15). When Walcott uses the term blackness, he means to:

signal blackness as a sign, one that carries with it particular histories of resistance and domination. But blackness is also a sign which is never closed and always under contestation. Blackness for me, like black Canadian, allows for a certain kind of malleability and open-endedness which means that questions of blackness far exceed the categories of the biological and the ethnic. I deploy blackness as a
discourse, but that discourse is embedded in a history or a set of histories which are messy and contested. (Walcott 2003:27)

To come into different grammars for thinking blackness, Walcott utilizes detour as method to attend to the discontinuities of sovereignty. He notes that detours are:

The (un)acknowledged routes and roots of black expressive cultures and gesture directly to their rhizomatic nature. The detour is both an improvisatory and an in-between space which black diasporic cultures occupy. Detours, both planned and accidental, are an important aspect of black diasporic cultures. The first detour might be considered Columbus’s; it set the groundwork for discussions of blackness in the Americas (Walcott 2003: 31).

By noting the arrival of the counter-novel, Walcott points to the variable ways through schooling and education in which the literary landscape of Canada is being re-shaped and working to re-organize Canadian historiography. His urgent call for the articulation of a black grammar contingent of historical time intervenes in celebratory discourses, disrupts nation-state heritage stories, and allows the Diasporic-African subject to think through black subjectivities in ways that invite a reasoning that moves the black social to different localities of settler nation-state (see also Davis 2007). Rather than settling on some utopian ideal, Walcott insists on preventing the erasure of the Diaspora by writing blackness in the context of Canadian culture (Walcott 2003). With these watershed moments of Pan-Africanism, what we are left with are the historical trajectories of thinkers about the variant ways the anti-and the post-colonial come to articulate Diaspora and the Diasporised subject. We are left with the different ways of understanding black identity through the anti and the post colonial. In summary, I am inviting a thinking for schooling and education that allows for a re-reading of the nation-state by way of the historical heterogeneity of the Diaspora. Through these authors, pedagogues/learners can come to imagine nation-state citizenry by way of difference. It allows for all learners to
come to understand a sense of belonging, community and inclusiveness through their variant subject positions of the Diaspora. In the next chapter I work to articulate some of the tensions between the anti- and the post-colonial, and how these different readings produce a particular understanding of Pan-Africanism and the Diasporic subject.
CHAPTER FOUR: LOCATING THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Decolonizing the Post

In this chapter, I primarily set out to discuss the way in which Euromodernity comes to be articulated through particular theoretical frameworks. I am engaging questions concerning the points of divergence and convergence regarding the anti-and the post-colonial. I am thinking by way of an anti-colonial articulation, how might we begin to engage questions of identity through a reading of community, solidarity, shared historical experiences, in a way that reconciles this sense of a post-colonial incomplete, fragmented, work-in-progress subject, which often enough works to form a divisionary poetics concerning the politics of blackness. I broach some of the contemporary discussions concerning the variant ways the post-and anti-colonial come to articulate Diaspora and the Diasporized subject. In doing so, I think it is important at this moment within the broader project of the thesis to talk about the politics of post-and anti-colonial thought and what it means for Diaspora and the decolonization process for different bodies.

If our collective goal for schooling and education for pedagogues/learners is about social justice, social change, social harmony, then the task of decolonization concerns all bodies. One of the quarrels concerning anti-colonial work is this sense of the African body having the authority, the monopoly on the discursive articulation about what it means to do anti-colonial/anti-racist work. The gripe is that the black/African body positions the African-subject as the central body to anti-colonial thought, and in doing so, becomes the dominant/imperial subject (Lawrence and Dua 2005; Dei and Simmons 2010b; Sharma and Wright 2008-09). For me, the question is not about which body
can/cannot do anti-colonial/anti-racism work, for every-body is a reservoir of embodied/cultural knowledge and a potential for political action. That is, everyone brings a sense of experiential knowledge concerning their governing socio-cultural environment. I am more concerned about the location of these experiential ways of knowing, and how particular embodiments of knowledge come to be classified/compartmentalized within educational systems. I am asking, therefore, what does it mean for the dominant body to do anti-colonial/anti-racism research? (Dei 2005). And how might the writing of the dominant body differ from and converge with that of racialised historically oppressed scholars?

I understand the anti-colonial project as not closed or fixed to particular bodies with shared historical experiences of plantation enslavement. I am saying that anti-colonial thought embodies an integrative discursive framework, which is inclusive of multiple experiences of different bodies and engages the many forms of colonialism as the colonial experience appears as normative in our everyday lives. If central to anti-colonial/anti-racism is the experience/embodiment of colonialism, then I can understand how the experiences of transatlantic enslavement of African peoples have come to centralize itself within the framework. Yet it is by no means totalizing. It seems to me, that there exists this problematic within schooling and education that positions and hierarchizes theory, resulting in a certain positioning of the pedagogue that simultaneously installs currency onto the pedagogue. So, if we are thinking about decolonization as the colonial comes to reside within theory through the embodiment of particular bodies with histories of enslavement, then we must speak about the politics of the subject, the shared responsibilities of the different pedagogues and the implications
when theorizing from different locations, the implications of having to articulate from different experiences of colonial oppression. The issue here is not to fall in the trap of hierarchizing oppression, that is to say that a particular human experience trumps other forms of oppression, that there exist a particular authority regarding historical memory in which only certain bodies are deemed endowed to write about a given geography of experience. We all speak from different locations, which in a sense, reminds us of the call for an integrative discursive framework that includes the myriad experiences of our social environment.

One of the quarrels coming from my classroom discussions concerning what does it mean for Indigenous knowledges to articulate itself through an anti-colonial framework? And how do we make meaning about the relationship with the African-Diasporized body, colonization, and Indigenous/Aboriginal knowledge? These germane questions speak to the experiences of Aboriginal peoples, land occupation, settler, and about the extraction of natural resources Indigenous to historic Africa. The gripe from the students was that the thrust of European colonization concerned natural resources/commodities more so than colonization concerns the black/African body. The question of the black body was more of a derivative or secondary component of colonization. We noted that there exists a particular danger with localizing colonization to certain hierarchised variables, or let us say into neatly parcelled classified units of thought. At the same time we must approach the essentialized discourse of race and colonialism. We must speak about the multiple intersections, the multiple geographies of race, class, gender, sexuality, ableism and religion to name some. Some students found it

---

1 This discussion emerged during a course in Anti-Racism Methodology at OISE
unsettling to talk about race, poverty, power and privilege, the preferred focus being more about globalization and democracy. Yet, within the governing epoch of globalization, to talk about race and citizenship is about disentangling historical relationships with colonial/imperial nation-states, racialized/Aboriginal bodies, immigration policies and the ongoing nation building enterprise.

The classroom disquiet was more around this historical category of *settler* and the manner in which settlement re-presents itself today in particular ways that come to implicate racialized bodies. The argument was that *settler* was a historical domain for the dominant body, as installed through the importation of the Euro-subject to produce civility, and that the nomenclature of *settler* was relevant and governed the racialized body. We went back and forth, trying to pin down what this meant then for racialized bodies, to claim a sense of belonging, to claim space through the Diaspora as home. We pondered how the racialized body comes to be complicit with the Euro-colonial project of modernity and the importance for all bodies to know how they come into this sense of belonging.

**Complicity of Nation-State Citizenship**

Claiming citizenship in the Diasporized West is not without its politics. The Diasporized-subject’s claim to citizenship in the context of Canada is about understanding how, through histories of colonization, the Diasporized-subject comes to be complicit with the performance of citizenry. For me, citizenship ought to be about a politics about the subject, a politics that strategically speaks to histories of oppression, a politics cognizant of expropriated lands, a politics that cogently engages histories of imperial governance. If to do anti-colonial work means speaking *from/with/through and*
out of the embodiment of citizenry, then the articulation of an integrative anti-colonial
discursive framework must be inclusive of particular historic specificities, such as the
material conditions of Euro-colonial modernity, that of Aboriginal lands, the
black/African body, the production of a genderised nation-state/citizenship, and Africa.
Today, questions about citizenry and the Diasporic-subject are well entrenched within
capitalist-globalization. Questions about citizenship are deeply entangled through the
land. One can quickly become immersed with a parochial discourse in which the
conversation approaches some beginning/origin orientation. At the same time we have to
work with these colonial histories. We cannot simply dismiss these moments and
interpret our lived social through the constraints of the contemporary. We also have to be
mindful of the dangers of high theorizing when doing anti-colonial work. In saying this, I
recognize the risk of sounding anti-intellectual, keeping in mind that often, it is alleged
that anti-colonial thought is without theory. Yet, the anti-colonial emerged from a politics
of action, anti-colonial theory is about activist scholarship, anti-colonial education is
about praxis. The anti-colonial emerged from resistance, from the need to survive. Anti-
colonialism materialized from plantation struggle to the will to self-determinate by
peoples who have been colonized. What this means then, is that we cannot theorize the
anti-colonial for the sole sake of publishing or intellectualizing.

Claiming citizenship through a particular theoretical framework is political for the
Diasporic-subject. Needless to say citizenship is about power and privilege, in that,
theory is neither neutral nor innocent. More so, to have to theorize through the lived
experiences of the Diasporized-subject is about coming to know through the embodiment
of knowledge, insofar as theory concerns cultural ways of knowing and understanding the
lived social environment of the Diasporic-subject. Recalling some of my research questions, where I am concerned with: What is the experience of race? How do Caribbean Diasporic peoples come to understand race through their lived public sphere? And by what means does the Diasporic experience of race organize the lived social of ‘blackness’? I am thinking about how might we understand these experiences through different theoretical frameworks. How might these moments come to be articulated through Afrocentrism, Indigenous knowledges, cultural studies, critical race studies, anti-racism, post-colonial studies, critical disability studies, Frankfurt school (critical theory), critical feminist theory, Marxism or Diaspora studies. In that, these theoretical positions have been installed within schooling and education in ways that inscribe power and privilege onto the Diasporic-subject. In coming into theory, I recognize that well embedded in schooling and education there exists a host of discursive contestations over different sites of knowledge in which certain bodies of knowledge come to be accorded with discursive currency in ways that reproduce dominant ways of knowing and understanding. To have, then, to write about the Diasporic experience of the subject through the post-colonial, or through Black feminist thought or let us say through critical feminist thought, comes with consequences, for theory, as oriented through particular histories to Europe, come to be valued more so than theory that has emerged through histories of colonization.

I often struggle with moments of belonging, with the act of arrival, of coming to a new land, of living with the histories of enslavement and indentureship. I struggle with the nomenclatures of *immigrant*, of *citizen*, with the privileging of these spaces, about the question of accessibility and rights and the relationship with Southern geographies. My
struggle with belonging concerns ontological primacy and the relationship with the Diasporic body. To think of the Indigenous body as always already being situated with geography, to contextualize Indigeneity through transatlantic enslavement, Diaspora, settler and the project of Euromodernity, to understand how the Diasporic body becomes complicit, to understand then how the Diasporic body becomes entangled through the politics of transnationalism. Part of the decolonizing process is about sifting through these complex entangled colonial histories. In locating the Diasporized-subject through these complex entangled histories, I point to the configurations of Euromodernity, in which colonial variants come to engage the subject in the lived everyday moment. Given the myriad transhistorical forms of identity and the immutable transmissions of Diasporic subjects, one of the challenges for decolonizing the Diasporized-subject is with extricating these histories of violence well augured through Euro-Enlightenment epistemologies. In a sense then, the colonial project is/was very much an epistemological project, that is, to embody the Diasporized body as historically determined through imperialized geographies is in a sense a concomitant claim to a particular transhistorical-subject. Meaning as always already colonially posited through these transhistoric bodies is neither apolitical nor neutral. Yet, historically imperial geographies have been discursively circumscribed through narratives with the invested interest of globalizing the Euro-predatory nation-state enterprise of modernity.

Within our contemporary public sphere, the post-colonial discursive has been well embraced as a particular method of writing back to the colonial imperative. Conversations concerning the post have been well archived through particular classifications such as, diversity, ethnicity, multiculturalism and heterogeneity. With
transnational identities being formed through Diasporization, the transnational emerges through cartographies, geographies, and celebratory configurations of the post-human. The concern with the post-human is about bringing to the surface the sediment-body deeply colonially entrenched within histories of Enlightenment narratives. My intention with the anti-colonial concerns moving through the Diaspora to rupture, disentangle, historical specific tropes that come to sediment subjectivity. I posit an integrative anti-colonial discursive framework, which speaks to the multitude of colonial intersections such as race, class, gender, sexuality, ableism, law, religion and the environmental. With the anti-colonial, my proposal is one of a countervailing discourse that speaks to the experiences of resistance and oppression. My argument is that the anti-colonial discursive in and of itself is pedagogical, it is a method through which one comes to know and understand the lived experiences of the Diasporized-subject through praxis beyond the Eurocentric circumscribed edict of modernity. I locate the anti-colonial as a contrapuntal body of knowledge, one imbued through local ways of knowing. I recognize the shifting dynamics of the colonial in which the mechanisms of imposition come to be arranged and re-arranged as the ethical register for the Diasporized-subject. My concern is with the conditions of existence in which the Diasporized-subject comes to know its possibilities, about how the Diasporized-subject comes to articulate its humanism through Western geographies.

As a method, I am engaging the anti-colonial in a particular way that draws from post-colonial, Indigenous knowledges and anti-racism thought. At the same time I am pushing back against celebratory discussions about identity. Instead, I am thinking through the historical procedures of colonial globalization, asking what is at stake with
claiming a particular identity. I am concerned with the process of identification in which
the identity comes into being. I am locating *the fact of blackness* as a political category
embedded in histories of colonial violence and resistance. I am thinking of modernity in
and through the Diaspora. I am writing against the colonial ableist gendered subject, in
doing so I am writing to understand the lived experience of the Diasporized-subject
through the sensibilities, conditions, pre-conditions, and utilities of Euromodernity. I
engage the anti-colonial through questions of the temporal as constituted through the
historical memory of enslavement. I am working through the anti-colonial to make sense
of ontological difference or Fanon as puts it, the *onto-socio genesis* (Fanon 1967). What
are the ways in which the ontological self comes to be socio-culturally discursively
produced and what are the moments of divergence and convergence? Diasporized
identity is always already produced through a particular violent imposition, one through
colonial space and time, one through colonial geographies, one through colonial justice,
one through colonial histories. In a sense the Diasporic-subject comes to self-
determination through particular historical conditions as posited within the configuration
of the Americas. What is currently at stake in articulating an anti-colonial sensibility
within the present constraints of a globalized Euromodernity? How might such a
sensibility help with extricating possibilities for theorizing Africa beyond its boundaries?
How might such a sensibility help with understanding black identity beyond the politics
of cultural hybridity or cultural syncretism? My interest with the anti-colonial concerns
re-imagining the Diasporic-subject through different trans-histories to make sense of
citizenship, sovereignty, nationalism, community, what it means to be human, and the
governing relationship with self and the State. My interest with the anti-colonial concerns
making sense of the contemporary Diasporized-subject within the governing nation-state and the possibilities of this experience we come to know as freedom. How can an anti-colonial sensibility help with understanding the particular relationships concerning black freedom, black liberation, or black emancipation? For example, given the recent seismic activities occurring on the geography we come to know as Haiti, how might an anti-colonial articulation help with making sense of the human condition that circumscribes the archetype axis of resistance to Euromodernity by colonized peoples? Through the anti-colonial, I am writing as a method to undo certain historic-specific thoughts about citizenry with the aim of disrupting the way in which particular narratives of history come to be repeated within the everyday sociality of Diasporic peoples. I am locating the Diasporized-subject, in and of itself, contrapuntal and tangential to Euro-modern public sphere sensibilities. I am working to identify possibilities for integration for the post-plantation Diasporic-subject as emerging from particular locations and strategies through moments of resistance, survival, assimilation, and recovery; through moments of public sphere uncertainty.

Regarding colonially oppressed peoples, my concern is with extricating subjectivity in ways that work through and against the essentialism. In doing so, I engage Euro-Enlightenment narratives of the ‘Other’, in order to re-fashion present histories of the Diasporized-subject. I am positioning the anti-colonial theory as a politics of action to come to know and understand Diasporized-subjectivity as the subject undergoes the Diasporizing procedures of Euromodernity (Dei and Simmons, in press). The anti-colonial involves countervailing articulations of the local Diasporic-subject. The anti-colonial involves speaking with intersecting geographies of oppression. I am writing to
make sense of how material forces as situated through historical techniques of the nation-state come to form limiting conditions of what it means to be human on peoples emerging from colonized lands. I re-imagine the anti-colonial through a reading of the earlier works of activists/thinkers, such as, Frantz Fanon, Albert Memmi, Aime Cesaire, Claudia Jones, Marcus Garvey, George Padmore, Stokely Carmichael, Amilcar Cabral, W. E. B. Du Bois, Henry Sylvester Williams, and Kwame Nkrumah. Through the corpus of these pedagogues, I engage the politics of intersectionality, that of, having to making sense of the lived experience of the Diaspora through difference as embodied through language, ableism, religion, class, sexuality, gender and race. To understand the contemporary human conditions of the Diaspora, to approach this sense of the post-human is about having a dialogue that concerns the transnational subject, the particular forms of social difference, and the manner in which the colonial appears or come to present itself.

Subjectivity and the Question of Identity

Ultimately, articulating Diasporised subjectivity concerns questions about identity. Yet identity involves more than just naming the respective body. Identity concerns myriad historical processes of coming into being. Identity involves positionality, location, constitutive of agency. Identity is not evenly formed. Identity is always already a work in progress, and unfinished and incomplete in its being (Hall 2000, 1997; Davies 2000; Weedon 1987; Minha 1989). But what do these overworked statements mean for oppressed peoples, marginalized groups, for social change, social justice, for transformation? How might we understand Diaspora through a shared politics or shared historical experiences of oppression and resistance? I am interested in a particular reading of the Diaspora, which locates specific histories through space and
time to come to articulate a Diasporic sensibility, which speaks to the multiple ways of
the lived experiences of the Diasporized-subject. We know Diasporic space involves
contestation. Diaspora, although often articulated through themes of exile, dislocation,
disembodiment and dispersion, comes to speak, name and mark popularized discussions
about identity. I hope to show that the Diaspora offers ways of engaging critical
pedagogies to make sense of the colonial imbrications and the attendant intervention of
Euro Enlightenment modernity, that within the Diaspora resides a temporality of cultural
constellations. I am saying the Diaspora envelopes particular pedagogies as imbued
through sensibilities then that come to be historically located tangentially to public sphere
modernity. As I have mentioned before, the challenge for the Diasporised subject is with
identifying, making sense, about coming to know and understand these everyday public
sphere articulations of the liminal. In doing so, I am suggesting dialoguing with the
different relations ensconced within counterpublic blackness as governed through the
public sphere of Euromodernity. I will show that through these entangled moments reside
alternative forms of knowing that shape ontological relations with the Diasporized-
subject.

Black subjectivity so often becomes trapped within the configurations of the
State’s articulation of the Other, within the constraints of being discursively produced,
discursively re-presented through particular texts, signs and signifiers, which ostensibly
locate the ‘Othered’ tangential to the social interactions of the governing public sphere.
Often, the black subject comes to be spectacularised through the corporeal aesthetic
culminating in a particular public sphere fetish, which places hyper-black masculinities as
desirable. Desirability becomes accepting and produced in ways in which the black
Diasporized-subject comes to accept this public conditional production of what it means for the black body to be human as ontological and as the only possibility to come to exist, to come to know the self, or to engage in public sphere activities in a sum meaningful way. I am concerned about the way in which plantation jurisprudence comes to enact itself within the contemporary of historically colonized peoples, ultimately working to mitigate and mediate the economic, civic and political possibilities of Diaspora peoples. I am re-inviting the necessity of a black counterpublic that engages a politics of transnationalism that work to endow counterpublic pedagogies. Immanent within black counterpublic are critical histories of enslavement, black civil rights struggle, Black Power movements, Pan-Africanism and anti-racist resistance. Important to the anti-colonial discussion is recognizing the knowledge systems residing within these bodies of the Diaspora. For through these different ways of knowing we can work to conceptualize a way of understanding the lived experiences of the Diasporized-subject. Ultimately, this conceptualization disembarks from the historical permutations of modernity and colonialism that locate the cartography of race onto fixed classifications of the governing human condition. I hope to show that the anti-colonial offers a way of re-imagining the dominant narrative of citizenry and the ensuing relationship with nation-state. The anti-colonial offers a way of approaching Diasporic sociality. It suggests an alternative interpretation to the placing of the Diasporised body within the Euro-metropolitan by way of re-locating the African subject in ways that articulate the nuanced relationships of embodied power and privilege immanent to the dominant body. At the same time troubling and working to disrupt the cryptic fixed location of the Diasporized-subject within contemporary formations of neo-liberal capitalist Euro-modernity. My task is to
think about and theorize particular continental geographies beyond their boundaries through space and time, as these geographies come to reside temporally and anachronistically within the governing cosmopolitan metropolitan epoch.

The anti-colonial also offers a way of dialoguing with the *autopoiesis* immanent to Diasporized peopling, that of a particular way of self-organizing and self-producing through Indigenous ways of knowing. The anti-colonial offers a means of identifying, a means of coming to recognize these incommensurable moments rooted within the lived experiences of the Diaspora. These moments come to be lived through the aesthetic, through language, through culture, through different speech acts, which provoke subversive pedagogies inclined to the making of counterpublic spheres. The anti-colonial has the capacity to identify these Diasporic experiences as connoted through imposition and domination as colonial. Concerning the colonial, we know that bodies matter, that bodies constitute a material good, that bodies come to be commodified in ways that preserve the colonial inscription. The potentiality of the anti-colonial speaks to engaging and transforming these colonially imbued narratives that come to form the social and discursive field for Disporization. It speaks to the fostering of a particular space, which can help re-shape and re-form the narratives immanent to nation-state discourse of what it means for Diasporic peoples to belong to a country, of what it means for Diasporic peoples to participate beyond the public sphere margins, to in a sense trouble the discontinuity, the fragmentation of community building through shared historical experiences. The anti-colonial entails the grammar that can articulate the inter/intra nuances, the struggles, the tensions residing with Diasporic communities, the frustration of coming to belong in a particular way, the grief of separation, of being divided from
family due to immigration laws, that, as a fetish, speak to a particular commodified peopling as the preferred people to constitute the nation-state. Historically, the question of citizenry for the Diasporized-subject as distinct from Euro-geographies meant coming to participate, coming to belong as the already disavowed subject. Yet the anti-colonial intervenes in ways that speak to the entrenched histories of belonging, the complicity of bodies performing within the heart of globalized, capitalist modernity, and to the political relationship concerning Indigenous peoples, nation-state and the Diaspora. It provides dialogue that takes into account historical agency, which can work towards providing equitable means.

But the anti-colonial is by no means the panacea. Confronting the material, as well as the abstract, the intangible is often difficult work, such spaces are often laden, often nuanced through contradictions, ambivalences, often encumbered and marked in ways whereby identity as conceptualized through the Diaspora seems to be seamed with fragility concerning belonging and community. Yet fragility can come to mean limitations while at the same time possibilities for the Diasporised-body. What then are the perils or risks of contemplating such desires of the Diaspora? Identity, as experienced through the Euro-West, is often compartmentalized in ways in which the black Diasporic subject comes to know the self through the essentialized reading of the black body which works to, as Fanon reminds us, the negation of the self, that of alienation as the human condition (Fanon 1967). Identity is often experienced through the popularized postmodern reading, as singular, distinct, monolith, independent, dis-identifying with moments of origin, questions of primacy, questions of shared historical experiences. It is the congealing of these same, different and distinct moments that gives the tapestry of
Diaspora life. Needless to say, writing about the Diaspora has become quite encumbering given the different political locations, the different historical experiences of the Diasporic body. The challenge being about finding a particular approach, a particular method that speaks to the complex histories of racism, colonialism, modernity, sexuality, class, gender, religion, ableism as they are anachronistically rooted deep within the temporal of the Diaspora. Such an approach must broach the interplay concerning language, culture and ethnicity. Such an approach must be contrapuntal, counter-discursive to Euro-enlightenment configurations of what it means to be human. As an interpretive prism, the anti-colonial offers a pedagogy, which cogitates through these Diasporic spaces, which have come to be scripted in and through historical dominant narratives.

**Anti-Colonial and the Question of Nationalism**

Anti-colonial writers such as W.E.B. Du Bois (1989), *Souls of Black Folks*, Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (1963), and *Black Skin White Masks* (1967), Aime Cesaire (1972), *Discourse on Colonialism*, Albert Memmi (1991), *The Colonizer and the Colonized* and Leopold Senghor (2001), *Negritude and Modernity* speak to the human condition of blackness. In different ways, they show that the human is experienced through negation, through the production of the archetype black subject that simultaneously posits the black body as the colonial abject. Du Bois’s *coming to know the self through the eyes of the other*, that of, *double consciousness*; Fanon’s *lactification of consciousness*; Cesaire and Senghor’s, *Negritude as a humanism*; and Memmi’s *psychology of colonization* give us an understanding of the colonial sensibilities which worked to fashion black-geographies. In many ways this study speaks from an anti-colonial reading as posited by Fanon, in that, for the Diasporized-subject to come to
experience the human, to come to invoke, home, belonging, citizenry, to invariably, to
silently push back against the temporality of exile and dislocation, is to constantly have to
negate the negation, to constantly have to be aware of colonial narratives as these
narratives come to embody the material. Hence, the Diasporized-subject comes into
cognition of what it means to be human through a series of constitutive enactments. This
being the Hegelian and Marxist dialectics, that of, material conditions propelling ideas, or
ideas being propelled by material conditions. Hence, the Diasporized-body comes into
being as the agentive subject through a particular way of belonging within the conscripts
of Euromodernity nation-state through counter-hegemonic discourses, which at the same
time are constituted through colonial sensibilities and not as outside or distinct from the
colonial project. Yet, historically these anti-colonial thinkers may have unwittingly taken
up questions of gender and sexuality in ways which work to repeat dominant histories,
while at the same time being tacit concerning certain spaces that have been saturated by
colonial inscriptions such as religion or questions about the constitutive sensibilities of
what it means to be the abled-body. In coming to understand the Diasporized-subject as
embedded with continuous histories of colonialism, modernity and globalization, the anti-
colonial as a theoretical approach can speak to the intersubjective self immanent to
Diasporic histories as imbued through transatlantic enslavement, transhistories, plantation
life, moments of origin, as these moments come to constitute the sensibilities of primacy.
Fanon, in particular, has given us an anti-colonial framework, which opens up different
possibilities to make sense of what it means for the black subject, the Enlightenment
‘Other’ to be human.
In an overarching way, my project concerns understanding Diasporic subjectivities produced through the colonial experience, and how these Diasporic subjectivities come to be formed through different positions of the liminal; how these subjectivities come to coopt, resist, embrace, engage, push back, dialogue with the cultural inscriptions as circumscribed through Euromodernity. What are the terms and what is at stake to speak about solidarity, community, and political identity as these Diasporic subjectivities come to reside within the Western public sphere? What are the ways in which Diasporic-subjectivity come to understand its relationship with the State as the sovereign-subject? Yet, in many ways, the anticolonial project has been all about nationalism, about enfranchisement, about self-determination for racialised peoples. In many ways the discursive production of nationalism has become saturated through the theoretical underpinnings of the post-colonial and the post-structural, which for one has worked to construct and re-locate the Diasporic-subject of the colonial by way of particularly linking the subjectivity to a series of cultural sequencing. Ensuing here is the freeing up of the Diaporic subject from the historical essentialized narratives of colonialism, which inevitably opens possibilities for the human condition. I am mindful of these possibilities coming to materialize through the production of discontinuous histories, whereby the Diasporized-subject comes to know the same subjectivity through the contemporary synchronic, that is, through the contemporary present absence of histories.

Nationalism materialized differently depending on the geographic context. One might argue that all nationalisms emerged through anti-colonial struggles, through anti-colonial resistance, from Haiti, to the Americas, to Africa. Yet nationalism as emerging
in the Americas has come to be nuanced in a particular way for both the body of the colonizer and the colonized. I am suggesting for the given colonized geography, the experience of nationalism ought to be read through a historical-material framework (James 1993; Rodney 1982; Robinson 1983), which not only centers race, but allows for a gendered reading which engages questions of masculinity, patriarchy and what it means to be this able body. Too often nationalism has been articulated as a sum pioneering adventure that centers the male hero through hyper-masculine tropes. Freedom, emancipation, transformation, liberation are always already gendered and willed into the archives of hyper-masculinity. These singular-gendered-nationalist reading of anti-colonial humanism, which worked to normatize the centrality of masculine classifications historically trumpeted previous scholarly accounts of nationalist debates.

I want, through an anti-colonial reading, to invite different ways of understanding and coming into the human condition. As starting points, I am thinking of two distinct, yet interrelated events in history where particular forms of modernity emerged. With the intervention of these histories a peopling ensued in which the sociality spoke to different forms of humanism for colonizer and colonized peoples. I first point to the site of contestation of the colonial British as residing within England and the Americas and the role of the transhistorical African concerning this act of revolution within the territory of the Euro-colonial body politic. I then turn to the place historically marked as Haiti, where C.L.R James (1989) in his Black Jacobins provides us with a detailed account of the revolution that occurred from 1791-1803, which inevitably sparked the rise of the Negritude movement. I am reading these historical disjunctures as necessitating possible Diasporic conditions for the Diasporized subject, that embedded within these entangled
histories are immanent dispositions of sovereignty, belonging, and citizenry of what it
means to be the post-plantation human.

James (1992b) in his essay *The Revolutionary Answer to the Negro Problem in
the USA*, notes the social and political significance of the African struggle for
Independence as localized within the geography of the Americas. James points to the
imperialist war within the colonial forces and the role of the African subject, that
liberation meant being immersed capitalistically through the organization of labor. Yet he
accounts for the African peoples to come to organize through a strategic way of
integration, which unequivocally marked the production of the African as the American
subject takes up her/his place within Euro-capitalist modernity. With this intervention of
history in which the African body interpellates into the humanism of the American
subject, this intervention becomes inextricably bound to questions of nationalism,
belonging, Diaspora, and particular orientations to citizenry. In a sense the anti-colonial
is not pinned to a particular continental reading or to a particular historical body. The
anti-colonial reading instead speaks to the quotidian spaces of imposition (Dei 2006; Dei
and Kempf 2006; Dei and Asgharzadeh 2001) and dialogues with the intersubjective to
make sense of the constitutive epistemes immanent to the Diasporized-subject. As Dei
(2000) notes, “anti-colonial is an epistemology of the colonized, anchored in the
Indigenous sense of collective and common colonial consciousness. In other words, the
anti-colonial framework is primarily an epistemology of the oppressed. It is a theory that
emerges from the “ground-up” in terms of local peoples understanding their experiences
in the context of colonialism, colonial and re-colonial relations and other associated
oppressions. ‘Colonial’ is understood in the sense of not simply ‘foreign or alien’, but more profoundly as ‘imposed and dominating’” (p. 118).

Concerning Haiti and the contemporary seismic activity, James reminds us of the particular modernity emerging through revolution, resistance and anti-colonial organizing, that of Negritude. James’s particular anti-colonial reading of Haiti, speaks of dialoguing with history through the articulation of a dialectical historical materialism (James 1993). Such an articulation allows for an understanding of the Diasporized-subject as constituted through a sensibility of the historical present. In this way, we can read Haiti as more than simply just being out there, as formulating its historical conditions. We can read Haiti as emerging from histories of oppression, through shared identities as governed through certain particularities, be it race/religion or shared experiential moments as these moments come to be foreground through the myriad intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, religion and ableism. It is not simply to say, as popularized within capitalist media, that Haiti is the poorest country in this or that hemisphere, and then the conversation becomes immersed within the giving of humanitarian aid, NGO talk, acts of kindness by the Metropolis West. Instead James moves us, through an anti-colonial reading, to think of what it means to come into being beyond the constraints of the essentialized subject by tracing the historical material conditions concerning oppression as emerging through relationships anchored within transatlantic enslavement. Importantly, James reminds us that enslaved African peoples in Haiti were the first to achieve independence through revolution. Moreover, this significant historical achievement is virtually written out of Eurocentric histories.
Conclusion

Interpreting Diasporised-subjectivity through the anti-colonial necessitates a strategic political act, for all lived experiences are subjected to different interpretations of coming to know and understand. I am suggesting that the anti-colonial is entrenched through histories of colonial embodiment, that the anti-colonial is about engaging the present Diasporic-subject through a certain memory of colonial violence. It is about the continued struggle to resist the governing procedures that colonially reside within the present-day lived experiences of Diasporised bodies. The anti-colonial concerns a particular historical self-reflexive relationship. It calls for the present-subject to dialogue with constitutive histories, that the present cannot be interpreted ahistorically, that the human experience speaks to movement and social change, in which, unequivocally the anti-colonial seeks transformation and social justice. This would involve thinking about the construct settler in relation to specific histories of Eurocentric colonization. It would involve a particular reading of transnational racialised bodies through the problematic web of globalization. It involves articulating the complexity of racialised peoples coming to be located in the West.

In the following three chapters, by way of contextualizing the data, I draw on Frantz Fanon’s embodied experiences of racism and blackness as situated in the sociocultural milieu of the Diaspora. I draw on my memories as lived through the Diaspora, and particular cultural artifacts to discuss the myriad articulations of the Diasporised subject. Self-reflexively, I work with this data to draw attention to the limitations and possibilities about the malleability of blackness by way of thinking through the fluidity of citizenry. More specifically, I consider what it means to
become/perform the national-subject, and about how abjection and alienation as
constituted through colonization and as materializing in transnational spaces, come to
form the human condition for the Diasporised subject.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCERNING THE DIASPORISED SUBJECT, PSYCHOANALYSIS, ABJECTION, AND EMBODIED ALIENATION – DIALOGUING WITH FANON TO APPROACH AN ANTI-COLONIAL POLITIC

Introduction

Somewhere within the humanism of Euromodernity resides the Diasporic constellation, formed through bodies of time and space, its contours shaped through the congeries of unsettling geographies, cultural landscapes, difference and cosmopolitanism. Diaspora, I submit, is a co-existing constituent of the Enlightenment public sphere, one marked through transnational relations. How might we begin to understand the poetics of Diasporic life? As the title of this chapter suggests, I am concerned with how and by what means the Caribbean Diaspora come to make meaning of its everyday social interactions? Increasingly, I have been thinking about how Fanon could help me better understand this experience. Fanon too, experienced a Diasporic way of being, having moved from his place of birth, Martinique, to study clinical psychiatry in France. Arriving in Paris, in the heart of France, at the center of modernity, he bumped into racism in a particular way that different itself from his Caribbean experience in Martinique. The propensity of racism as was practiced in France, conjured many distinct moments to his racial experience of Martinique. In Martinique as Fanon would say, he was a “West-Indian,” a distinct coterminous category to that of the African. Being well educated, as he was, allowed his body to maneuver through, in Fanon’s terms, the “historical racial schema” (Fanon 1967: 111), as embedded in Martinique through plantation life. He found that his body, as deeply entrenched within the corporeal schema of colonization, to be closer to the body of Euromodernity, a proximity that brought a refreshing distancing to the nearby
plantation enclave. Moreover, this plantation life was already pre-reserved for the body of the African. But in coming to France the experience taught him otherwise. He found his ‘blackness’ rooted to the African, buttressed to the plantation. How was Fanon then, in his newly found Diasporic environment to now work with this archetype human condition of plantation life? What does Fanon give us by way of an anti-colonial politic to earnestly engage these contemporary issues?

With this discussion I am trying to invoke “pedagogic thoughtfulness” (Van Maanen 1997), a sense of critical discernment on day-to-day Diasporic life in order to understand how one’s Diasporic experience might come to be accepted through abjection and embodied forms of alienation. The purpose here is to extricate the Diasporic body of difference from a homogenous socialization of Euro-modernity by engaging in what I am thinking of as selective communicative practices that come to self-determine Diasporic citizenship. In what follows, I speak about hue and the way it forms itself into a material currency for the Diaspora. I am concerned with how hue comes to embody time and space. How does a particular space come to be suggestive of a certain form of hue? I am thinking about what it means for Diasporic bodies to have to engage these spaces through these already permanent suggestions. I bring attention to the moment whereby Diasporic peoples come to know, as Foster (2007) puts it, one’s ethno-racial register. I am interested in how this ethno-racial register comes to provide the tacit knowledge needed to form communicative strategies that allows for temporary ‘extrication’ from what Fanon frames as the epidermal regions of inferiority, that is, the locus of the Diasporic domain, what we come to know as the Caribbean. I ask some pointed questions concerning this nomenclature of the Caribbean in order to consider the historical origins
and implications for the Diasporic body. I then consider the popular ‘black’ body within
the contemporary North American public sphere, that of the US Presidency, in particular
some complexities concerning limitations and possibilities of the *fact of blackness*. I also
discuss what Fanon locates as the *alienation of blackness*. The conversation here
concerns itself with how alienation embodies the ethical and moral conditions of
Diasporic ‘Truths’. I then move to the intricacies of the Diasporic experience, through
Fanon’s discussion of particular acts of assimilation, integration, acculturization and
simultaneous deculturization. I am concerned here with the following question: to what
extent do these acts constitute forms of strategic distancing to local Diasporic cultures?
This conversation spills over into the nuances of Diasporic peoples as of having a sense
of national consciousness. I try to tease the way Indigenous forms of knowing come to re-
present subjectivity in order to engage the public sphere of Euromodernity. I want to
better understand how abject Diasporic subjects come to *lactify* (Fanon 1967) certain
communicative processes, which constitutes a particular *denegryfication* (Fanon 1967). I
ground the discussion by contemplating Caribbean identity, the possibilities for Diasporic
intersubjectivity, the unfreedoms of a post-humanism and the potentiality for schooling
and education.

**Material Embodiment of Hue: What is this Caribbean?**

Before we set out, it is important to talk about the material conditions of
Diasporic peoples, in particular, the body, as it constitutes the material. We need to note
also, the relationship through enslavement and plantation life where the colonizer’s
epistemological imposition of hue comes to form the ontological resources for present-
day ‘Truth’ systems. We cannot discount the question of time and space, and we cannot
neglect the way in which, historical meanings resonate in our daily interactions. We cannot simply trumpet the notion of democracy and say access for all regardless of ableism, race, class, gender, and sexuality. We cannot continue to talk about issues of oppression and domination through a de-raced lens that cries out to a neo-liberal humanitarian ideology (Dei 2008a, b). We cannot sweep the issue of hue and the co-present currency under the rug. Firstly, let me say that I am thinking of ‘blackness’ as a colonial discursive formation that organizes and inscribes particular meanings onto the body as abject. I am thinking of ‘blackness’ as an already formative occasion that brings a classificatory system of “Truth” that when embodied constitutes alienation that simultaneously interpolates the Diasporic body into its subjectivity. That through ‘blackness’ one comes into an already disciplined way of understanding humanity.

Concerning the ‘already formative occasion,’ of blackness, I am thinking of the ontological. Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln talk about ontology:

As a reality which was shaped over time by the congeries of social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender factors, and then crystallized (reified into a series of structures that are now inappropriately) taken as “real,” that is, natural and immutable. For all practical purposes the structures as “real,” a virtual or historical reality. (Guba and Lincoln 1994: 110)

The ontological question then is, “what is the form and nature of reality” that governs the Caribbean Diasporic body? Concerning the Caribbean, Glissant’s question is important here: “What is the Caribbean in fact?” (Glissant 1999: 39). Glissant speaks about the Caribbean as being a “multiple series of relationships.” Yet, immanent to these relationships are denigrating colonial constructed categories of knowledge of Carib and Arawak which come to represent Indigenousness of Kalinago and Taino. Here devalued meanings are colonially ascribed to not only a peoplehood, but in a totalizing way, to
bodies, geographies, time and space, which then come to be deemed as uncivilized (Fanon 1967). I want to historically trace the origins of these colonially engendered formations to the discourse of ‘blackness’. So, in thinking about the Caribbean through the matter of hue, my position is not a totalizing one, that is to say that every body that emerges from the Caribbean in a permanent way is constructed as ‘black’, as abject. I am saying the archipelago that has come to be governed through this accepted title of Caribbean, was discursively organized and inscribed through grand colonial narratives. The Caribbean, or put another way, the archetype for plantation life, had as its base, the material human condition of ‘blackness’. This geography known as the Caribbean comes to be constituted, as Fanon would say, as the epidermalization of inferiority. In a sense through Euromodernity, the Caribbean was formed as this historical abject. What we ought to understand is that the Caribbean emerged through colonial Euromodernity by way of dialectic discursive fields of “whiteness/blackness” (Goldberg 1993:43). Hence in talking about embodied blackness, I do not think we can afford to discard the abject material embodiment immanent in ‘black.’ I think we also have to guard here against slippage in interpreting blackness as a sum homogeneous schema of the Caribbean. So with this understanding of the Caribbean as being constituted through hue, I am thinking of hue as this shifting constitutive abject classification that endows modernity with a particular mode of orientation. I am thinking how time, place, bodies and geographies, in a very totalizing way, come to be discursively scripted through hue and come to form a mode of organizing relations for Diasporic peoples. I am also mindful that within contemporary public sphere life we have no certainty that this discursive has some
definite locus. Instead what is experienced is this shifting spatio-temporal terrain onto the body.

I think we ought to spend some time here and talk about the ethical and moral implications of speaking of this thing of ‘blackness’ in a way that strategically acknowledges the dominant historic classification. What are the consequences and implications, of strategically essentializing, to work with what Fanon (1967) calls ‘the epidermalization of inferiority’, to posit this ‘black’ as abject, as denigrating? And what about essentializing? Mind you, regarding essentializing, I am thinking about the constitutive process which accords permanent negating knowledges onto the body. So we have to be careful here in already scripting the ‘limits of possibilities’ onto the ‘black’ body. This is not to negate the human conditions of plantation life, that of master-slave dialectic as void of the contemporary public. I think the question that is pushing out here is, how is it that colonial moments become re-presented in our every-day lives? If we are to acknowledge this shifting spatio-temporal terrain of the ‘black’ body, then what does it mean here to strategically essentialize? What does this mean for the ‘black’ body to be cognizant of this designated public sphere reading of its subjectivity? What does it mean for the ‘black’ body to understand the fluid discursive rules of ‘blackness’? How do we extricate ourselves from ‘blackness’? (Fanon 1967: 10). More so, how does the Diasporic body come to understand which discursive rule to embody and simultaneously reify as some material good? And what knowledge counts to inform everyday communicative practices, which are utilized to engage strategically, the contemporary public sphere of Euro-modernity? So, if we are thinking about our contemporary public sphere, how do we understand the space of United States Presidency as it emerged through ‘blackness’.
U.S. Presidency – The Extrication of Blackness?

I remember November 4, 2008,11-ish pm. I was glued to my computer screen, checking the elections. I don’t know if I were more in shock or awe that Barack Obama won the elections, or was it the global attention the elections received, the fact that millions were watching/listening/paying attention in some way? But what was the interest? Was it that the world was curious/interested in political science/electoral politics or issues pertaining to contemporary America? Or was it that a ‘black’ body won the Presidency? What about this ‘black’ body left the world whispering? Is it that, at that moment, there was this universalized perception/understanding of, what it means to be ‘black’? Is it that, at that moment ‘black’ was in a global way understood, as Fanon would say as the ‘wretched of the earth’? What does it mean then for that which is classified as the ‘wretched of the earth’, for the body designated for plantation life, as abject to emerge to the position of presidential life? To what extent does this experience provide the conditions for (and to borrow Fanon’s term) ‘the extrication of blackness? Is it that this moment ought to be interpreted as a moment of “ontological security”’? (Giddens 1990). And within contemporary public sphere does it work to condition pedagogic trust among different bodies? There was a lot of shoo-shooing around Obama’s identity. American, African-American, Black, African were all tossed around. I think though, that throughout the campaign, Obama’s politics were more centered through a totalizing discourse of American. For example, there was a lot of debate about how Black Obama’s politics were, how Obama subdued his blackness in order to appeal and appease White voters, how Obama denied that the election and his candidacy were
about race. What are the implications here for Diasporic communities? What does it mean for “the fact of blackness” to be part and parcel, that is the centre, of U.S. white house operations? How does this speak to the moment Obama appeared hand in hand with the family for the token victory speech? I think we ought to talk about how we understand “the fact of blackness” as an organizing principle of White House operations.

Historically we come to know this location as organized/inscribed in and through modernity, that of presidential subjectivity. What then does this mean for modernity and the Diaspora when presidential subjectivity is now occasioned/attended to by the material of plantation? Is this representative of this “new humanism” as Fanon spoke about? What does this moment mean for countries that have been underdeveloped? What then does it mean for imperial America to be governed by the ‘black’ body? Another important conversation I think we ought to have, though I think is too much for this discussion, is to consider the role of plantation life, in inscribing spiritual principles and ethical procedures onto the Diasporic body.

**Alienation as a Human Condition**

I want to point to what Fanon calls the “alienation of blackness” (Fanon 1967:11) as a material good. I am more or less thinking about the ways in which this *alienation of blackness* becomes the interpretive framework for the Diasporic body to make meaning of its lived socio-economic public sphere. What are some of the limits and possibilities here and, “how do we extricate ourselves?” (Fanon 1967:10). What are some of the communicative attitudes, desires, anxieties, and fantasies developed to mold Diasporic identity? And how is it that this “alienation of blackness,” embodies the ethical and moral
conditions of ‘Truth,’ which at the same time, accord a certain governance on the everyday lives of Diasporic bodies?

In the context of the Caribbean Diaspora, *alienation of blackness* becomes a particular experience whereby the Diasporic body, through day-to-day negotiating, interacts with its newly found terrain, a sort of pick and choose if you will. This is not to say this negotiating is done in some formal sense. What it is, is that the Diasporic body goes through this unyielding self-dialogue where the goal is always already to fit in, to gain acceptance, or to say mobilize itself, within the broader community. One could imagine that in coming to a new place these goals would pose some challenges. I am more concerned with how and by what means, Diasporic peoples take up some of these challenges. With alienation as experienced from within, that is, this internalized inferiority, as a material good, as a starting point, and as alienated politically and socio-economically (Oliver 2004), Diasporic peoples then as poised through what I am thinking of as a liminal constant, come to interact, come to form itself as this subjugated counterpublic, (Fraser 1992:123), which hereby, operates not necessarily with the will to subvert dominant spaces, but more so in a way to strategically acculturize to the existing conditions of the present public sphere. This process can become quite complex, and needless to say, problematic, for to have to discursively interface with dominant spaces, it seems to me it ensconces what Fanon speaks of as the need “to dissimulate, to deculturize and at the same time acculturize” (Fanon 1964: 40, 41, 42). Maybe we ought to open up the conversation here, to speak about dissimulation, deculturization, and acculturization, these important experiential moments for Diasporic peoples, what I think make for
possible pedagogical moments which come to be imbued through this ‘alienation of blackness.’

“Epistemic Saliency” of Alienated Blackness: Dissimulation, Deculturization, and Acculturization

Concerning deculturization, I am thinking of how the Diaspora, through time and space, distances itself from continental lands, which then materializes itself through cultural modes of communicative exchange. wa Thiong’o talks about, that “culture is a product of a peoples’ history, that it also reflects that history and embodies a whole set of values by which people view themselves and their place in time and space” (wa Thiong’o 1993: 42). Mind you, here I am cognizant of the danger of bringing a particular monolith, fixed, homogenous reading of culture. By no means am I trying to peg culture to such a position. I recognize the fluidity, flux and heterogeneity of culture. Where I am going though, is to suggest that wa Thiong’o’s reading is one of the possible ways of coming to understand culture and Diasporic peoples. So if we were to think of culture as it reflects history and as of embodying the values of Diasporic peoples, we can drum up some sort of communicative discursive interface, which ought to insulate Diasporic subjectivities from governing cultural practices. Yet this discursive interface works to distance the Diasporic subject from homegrown cultural dispositions, so be it “metaphysical guilt or be it the obsession with purity”(Fanon 1964:18) the Diaspora then, comes to exude particular desires, anxieties and fantasies, whereby one of the experiences as Fanon succinctly puts it, is to “judge, condemn, to abandon language, food habits, sexual behavior, way of sitting down, resting, and laughing as such” (Fanon 1964:39). What reveals itself in myriad ways is more of a dissimulated Diaspora where, dispositions,
attitudes, expressions and behavioral ways are specifically re-shaped in order to be recognized by the popularized dominant culture. But, dissimulation requires experiential knowledge. It requires an inter-intra cultural understanding of the lived social.

Aptly, Fanon refers to this particular experiential knowledge as “technical knowledge” (Fanon 1964). What we have with this everyday technical knowledge or as (Hook, 2006) notes, the pre-discursive, is in a sense a form of purposive reasoning that always already has its mode of orientation steeped within Indigeneity. It is more a mode of orientation whereby the governing locus emerges through plantation origins, which to me constitutes liminality, in that, plantation life provides for the Diaspora that consciousness, that spirit if you will, that cannot readily be felt or let us say be experienced by the dominant culture. If one of the problems coming out here is the capacity to communicate, then we ought to remember, as Fanon reminds us, that well sketched within the Diaspora is this “historical racial schema” (Fanon 1967:111), a schema which comes to codify and let us say govern communicative and Diasporic interactions. If we were for the moment to think of the Diaspora as this “racial epidermal schema” then of concern here is the way in which the Diasporic body becomes a site of cultural exchange, through which communicative practices are informed by a particular mode of reasoning, whereby one’s understanding of culture becomes a technical knowledge (Fanon 1964). There is a question of surveillance here, where the saliency of hue becomes the crucible for embodied knowledge and makes possible for a re-inscribed self-regulating way of knowing for the Diasporic body. This way of knowing is not to be confused with that of having epistemological authority (Dei 2008c). It is more an epistemic salience (Dei 2005) where “centrality is given to minoritized peoples’ multiple
perspectives on the issues of race, social justice and oppression” (p. 13). As the Diaspora continues the never ending quest for the better life in the West, and as this Diasporic life becomes more and more entrenched with the push and pull of colonial positioning, with the push and pull of Euromodernity, communicative strategies then become very important. Indigenous peoples speak about the urgent need for “survival, recovery, development and self-determination” (Smith 1999). But how is it that the Diaspora takes up these moments? Is it through a process of assimilation? And, if one were to assimilate with the governing culture, to what extent is this integrative process a procedure of deracialization? What does it mean to say as a communicative pragmatic, the Diaspora, to some extent, has strategically de-raced language? To have self-determination, recovery, survival, and development be all governed in and through this particular deracialization process, allows for totalizing deculturalized relations. Assimilation accords integration in a particular way that obtains in a sense a permanent dismissal of Diasporic culture. If we are talking about integration then we ought to ask on whose terms. For how, then, does the public sphere of Euromodernity integrate itself with Diasporic communities and take up its multiple centers? To speak of the integration of multiple public spheres, multiple communities, multiple centers, is to be open to interactions of cultural difference. Problems pop up when these interactions come to exist through a one way, fixed direction, whereby the compass becomes navigated through this universalized homogeneous scripting of Euromodernity. The economic outcome is real here for the Diaspora, resulting in assimilation becoming more and more the Diasporic companion. But what ought to take up more than a companion-like position to Diasporic relationships is the experience of decolonization. In fact, if we remember that the colonial is not only
foreign imposition but also as imposed from local positions (Dei 2000; Dei & Kempf 2006), we can then begin to discuss decolonization for all, rather than for a particular body that has its genealogy located within the colonized experience. With decolonization, Diasporic peoples can work with embodied ways of knowing. Diasporic peoples can work with the pre-discursive, with that experiential knowledge fecund through local cultural resources. Importantly here, the Diasporic body ought to be centered within its experience rather than being determined through some tangential existence. But what does it mean for Caribbean Diaspora to work with memories of local Indigenous histories?

**Modernity, Diasporic Diction, Lactification, and the Embodiment of Cultural Currency: What does it mean for Diasporic Peoples to have a Sense of National Consciousness?**

While in France, Fanon’s Diasporic experience was influenced by the Negritude movement, which allowed him to think of “the fact of blackness” more as a cultural Indigenous resource than as some abject source. Leopold Senghor (2001) invites us to not only think of Negritude as a form of humanism, but also to think of the humanism of Negritude, in relation to the humanism as engendered through Euromodernity. He tells us that Negritude is “a will to return into oneself, that it is a will to take on the values of the black world, to live them oneself, that one has to make descent into a series of negation to retrieve the meaning of blackness, that Negritude is a humanism with a universal scope” (Senghor 2001). But this humanism with a universal scope, I think, ought to be queried. Giddens (1990) asks us to think about modernity “beyond an epoch or an era, to think of modernity as an attitude, as a mode of organizing the social that
emerged in Europe, to think then of modernity as a set of political/institutional/
economical/cultural/social processes located at a certain point in the development of
Europe that universalized its way of knowing, as knowledge for all” (Giddens 1990,
1991). To some extent then, we are all historically determined through modernity. So
when Senghor (2001) speaks of a humanism with a universal scope, I think too that this
universality was always already discursively encoded through Eurocentric ways of
knowing, and it is this universal that provided the conditions of possibility and at the
same time the limitations for the Negritude movement. Foucault reminds us of a certain
humanism as revealed through Euromodernity which was preoccupied with a set of
themes, and as preserving by particular values, that was prominent in European societies
(Foucault 2007: 111). Some of these themes were racism, masculinity/femininity,
sexuality, whiteness, violence, aesthetics, ableism and religion. One of these themes that
Fanon confronted was racism. A theme, in effect, that legitimized whiteness as a
Eurocentric aesthetic body of knowledge, and as being the only material means to
humanism. A theme, in fact, Negritude left well in place. So in a sense then, Negritude
as a form of humanism was always already ethically and morally constituted through the
values of the cultural register of Euromodernity. Fanon, in wanting the wretched of the
death to extricate themselves from blackness, moved beyond the movement of Negritude.
Fanon troubled the humanism of Negritude, and in doing so he centered the white-black
dialectic. That is, he asserted the location of his blackness in relation to white, that black
was constructed in relation to white, as the abject, as that of negation. Fanon notes:

The dialectic that brings necessity into the foundation of my freedom drives me
out of myself. It shatters my unreflected position. Still in terms of consciousness,
black consciousness is immanent in its own eyes. I am not a potentiality of
something, I am wholly what I am. I do not have to look for the universal. No
probability has any place inside me. My Negro consciousness does not hold itself out as a lack. It is. It is its own follower (Fanon 1967: 135).

At the same time, Fanon challenged modernity as this Eurocentric body of knowledge, which determines this singular mode of humanism. Fanon proceeded to counter the “epistemic salience” (Dei 2005) of modernity, by coming to understand how black bodies make meaning of their lived experience in a white colonial public sphere. At the same time challenging the domain of white colonial, which in of itself is an anti-colonial politic, point of departure from the movement of Negritude. Fanon seemed not to be convinced that Negritude was working to counter modernity as a master narrative, but more so, that Negritude thought through Euro-paradigms to retrieve and shape its cultural histories. This is not so to say in a totalizing way we ought to dismiss the project of Negritude, no. In fact, Sartre is correct when he speaks not of Negritude as anti-racist racism, but of Negritude being as a “dialectical progressive” (Sartre 2001: 137). The question coming out here then is: to what extent did Negritude challenge or leave modernity intact as a form of humanism? Or to what extent did Negritude bring ontological security (Giddens 1991: 36; 1990: 92), to ‘blackness’?

With the colonization of time the question of modernity has been bursting. Be it a particular period, a particular epoch, be it the way of organizing life and the ensuing behavioral expressions, desires and anxieties, be it the classification of the social. We ought to remember the historical trajectory of modernity, wherein the interests concern themselves with a particular humanity. More so, we ought to think through how this humanism has come to be universalized as a mode of knowing in our everyday life. Familiarity with this text of modernity has governed contemporary spaces, becoming in a sense, one’s tacit go-to socio-cultural register. Navigating through these complex and yet
sophisticated contours of public sphere life could be come quite challenging for Diasporic peoples. Given this text of modernity, what does it mean then for Diasporic peoples to work with a sense of national consciousness? Some have argued for a cultural supermarket, that we live in a multicultural society, where we can participate in the myriad spaces that culture offers. Choice more often comes through this selective process of understanding through embodied experiences. The cultural supermarket becomes the spatio-temporal meeting point whereby expressions, behavioral ways and modes of thinking come to be socially organized at the site of the body. The body comes to be inscribed in and through what Fanon calls the “historical racial schema” (Fanon 1967: 111). The challenge here is to understand how the Diasporic body comes to be discursively scripted and simultaneously becomes the occasion for the “corporeal malediction” (Fanon 1967:111). That is, how do these socio-historical discursivities of the “corporeal schema” mould the perceptions of Diasporic spaces? How do Diasporic spaces come to be preconditioned with the interpretive faculties to make meaning of the embodiment of cultural currency? What then are some of the desires that are formed through this understanding? If we are thinking about the embodiment of cultural currency and the ensuing attitudes within Diasporic spaces, then we ought to talk about the “manicheism delirium” (Fanon 1967: 183). Firstly where does this cultural currency (Bourdieu 1991) reside as distinctive of its embodiment? What constitutes this cultural currency? How does the Diaspora come to know this material good of race? What are some of the socio-historic discourses that come to form this knowledge of cultural currency? And what about this thing of a Diasporic spirit? How does this Diasporic spirit
come to be fecund? What is the condition of the Diasporic spirit as it comes to be
determined through these communicatives exchanges?

As society becomes more and more bound through Diasporic difference, and as
the determinants of modernity work to re-codify social categories, public sphere now
quickly adapts itself by re-configuring its mode of orientation, difference that is, to the
tune of Euro-modernity. So, how is it then, that Diasporic difference learns to adapt or to
what extent is Diasporic difference equipped for the challenges of the public sphere as
governed through a Euro modernity mode of orientation? Is it through as Itwaru (1994)
speaks about, an imitative intellectuality? In a sense then, this experience begs the
question of the quality of humanism within the Diaspora. Concerning the quality of
humanism, Sylvia Wynter on reading Fanon, poses seemingly simple questions: “What it
is like to be human? and What it is like to be black?” (Wynter 2001: 31). We ought to
note too, that there are different modes of the lived experience of blackness, as it
circumscribes and forms constitutive elements within the constellation of the Diasporic
difference. That immanent to the “lived experience of blackness” there is the sense of the
liminal other (Wynter 2001: 57, 58), more of an anachronistic consciousness within
Diasporic difference. For the lived experience of blackness to come into a particular
humanism, to engage with “what it is like to be human”, the socializing process as
determined through the Diaspora, takes up different modes of organizing itself. Let us
take for instance language and the way perceptions, desire, fantasy, behavioral patterns,
culture, communicative exchanges are shaped through this medium. For the Caribbean
Diaspora, language is always already the moment of engaging with the liminality of the
‘self/other’ (Fanon 1967: 17: Wynter 2001: 57, 58). It is a moment of exchange whereby
Diasporic diction comes to be an appreciated/depreciated material good in which abject hue constitutes its historical base. Be it to strategically distance subjectivity from Diasporic encodings, or be it to resist the dominant culture, or be it to assimilate/integrate with the dominant encodings of the Western public sphere, Diasporic diction come into being through moments of selective performative practices. These selective practices come to circumscribe a certain experience of the peoples of the Diaspora, which Fanon amplifies when he speaks about:

Every colonized people—in other words, every people in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of its local cultural originality—finds itself face to face with the language of the civilizing nation; that is, with the culture of the mother country. The colonized is elevated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country’s cultural standards. He becomes whiter as he renounces his blackness, his jungle (Fanon 1967: 18).

So, if we were to take language for example, where the idealized language of the colonizer comes to form itself as the imperial sacrosanct, as being the language of the colonized, and to say that within the archipelago known as the Caribbean there exists a particular way in which difference is situated on the diction or, if I can say on the ‘vernacular’. To what extent then through language, does the Diaspora come to “lactify” its communicative practices? In fact, for the most part, Diasporic exchanges come to lactify itself, in order to present a manner that is non inchoate. What I am concerned with, is how language, that is, Diasporic diction as a lactifying procedures, come to form itself as an archetype humanism. I am interested in how the Diaspora comes to understand the moment of recognition in which lactifying procedures ought to be taken up in order to meaningfully socialize. I am interested in the different moments, or, different pictures where, as Fanon tells us, of talking like a book or scorning the dialect (Fanon 1967: 21),
come to be revealed. I want to better understand how Diasporic lactifying performatives becomes a disciplinary way of life, a humanism in of itself, how this performative comes to embody Diasporic culture, how this performative comes to be the identity for bodies of difference. I am thinking about the inter/intra socializing processes, that of, the communicative exchange between the Diaspora and Euromodernity and at the same time communicative exchanges through bodies of difference as it contains and confines itself to the geography of its Diasporic constellation. To what extent is this socializing behavior constituted through a “neurotic orientation” (Fanon 1967: 60). Is the diction of the Diaspora as lactified and as the performative formation of identity an expression of what Fanon calls, *manicheism delirium* (Fanon 1967:183). What I am left thinking about is the way in which the Caribbean Diaspora work with language as a communicative pragmatic, to cogently engage with the public sphere of Euro-modernity. To note then how this language of the Caribbean Diaspora, this language immanent to plantation life has its alterity as tangential to the paradigms of Euro-modernity?

With its rhythms reverberating through colonized territories, Diasporic citizenry and the co-present protean, come to take up this sense of a historic belonging within the framework of nation-state. Yet, to strategically engage with this sense of belonging calls for selected communicative practices, selected communicative practices that ought to have the capacity to dialogue with this naturalized universal way of reasoning. If, then, these communicative practices are selected, how does the Diasporic subject come to understand what knowledge come into play with this selection process? How, then do Caribbean Diasporic peoples make meaning of their lived experience in the Western public sphere?" So if this sense of nationalism that one takes up as his or her own is
entrenched colonially to subhuman status, what Fanon would call “epidermal regions of inferiority”, is it then to dismiss, or maybe perhaps to rename all colonial categories? Is this part and parcel of the decolonizing project? How would this renaming project shape or rupture the Caribbean experience? Given cultural difference, given cultural heterogeneity, what does it mean for the Diaspora in an Indigenous way to have a sense of national consciousness? Would it make for possible different discursive contours of the Diasporic body? Is it that the Diaspora, in a totalizing way, as it emerged through the reservoir of plantation life, as it comes to exist, constituted through ‘blackness,’ as Euro-modernity’s ‘other’? Fanon tells us, “alterity for the black man is not the black but the white man” (Fanon 1967: 97), that “the black soul is a white man’s artifact” (Fanon 1967: 14), that “it is not I (the black body) who make meaning for myself, but it is the meaning that was already there, pre-existing waiting for me (Fanon 1967: 134), that “I am overdetermined from without. I am the slave not of the “idea” that others have of me but of my own appearance” (Fanon 1967: 116). The experience of the particular ‘body’ that comes through the Caribbean Diaspora, to have to wittingly or unwittingly perform acts of ‘denegryfication’ (Fanon 1967:111) is real. We cannot discount the moments when the Caribbean Diaspora comes to recognize its “Negritude”. We cannot help but notice how the language of the Caribbean has come to exist through the ontological alienation of Diasporic peoples. If as wa Thiong’o (1993) mentions, language is this crucible for culture, that language in of itself is Indigenous to identity.

The language of the Diaspora comes to be experienced as the embodiment of its own alienation. It is not as simple to take up Fanon’s ways, that is, to “extricate ourselves” or to rid ourselves of this Indigenous way of knowing, from Indigenous way
of communicating. To turn a new leaf and pick up some new found way to enunciate is to rid oneself of particular histories, is to rid oneself of insulating memories. But with the myriad permutations and arrangements of culture, it is not to say the Diaspora ought not to work with different cultural practices, such as language, food, religion, or dance. But to willingly disengage from Indigenous ways in order to communicate, that is, to strategically practice a way of life as distinct from one’s Indigeneity, to interact in a totalizing way through practices which, unilaterally converge to historical and contemporary dominant paradigms of Euro-modernity, is to engage in what I am thinking of, as *epidermal displacement practices*. It is to engage in particular practices where one’s local Indigenous socio-cultural ways of coming to understand becomes silenced and it is this silence that comes to write the history of Diasporic possibilities. It is this silence that provides a platform of meaning for Diasporic experiences. If silence then becomes one of the possible modes to organize relations between the Diaspora and public sphere of Euromodernity, how does the Diaspora come to interface with itself? How do Diasporic communities come to organize themselves, considering the inter-intra relations of cultural difference? By what means do Diasporic bodies as “epistemologically limited” (Gordon 1995) through its embodied alienation, engage Diasporic spaces by being cognizant of the proximity and distancing from its historic-cultural artifacts? How does the Diaspora come to understand the experience of the lived public, when spaces as the “town hall, institutions, school administration offices, the school, sports arenas, administrative places come to be strategic places of alienation” (Glissant 1999: 36)?

What I am hoping to come out of this conversation is for us to bring to the surface the every day or taken-for-granted embodied ‘Truth’ that organizes
communicative principles of colonial modernity. Whether it be the morals of colonialism, or colonial logic, how is this mantra taken up as one’s own and, at the same time, works to position the abject black? If, as Fanon requests, we were to de-ontologize the lived ‘black’, then, as a starting point, we can introduce colonial historic specificities. I am more concerned here with colonial constituents, some of which are the temporal, space, violence, anachronism, dialectic of hue, racism, geographies, civilization, Euro-intelligentsia and plantation life. Notably, there is a danger here in discarding these constituents as relic, as some irrelevant distant artifact. Instead maybe we ought to think about how these constituents come to be re-shaped, and re-organize and regulate our present day social. So as our daily conversations become mediated through these colonial constituents we can begin to wonder how certain knowledges come to be centered within different socio-cultural sites. We can come to understand what embodied knowledge is selected as a communicative procedure to form some sort of working harmonious union. Be it a performative procedure or not, the Diasporic subject wittingly or unwittingly makes meaning through integrating viable ‘Truth’ systems. It is not necessarily, in the Fanon sense, that the Diasporic subject is undergoing an “inferiority complex.” Rather, I think it is more about having a working understanding of the socio-economic-cultural register of modernity and how it plays out in time and space; that is, the consequences of practicing a certain reading of the body at particular social sites.

**Conclusion**

With this discussion I hoped to have enhanced the potentiality for schooling and education by articulating the way in which Diasporised subjects come to internalize racism. I wanted to think through certain sites that operationalized the centre of Fanon’s
colonial experience, such as race, hue, abjection, culture and alienation. My learning objective was to bring awareness to certain discontinuities, in particular, how abject blackness as embodied, self-regulates different Diasporic spaces. I wanted to accord cognition to Diasporic socio-historical conditions. With the hope of transforming our social reality, I wanted us to come to be critically reflexive about our experiences, in order to think about some pragmatic communicative possibilities relevant for schooling and education. In doing so, I think it is pertinent we continue to remind ourselves that this embodied alienation we are speaking about, has its mode of orientation well rooted within the interstices and aesthetics of the colonial index. As Fanon reminds us, we have a Diasporic subject then experiencing alienation of the body from within. We also have a subject here that experiences alienation from historic ways of knowing, from customs, from values, from habitual practices. I am also concerned about the ahistoric ways of coming to know Diasporic subjectivity. Be it that the subject comes to make sense of its social field as Fanon framed, through lactification practices, or be it a subject imbued as (Du Bois 1989) mentions, through the “eyes of the other,” or be it a subject experiencing what (Asante 2007) calls a “tortured consciousness” that results in the body being “magnetized by white privilege”. There is, in a sense, an incommensurable loss (Butler 1997; Oliver 2004) being experienced here. I am more interested in how this sense of an incommensurable loss (Butler 1997; Oliver 2004), comes to seduce the Diasporic subject through a mode of thinking which brings a self-regulating surveillance on the body which materializes itself in the production of a particular transnational subject. I am left here contemplating, how does this incommensurable loss endow the socialization process where the Diasporized subject has to integrate different socio-cognitive interests to form
cogent communicative strategies of the lived social, as organized through the
classificatory system of Euro-modernity? So if we were to talk about the Caribbean
Diaspora, if we were to speak about Diasporic intersubjectivity and Caribbean identity,
then we must speak about the link with colonial alienation (Sartre 2001; Oliver 2004).
We must remember, that as a starting point and as (Gordon 1995) reminds us, “ontology
must be suspended” (Gordon 1995:14), that the Caribbean Diaspora, experiences
“absolute ontological rigidity” (Gordon 1995: 43).

What, then, are some of the pedagogical properties of this “absolute ontological
rigidity,” which circumscribe the everyday Diasporic experience? Is this absolute
ontological rigidity race? How do we decolonize beyond the text, this illiberal
ontological rigidity of the Diaspora? What are the ways in which this absolute
ontological rigidity becomes constituted through Indigeneity? How does Fanon’s colonial
experience diverge and converge with the contemporary Diasporic experience? By way
of decolonizing pedagogies, what does Fanon offer us to subvert the homogeneity of
Euromodernity’s humanism? If we were to think of lactification as it is reified through
time and space, what does it mean for the body of difference to lactify beyond the
epidermal schema? What does it mean for everyday sites of interaction, from the choice
of food, to the way one speaks, to the conversation on religion that is tacitly encoded
through bodies of distinct geographies, to the choice of clothes, to schooling and
education, to the institutions of work, to be aesthetically and epistemologically oriented
to the humanism of Euromodernity? What are the unfreedoms for the Diaspora when this
humanism of Euromodernity becomes the only way out for bodies of difference? In the
search for a different humanism, Fanon pushes us to think of the ontological
underpinnings of our experience. Fanon leaves us pondering the form and nature of our reality: the protean elements concerning race, class, gender, sexuality, ableism, religion, which mold and shape our existence. More so, we are left thinking about the underlying bodies of knowledge that worked to conceptualize our participatory form of humanism.

We are left contemplating the ethical and moral implications of socializing through particular communicative practices. Frantz Fanon’s reading of the lived experience of blackness provides us with possible decolonizing pedagogies to understand different Diasporic experiences. Moreover, Fanon gives us the means to understand local colonial encounters and compels us to unconditionally question the colonial archetype and the immanent humanism.

In the following chapter I am interested in the experiences of the Diasporic body and questions of identity, as they come to be shaped through the unfreedoms of Euromodernity. In doing so I write through some of my personal journeys to bring to the surface the variant cultural formations embedded within the myriad Diaspric experience.
CHAPTER SIX: THE RACE TO MODERNITY: UNDERSTANDING CULTURE THROUGH THE DIASPORA AND THE SURVEILLANCE OF DIFFERENCE

Introduction

In the much popularized postmodern context, race has often been framed as complex, sophisticated, and shifting, making way for the discursive ground of culture, ethnicity, and Diaspora. Needless to say, within the present globalized transnational epoch, one is faced with different questions concerning Diasporic identity (Hall 2005; 2007a; 2007b). Yet race, culture, ethnicity, identity are not distinct moments. Rather they come to be discursively constituted, working in some protean way to form these different transnational identities. What I am interested in is the experience of the Diasporic body concerning these contemporary questions of identity, as they come to be historically shaped through the social conjunctures of the many cultural formations of modernity.

I begin at March/11/2008, Glossop Road, Sheffield, England. It was the designated reading week for most graduate schools here in Ontario. I had the opportunity to listen to a thesis defense at one of the academic institutions in Sheffield. But while in Sheffield, what got my attention was the popular debate in the mass media public sphere (Habermas 1991; Appadurai 1996; Fraser1992; Brantlinger 1990). From newspapers to television, what was shoved in my face was the question of Britishness. Some of the headlines were, “What does it mean to be British? Is allegiance to the Queen enough to be British? And is Britishness, Englishness?” I was a bit taken aback by these conversations, in particular the way in which the question of citizenry, and what constitutes the authentic citizen were still troubling ingredients for public sphere talk.
The conversations I felt were, in some collective way, hooked on some fixed category of identity. In fact, what was being invoked into these mass media debates was how to inject more Britishness into Britain. Much of the debate was centered on the question of: In this globalised society how do we begin to think of what it means to be British? And is pledging allegiance to the Queen and country sufficient to produce citizenry? But for me, concerning here from Glossop Road, is the question of Diasporic citizenry, insofar as how this particular form of humanism, comes to be constituted in the interest of nation-state, through the surveillance of mass media public sphere (Shapiro 2005; Gilliom 2005; Brantlinger 1990). My interest lies in the way in which cultural conditions form and reform itself through the governance of what I call Enlightened subjectivities. I am querying how this newly everyday Diasporic citizenry rewrites the cosmopolitan through these colonially imbued Enlightened subjectivities (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002).

From Glossop Road, I was experiencing Diasporic citizenry not to say forming itself as some new counterpublic (Dawson 1995; Gregory 1995), but Diasporic citizenry being located in a way whereby one had to conform or adapt to the particular historic colonial conditions of citizenry. So from the get-go the Diasporic body was always already presupposed as being outside the realm of what it means to be a British citizen within the Euro-Anglo context. More so too, there was a particular push and pull activity happening. I articulate this moment as being the turbulence formed when the primacy of cultural knowledges, as an ontological raw resource of the African Diaspora, interacts with the cultural register of modernity (Foster 2007; Everett 1995), allowing for a shift and at the same time stabilizing these inherently pure, singular categories of let us say British, English or Canadian. For me, Glossop Road reminded me of some of the tensions
of communicating in our everyday lived social. Glossop Road reminded me of ways in which racialised bodies come to be discursively positioned and interpreted in conversations. Glossop Road moved me to think about how one’s daily living comes to be nuanced, through some of these historic-colonial narratives. What Glossop Road did, was really to push me to think about what it means to communicate in a public space with multiple historic specificities or multiple modernities (Habermas 1998), Glossop Road pushed me to think about the way in which difference comes to organize around, a particular fixed singular triumphed form of origin, while at the same time being grounded to a certain historical primacy. Britishness then, in a sense, as circumscribed through the colonial scripting of the body coalesces with emerging Diasporic modernities. Central to this debate concerning Britishness, is pondering whether to include or not to include, to defend or not to defend, the colonial will of British modernity.

**Theorizing Culture, Diaspora and Knowledge Formation**

My experiences at Glossop Road speak not only to how Diasporic bodies and Diasporic geographies come to be encoded and textualized but also the aestheticization of these cartographies that produced what Fanon calls the ‘epidermalization of inferiority’, (Fanon 1967:11), a culturally inscribed schema, which operationalizes scaffold imbued relations onto society. So we have relations being formed where culture now becomes starting points for conversations. wa Thiongo (1993) tells us that “culture carries the values, ethical, moral and aesthetic by which people conceptualize or see themselves and their place in history and the universe, that these values are the basis of a society’s consciousness and outlook” (p. 77), that culture “is a product of peoples’ history. But it also reflects that history and embodies a whole set of values by which a people view
themselves and their place in time and space” (p. 42), that culture develops within the process of a people wrestling with their natural and social environment (p.27). Diasporic culture, then, as formed through these particular knowledges, and as posited in overdeveloped countries, cites itself in ways whereby it is always speaking in relation to colonial narratives of the past and present alike. I say past and present for there is this ongoing re-shaping and re-writing of historic colonial narratives as experienced through the Diaspora. But what is this re-shaping and re-writing of colonial narratives by Diasporic peoples? Is it not the capacity for Diasporic peoples to experience other ways of knowing, other values, customs, practices, and knowingly or unknowingly participate in its everydayness? More so, experiential knowledge taken up as one’s own by the Diasporic body, might be taken up in a synchronic way, as in the now, disconnected from histories, time, and space. Or, in another context, some of the experiences of Diasporic bodies might be taken up with the conscious knowing of colonial histories. For, although culture can be understood through space and time, we still experience culture through its embodiment. Bodies, therefore, do not operate in vacuums. They form relations as compartmentalized or bound. Culture, has the capacity to traverse through these once impermeable membranes.

Incommensurable as it were, culture is very much dependent on the body, which has caused all sorts of problems for contemporary debates concerning citizenry. Diasporic culture as it reveals itself through bodies of difference, come to converge and diverge at different moments, such that the identity of the Diasporic subject is revealed and marked in ways where meaning and experience are understood through this omnipresent historic colonial narrative. Grand and ontologised as it were, and
popularized through the chosen image, the Diasporic-body is invited to participate in certain spaces through spontaneous performances in order to strategically maneuver nation-state imperatives, imperatives that give guidelines on how race, gender, space and time ought to be engaged (Goldberg 2002; Balibar 2002; Dei 2006; Collins 2000; Wane 2007). Time here, however, accompanies itself with this cultural register of modernity (Habermas 1998), which continuously updates itself with particular currencies on the re-marked Diasporic subject. Importantly then, for the Diasporic body as located in the contemporary West, is identifying marked spaces where the colonial aesthetic comes to reside, that is, being cognizant of the dominant encoded currency within one’s governing social space. The Diasporic body becomes encoded in a way that accords mobility through the myriad inter-intra cultural relations. Difference in a sense then, forms de-symmetric relations operating tangentially to these colonially inscribed meanings as popularized by mass media. Fluid, dynamic, transformative as it were, culture though spatial, comes to be represented through the Diasporic subject. Culture has these transformative and mutable components, resulting in the ever-transcendental Diasporic identity. Transcendental as they may be, identities are neither separated nor fixed to particular historical domains. Difference-sameness of culture, at times, is more so negotiating, or being cognizant of each other’s anachronistic spatio-temporal (see also Horkheimer & Adorno 2002:20), that is, those moments of coming to recognize or placing the different geographies of historical mannerisms and expressions on one’s cultural register. So as difference emerges through multiple historical domains, the Diasporic body then comes into a social reality, where continuously, meaning as constituted through difference, transforms itself in ways that there is no fixed historical
locus. But Diasporic bodies are not without histories. There is always already some lineage to a particular time, space and geography. On the same note, it is not that these histories are bringing a fixed homogenous reading onto the Diasporic body, for within these histories, heterogeneity is very much central to the experiences of the Diasporic subject. What we are left with is that culture now, has slowly shifted from the manner in which it were accorded currency through the Enlightenment knowledge of modernity (Horkheimer & Adorno 2002; Foucault 2007), not that it has disengaged with the prototypical colonial production, but it is this colonial that has re-shaped and re-formed itself in order to be congruent with the neo-colonial/globalized particularities of our cultural present.

**Ethnicity and Questions Concerning the Cultural Resources of the Diaspora**

Here in Canada, assumption of citizenship entails a pledge of allegiance to the Queen of England, of the British Empire. Canadianess has become a major terminal for Diasporic communities to take up the designated position of Enlightenment. But taking up the oath of allegiance has its own complicity. What does it mean for one to have come from a land that has been historically colonized, to a space where one is in a position to benefit from nation-state violence, that is, how does one negotiate these unfreedoms, that of citizenry, nation-state and Diasporic subjectivity? (Hall 2007b; Wynter 2001; Walcott 2003; McKittrick 2006; Manette 2000; Davis 2004; Bannerji 2000; Thobani 2007; Razack 2004). So if Diasporic subjectivities come to culminate with proximity to modernity’s Enlightened subject, what does it say then for the African Diasporic community that has been historically determined through colonialism? How does the Diasporic subject that emerged from a colonized geography, one placed within the heart
of the supposed Enlightened space, work with these debasing histories as a raw resource?

In that, immanent to Diasporic movement, movement that ought to supposedly bring this *better* way of life, there is existing a particular performance by racialized bodies, one that attaches itself to modernity and simultaneous distances itself from those spaces assigned as less-than to racialized bodies. This lived experience of racialized peoples as determined through colonially inscribed sub-human categories and spaces has become the omnipresent reminder for African Diasporic consciousness, the omnipresent determinant for post-human relations (Weheliye 2002). In a sense then, Diasporic bodies always already have to be constantly glancing back to make sure the sub-human does not catch up or is not too close. But even with this glance back by Diasporic bodies to confirm progress is to understand that this sub-human distancing is part and parcel of the post-human. The question of injecting more Britishness into the British, in a sense though, is really an act of coming up with different ways to inculcate this Enlightened humanism. How Britishness is taken up in the public sphere, is as if, collectively by nature’s plan we had a shared understanding of what is *authentic* Britishness. So then, if for now we can think of Britishness as historically determined through particular knowledges, State formation and legitimized violence we can begin to problematize this singular pure authentic origin of Britishness. We can also push back with questions concerning how Britishness comes to be marked through the African Diaspora.

Yet, within our governing epoch, ethnicity has come to be discursively deployed in a way that works to situate, and at the same time, stabilize Diasporic bodies through particular historical conjunctures. What then does it mean to talk about British as being ethnic? If then, from the racialized ‘Other’ to the black spatio-temporal, one is forever
ethnic, what then are the constitutive determinants of ethnicity? Let us for the moment think through the discourse of Canadianess to understand the loci of particular bodies. To think about what it means to be Canadian in the context of nation-state, Diaspora and transnationalism (Walcott 2003; Appadurai: 1996; Bannerji 2000; Davis 2007; Thobani 2007), is to think about the historical social formations and the ensuing trope of Canadianism as contextualized through the interstices of ethnicity. Where then are the spaces for black Diaspora, spaces that have come to be written out of the institutionalized text? What I am struggling with is the manner in which the discourse of difference and at the same time the discourse of ethnicity comes to be invoked within the civic sphere of public life. From the dominant location, from State to media, ethnicity extends across the horizon of the racialized ‘Other’ to those outside the construct of Britishness (Hall 2007a). But within black geographies there is talk about ethnicity from the dominant position, but also within blackness there is talk about difference from within, which I think at times, could be troubling. There is a particular danger we need to tease out, in that, historically, alterity as a material good, as embedded through time, through particular social categories, worked to organize the conditions for colonial relations. In the contemporary setting of the West, these colonial relations very much languish in everyday conversations concerning identity, difference and ‘Other’. As these conversations come to be discursively framed and represented through particular media images and different locations of ethnicity, there exists this localized mobility within the discursive terrain of the racialized ‘Other’. Let us for the moment think about blackness as homogenously conceptualized through hegemonic relations of Canadianess, let us for the moment think about blackness as a fixed reducing reading on a particular body that
has been rooted historically to colonization, that this reading becomes the conditions of
existence, that this reading becomes the conditions of limitations and possibilities for the
body. We also need to talk about the body as geography, to consider how the archipelago
that we come to know as the Caribbean, comes to be determined through different bodies
lumped as the ‘Other.’ What are the implications for the Diasporic body as located in the
Caribbean and as being co-determined through this historical collective conjuncture of
ethnicity? The question of blackness has discursively moved itself from the Negro of
plantation life, to the contemporary people of color, to the politically correct racialized
minoritised, the African Canadian, the African American and black British. Inserting self
into the ethnic terrain is the brown discursive, becoming particularly vibrant within the
North American context, though for the most part in Britain, the black discursive has
historically engulfed the body of the ‘Other’, be it Asian, South-Asian, African or
Moslem. Given then the collective histories that are spatially steeped in colonialism and
shared dialogues of resistance, what is the experience of resistance when, let us say, in
the context of the West, the mobilization of racialized peoples comes through particular
moments, such that these shared moments of colonial histories separate itself as distinct
or singular moments within the classification of the ‘Other’? What then are the
consequences for the different voices of the oppressed when the politics of identification,
the politics of ethnicity work to dissipate the collective voice of shared colonial histories?
How might we speak about ethnicity, difference and culture, and not dilute the
responsibility of speaking about racism (Dei 2009; hooks 1992; Opini and Wane 2007)?
At the same time, we need to speak about ethnic difference beyond the racialised ‘Other’,
to include the dominant body as ethnic, to ask new questions concerning power and
privilege (Hall 2000; Said 1994, 1979; Bhabha 1994). Ultimately, these questions reside along the lines of citizenry, nation-state representation and the contingencies of globalisation.

**Mass Media Surveillance of the Diaspora**

Concerning the flotsam of modernity, the question that continues itself here is how do we dialogue with each other and come to understand different ways of knowing in order to move beyond tolerance or a practiced partitioned form of respect? Yet as the African Diaspora move towards emancipating its public sphere realities (Everett 2002; Gregory 1995), communicating calls for the ability to read the governing domain of statements, that is, the mutable yet fixed regulating group of statements that circumscribe the body. So understanding space here is important, for it is not as if these bodies come to know themselves or come to form relations in a vacuum. Public sphere has this temporality of socio-historic specific constituents that come to mark identity, that come to give one’s way of knowing, that is, our communicating capacities thrust and direction. Be it Britishness or Canadianess, I think African Diasporic communities are surveilled (Shapario 2005; Gilliom 2005), not only from the State, but also by oneself, and from within local and global communities.

The glance back by the Diasporic body allows one to be aware of the previous sub-human experience, an awareness that culminates in this constant inventory check on life structures from earlier historical settings. So the aligning and distancing of each other within the African Diaspora comes to be nuanced in ways which might not necessarily fragment Diasporic communities in a sum totalizing way because, yes, there exists heterogeneity, that the Diaspora is constituted through different bodies, different
identities, different experiences, that the Diaspora is constituted through difference. What I am arguing for however, is that if we are talking about the African Diaspora, then we ought to acknowledge shared histories of enslavement and a particular shared racial experience, so this is not some prescription for some homogenous or fixed experience, but more so I am saying that the aligning and distancing which situate itself through Diasporic exchanges work to bring a particular tangentiality within local Diasporic relations. But it seems to me, as I locate myself as a body of the Diaspora, that this knowledge production through the everyday surveillance of that which comes to be designated as sub-humanism, that the particular way in which this knowledge comes to govern the lived Diasporic experience, helps to mark spaces of freedom and unfreedom for Diasporic peoples. What happens here, is that the discursive project of modernity is propertized by local Diasporic communities, be it intentional or not. When Diasporic bodies come to distance or align themselves with each other, this interaction works to re-write the discourse of what it means to be this Enlightened subject. For me, it seems like I can never extricate myself from the Fanon question: How do we extricate ourselves? (Fanon 1967: 10)

Yet with the need for Diasporic peoples to constantly glance back, is not only about Diasporic peoples attempting to stay ahead of plantation life. I think it is also about the everyday question of what to retrieve from the past. It is the sense of how one’s daily Diasporic journey comes into some sort of dialogue with this omnipresent flotsam of plantation life, that is, being conversant with cultural artifacts and expressions as a particularized way of life and as historically determined through plantation procedures. What comes up here is the question of what does plantation life reveal itself as today in
this Diasporic contemporary, where the gradation of disenfranchisement has reconfigured itself within contemporary globalized geographies through everyday spaces of freedoms and unfreedoms? Also, as these everyday spaces of freedom and unfreedom come to mark the determining limits of Diasporic social interaction, the challenge here then is in utilizing these same limits to transform the Diasporic self and at the same time not be bound to some historic pre-configuration of the Diasporic body. What I have experienced, in a sense, through remembrance, is this longing for home beyond the physicality of some fixed geographic location. I have had to find ways in which to inscribe my everyday social space, or let us say introduce particular modes, ways of communicating within Diasporic public sphere life (Appadurai 1996), where I can still centre my experiences through which I come to know myself. With this in mind, I am thinking more of enunciation, diction as it emerged from plantation life as an Indigenous sensibility, where I think in a very strategic way, enunciation comes to be a tool for communicating through Diasporic public sphere life, Diasporic life which has been burdened with histories entangled in colonial violence, through the dominant/subordinated coordinates of Enlightenment. But what is this Enlightenment and modernity that so many scholars have dwelled on. Understanding these classifications are a continuous process. One of my interests is trying to understand the experience of the African Diaspora, through the variable social approaches toward modernity as it plays out within the social reality of the Western cosmopolitan. But for the moment I want to think through some of the intertextual experiences concerning modernity and the Enlightenment.
Modernity and the Governance of Enlightened Subjectivities

Foucault talks about the Enlightenment as:

An event, or a set of events and complex historical processes, that is located at a certain point in the development of European societies. As such, it includes elements of social transformation, types of political institutions, forms of knowledge, projects of rationalization of knowledge and practices, technological mutations that are very difficult to sum up in a word ....... (Foucault 2007:111).

He also talks about the attitude of modernity:

Modernity is often spoken of as an epoch, or at least as a set of features characteristic of an epoch; situated on a calendar, it would be preceded by a more or less naïve or archaic premodernity, and followed by an enigmatic and troubling “postmodernity.” And then we ourselves asking whether modernity constitutes the sequel to the Enlightenment and its development, or whether we are to see it as a rupture or a deviation with respect to the basic principles of the eighteenth century (Foucault 2007: 105).

For me, presently the local public sphere is that of Toronto. At the moment it is scripted as cosmopolitan, officially categorized as multicultural by the State. But if Foucault positions the Enlightenment as the “set of events and historical processes located at certain points in the development of European societies,” I then would like to mark these moments to think about formations and transformations of enslavement, Indentureship, plantation life, the archipelago known as the Caribbean and let us say, the historic monstrosity of a relationship formed through Africa, the supposed New World and the Anglo-Euro continents. I am more interested in forms of thinking, that is: How do Diasporic peoples, historically determined through colonialism, come to make sense of their lived reality? I am more interested in how the myriad cultural expressions come to be embodied differently in order to negotiate the newness of Diasporic realities. How is communicating within a Diasporic public sphere vectored through this vestigial memory of colonization (Hall 2007b; Appadurai 1996; Gilroy 1993)? And, how this vestigial
memory of colonization comes to be this ubiquitous signpost of Diasporic freedoms and unfreedoms. It is almost another form of electronic surveillance, instead, more so, the surveillance itself becomes self-regulated in and through the Diasporic subject. What comes out of this relationship? Is this regulation of cultural memory, a type of governance imbued specifically through the Diasporic cultural register? With this Diasporic cultural register, much needed here is familiarity with the cultural discourse in practice within the contemporaneous public sphere life. Only then can one take up a strategic position of communicating. With Diasporic peoples forming strategic positions of communicating, what ought to be understood is, how cultural currency circulates through particular power-knowledge points, that is in an overarching way through race, class, gender, and sexuality and also, how they come to be positioned by particular structures and institutions in framing the popular discourse of public sphere talk. Yet aligning and distancing from Europe and plantation life by Diasporic peoples as a form of resistance and survival is very much real. I mean we could talk about people not being appreciative of their Diasporic Indigenous culture, or thinking their Diasporic culture as less than, that it warrants a shift away from the minoritized cultural space, or we could talk about the recognition by particular groups of their cultural currency and the strategic investments within this cultural space. See, what happens here is that Diasporic culture in a sense, becomes commodified/marketized, and mobilized within this popularized cultural space allowing for what I am calling, communities of compartmentalized solidarity. So if for the moment, we were to think of this public sphere as the property of modernity’s Enlightened subject where difference comes to coalesce through collective histories and shared experiences, we could then understand the way in which plantation
governmentalities (Scott 1995) play out in present day experiences of African Diasporic peoples. We could, more or less, think of the mutability of plantocracy governance within Diasporic public sphere in order to understand how the social transformation of Diasporic bodies comes to organize and mobilize their everyday social reality through the limitations of these same said historically determined plantation governmentalites.

Another interest of mine is to think of modernity through the governing historical process of plantation enslavement in relation to the development of European societies, in particular, the subject formation as located to the geographies of freedom and unfreedom, and also the nuances coming out here with that of nation-state, nationalism and citizenry in this neo-colonial globalized epoch. So, to return to Glossop Road, to the mass media debate over the question of Britishness, I think what was absent from public sphere talk, were the delimiting historical determinants where race formed the constitutive elements of this geography of freedom which we come to know as English. Culture, as it reshapes itself through Diasporic relations, has very much re-written the national discursive. In the past to think of being British, English or Canadian would have conjured Anglo-Euro images. But globalization and the ensuing transnational currents, have shifted the cosmopolitan schema, thereby troubling Euro-modernity nation state discourse. Yet, I am more concerned with the forms of thinking immanent to Diasporic communities when it comes to culture, and how this thinking becomes the raw resource to make meaning and engage public sphere dialogue. So, in returning to Glossop Road, no longer is there this one authentic ‘Truth’ citizenry constituting nation-state. Instead what we have are multiple subjectivities, which in and of themselves, work to contest this nation-state narrative. But how does this play out in a mass media public sphere where what it means
to be British always already ought to propagate the dominant narrative of Euro-modernity? If we think about belonging, then this brings a host of problems for Diasporic communities, for in relation to the historic nation state-discourse, we find a counter-public citizenry discursively forming itself, resulting more so in the transformation of what it means to be British or Canadian.

Yet, implicit in the question of what it means to be British is this homogenous orientation to the cryptic script of nation-state citizenry. To belong, then, for the Diasporic subject, means to take up particular codes as endowed through Euro-modernity and perform them as one’s own. But there is a complexity here for the Diasporic subject, in that, culture and self are continuously transforming. Is not to say that the Diasporic subject can choose cultural closure, for even in this closed state culture has already reshaped itself as governed by that space and time. How then does the Diasporic body come to negotiate with the culture of modernity and simultaneously negotiate with the culture of Diasporic Indigenous history? This is a bit complex here, that is teasing out the intersections and points of departure of these cultural spaces. I think very much here it is important to have a conversation about modernity and the Enlightenment in relation to enslavement, plantation life and Diasporic movement, in a sense, to understand the historical processes which constitute the ‘Other’ as sub-human and at the same time transforming Anglo-Euro geographies into what we come to know as the human. If presupposed to the Diaspora is social transformation, then Diasporic cultural knowledges be it counterpublic or not, ought to inform this debate of Britishness. But the national narrative concerning British citizenry is very much controlled through the nation-state discursive formations (Hall, 2000, 2007a, 2007b). To communicate one’s sense of
citizenry, of what it means to belong to a particular time and place within mass media public sphere, is more so vectored through Anglo-Euro modernity’s discursive search for this subject of Enlightenment. What, then, is the place for Diasporic cultural knowledges in rewriting its own citizenry, on its own terms within the governing mass media public sphere spaces? And how can this counterpublic cultural knowledging work to invoke a sense of the posthuman for Diasporic peoples within contemporary cosmopolitan tropes of nation-state?

If we are thinking social transformation here, then, from a knowledging position Diasporic culture as an important Indigenous resource more or less ruptures modernity’s Enlightenment. So when Foucault asks if “modernity is the sequel to Enlightenment,” as mentioned before, I am understanding this more as part and parcel of each other, as constitutive, as operating in continuum, whereby these Diasporic cultural knowledges bring the much needed, what Foucault calls, “deviations with respect to the basic eighteenth century principles” (Foucault 2007: 111). Much of these basic eighteenth century principles relied on the “stitching together of Scientific positivism and the development of States” (Foucault 2007:50). Here, with this relationship of Scientific positivism and the State, I am pondering how, through this relationship, the Enlightened subject was rationalized into being, that is, how is it that positivism and State organizing procedures come to formulate what it means to be human. And how this understanding of the human legitimized the inscription of particular bodies as this universal citizen.

**Permanence and Flux: The Ebb of Transnational Culture**

As Diasporic culture continues to shift and reshape itself, and as it moves through the time and space of the West, I think there is this constant negotiation with self, that is,
the Diasporic body constantly asks what historic ways of life, aesthetic forms, expressions, diction, food and music to name some, could come to provide some form of currency to take up the challenges of communicating within this governing mass media public sphere. For some Diasporic peoples, all culture as it emerged from lands that were colonized were knowingly forgotten; moreover, it was an act of forgetting which really ought to usher in Enlightened subjectivities. Instead what was utilized, as a substitute, was the Enlightenment culture of modernity. For some Diasporic peoples, it was important to not only maintain their culture but to actively pursue the Diasporic Indigenous ways of doing things, a manner that can be interpreted as being “pure”, absolutist or even closed. For some peoples of the Diaspora much depends on the flux of the present, that is, culture as it forms itself today and differs the next day, wherein one can decide, to choose which form of expression to take up as one’s own. However regarding this choice, I think what is coming out of these positions that situate themselves within Diasporic communities, is the need for a strategic engagement of their transnational globalized epoch. We can ask then, how do Diasporic peoples come to align themselves through the politics of culture to engage their daily lived social? And how often does the cultural register of modernity called upon, when dialogue concerning these Diasporic raw resources, tacitly mediate conversations? The thought of Diasporic peoples constantly ongoing, as an everyday surveillance method, that is, the glancing back and forth to the cultural registrar of modernity is real. From cultural representations, to institutionalized forms of knowledge, to the popularized public sphere mass media discourse, we seem to all at some point in time become experts in understanding how the space and time dynamics of the West come to universally culturally encode our lived
reality. Indeed, the Diaspora today has brought some complexity to this cultural register of modernity. Universalized Self and ‘Other’ classifications allowed for compartmentalized geographies of solidarity, where the phenotype of the Diasporic body comes to be perpetually bound to particular geographic locations. Out of this classification came what I would like to call the Diasporized-subject, where bodies in a discursively totalizing way were organized and inscribed as inferior knowledges. So this omnipresent cultural register of modernity now tangling with a public sphere whereby the Diaspora is not to say centered, but has shifted its locus from the margins, has to more or less, let us say, recalibrated its coordinates for difference. Imagine the difficulty here; for the Diasporic body has fluidity. It is not, for the most part, contained in this permanent rigid category. So, the way we come to know bodies, geographies, citizenry is no longer through its singular origins. I think this here is the struggle at Glossop Road. And I think it goes back to the relationship between Scientific positivism and the State where we come to know what it means to be British through these permanent homogenous categories of citizenry and nation-state. So it is no longer an easy check off mark for Britishness when it comes to the cultural register of modernity. Diaspora has ushered in a cosmopolitanism where public sphere talk, be it through mass media or not, has to now take up the nuances with difference, culture and citizenry (Habermas 1991). Is it then, that in rekindling the debate about Britishness with questions concerning to pledge or not to pledge allegiance to the Queen, a means, or an attempt to return to singular, pure origins of nationalism? Or is it that Diasporic communities which come to form itself as a counterpublic, more so now in a material way, seriously opening up spaces for pluralism within this fabric of Englishness? This becomes a bit of a worry here, when we hear the
Western world resides supposedly in the time of a democracy, as trumpeted through the governing neo-liberal humanitarian discourse. Yet as the counterpublic challenges this space of freedom and unfreedom, that of Britishness, and as the cultural register of modernity discursively recalibrates itself to re-mark the illiberalness of Diasporic communities, I think my concern here, is with how Enlightened subjectivities come to reshape itself as it embodies the Diaspora, and how so this reshaping come to be mobilized through what were previously illberal spaces for the Diasporic body. So, coming out of this entangled relationship with Diasporic communities and Enlightened subjects, is this sense of flux where permanent spaces of freedom and unfreedom are now reclassified, not so much by the State or mass media public sphere, but more so now by the residing Diasporic counterpublic, which materializes through its own discursive growth and finds itself now being taken up by the same mass media public sphere as their own, as always already belonging in some pure Enlightened form to the State.

**Conclusion**

Returning to Glossop Road, we notice as the Diasporic counterpublic tries to ensconce itself within Euro-modernity, the emerging rumble here concerns the newly reconfigured permanence and flux of what it means to be a British citizen. I think some of the problematics that the Diaspora is bringing, are that of: How can modernity will itself to new forms of citizenry and simultaneously secure the trope of Enlightenment? How can Britishness retain its Englishness and still allow for Diasporic communities to have voice? The cry, though, to maintain allegiance to the Queen, the historical cord to Enlightenment subjectivities, I think, allows for a post human, where pre-supposed, is the liberal harmony of the Enlightened subject and Diasporic communities, all in the name of
continuing the will of modernity. But as the State and mass media work in tandem to secure their hold on historical formations of citizenry, and as the Diaporic counterpublic reshapes itself through Indigenous cultural knowledges and newly found Enlightened subjectivities, what we have is a relationship in which the colonial encodings of British citizenry come to engage the protean presence of Diaporic identity. Materially then, what does this relationship reveal itself as? Is it that, as Foucault reminds us, we need to look at those “events with complex historical process that are difficult to sum up in words, those with technological mutations, those which include social transformations, those that locate themselves within political institutions, those projects of rationalization of knowledge and practices?” (Foucault 2007:111). So be it the Diaporic body pledges allegiance to the Queen, or as we question the classification of Britishness and Englishness, and as the Diaporic posthuman takes up its newly found place in the West, I think what Glossop Road gives us then, is more so, a means to question how we come to know and understand the ensuing humanism of the Diaspora.
CHAPTER SEVEN: DIASPORA AND THE QUESTION OF RACE

The events of Glossop Road speak to the phenomenological modalities of modernity, insofar as the Diasporic-subject and the nation-state come to be discursively configured through the present governing epoch, which concurrently are embedded within historical trajectories to colonial formations. Through these geographies we are left to make sense of how simultaneously the Diasporic-subject and nation-state alike come into identity, or put another way, how identity becomes the material of the subject and the material of the nation-state. At the local level of the Diaspora, the Diasporic-subject comes into the material through protean-like desires and performatives, hence identity endows particular dualisms immanent to the subject, such as permanence and the temporary, finitude and infinitude, the mutable and immutable. To come into this humanism of citizenship would entail embodying particular values, expressions, desires, attitudes, and articulations as parlanced through the dispositions of Euro-modernity. These performative moments of the subject all come to be circumscribed by the state through this classification of ethnicity. Yet, at the same time, the ethnic-subject as residing within the nation-state comes to belong homogenously to the history of the nation. The disquiet coming from Glossop Road speaks to this hegemonic desire of homogeneity, which historically has articulated and continues to articulate citizenry. So if we were to ask, Who is Canadian? Or what is British? It is to then have to recognize the historical racial schema (Fanon 1967) as embedded dialectically through public sphere discourses of Euro-modernity. I am saying then, that Glossop Road presents the ontological, epistemological and axiological calling for nation-state determinants to return to singular origins. Sylvia Wynter’s argument is important here, where she notes,
“the struggle of our new millennium will be one between the ongoing imperative of securing the well-being of our present ethnoclass (i.e., Western bourgeois) conception of the human” (Wynter 2003: 260). Given the nation-state’s gripe to secure homogeneity through race, class, gender, sexuality, ableism and religion, and as the black Diaspora syncretises transhistorically through contemporaneous cultural variants, through these tensions, new/different articulations of the human come to be ontologically embodied by the Diasporic subject.

Uneven distribution of the environment’s material resources has fueled the movement of people both liberally and illiberally. Yet modernity has been ushered in through this movement, or should I say a particular representation of this movement. While the debate pertaining to North-South relations expands globally, the stabilization and fragility of African, Asian, Latin America and Caribbean nation-states continue to erode in ways that promulgate bodies from these geographies that have been underdeveloped through the principles and procedures of imperial debt relations as installed through certain financial institutions of the West, predominantly the International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization and the World Bank. But what do these concentric relations mean for the oppressed, for the Diaspora, for the future of Southern countries, when survival, or to come into the human means residing and actively participating in the uneven distribution of the transflow of goods, commodities and material resources?

For some Southern countries, the Diaspora as always out there, as being external to the South is concerning. The Caribbean basin has been central to modernity and to the Diaspora, yet, historically the Diaspora has been articulated in ways that constantly point
to movement from plantation archipelagoes to the Euro-West, culminating in desire across time and space for this place called home. Yet, the fact of blackness as it resides within the Caribbean works to disavow strategic relations as encumbered through the antecedent archipelago, which can help with countervailing dominant relations as trumpeted by the North. Pointedly, Stephens (2005) has called for a *continentalization of the islands*, which like James (1993) offers a different way of understanding the black subject as produced through the required procedures, performances and desires of transnationalism. The need for federation within the Caribbean, not a new independence, but a particular relationship of dependence through the islands is important to recall for this discussion. What is needed is a re-mapping of colonial relations. For James (1993), Federation is needed to break and replace these relations. James (19993) call for an island-state system that facilitates movement, along economical, financial, socio-political and intellectual lines, to create a new national community, built not on territory, but on free movement of people, resources and ideas between territory, the key being, “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”. James argues for the need for a nation-state to produce the integrative citizen, keeping in mind this integration has been and continues to be produced in and through a racialized gendering as governed through the capitalist mode of production, one that includes and simultaneously excludes bodies of the Diaspora. Furthermore, my contention with transnationalism, is that it seems to be always already discursively positioned within spaces of the West, replete with a desire to consume the colonial harvest of globalization, eagerly willing to be immersed within the techno-capitalist sphere of our contemporary social environment. In that, if we are speaking about the variegated forms of nationalism as contextualized through particular
historical precedents, and how these different nationalisms become transient and localized to certain spaces and certain bodies, we ought then to note the implications, the intricacies with race, racism, the Diasporic subject, and the relationship with the state. This complex imperial relationship speaks to the spatiality of race. Like Glossop Road, race and ontological belonging become discussed through public sphere media by means of culture, ethnicity, settler, immigrant, refugee, Moslem or this trope of being British. Space then becomes racialized/territorialized through particular historical readings on the body. Legitimised/naturalised belonging becomes located to spaces in ways in which the subject already knows how to act, or behave. Indeed, the materialization of space consists of certain procedural arrangements. National consciousness of the state as historically imbued through the historical racial schema, positions Diasporic-bodies in ways which de-settle colonial geographies while at the same time stabilizing the national subject (Scott, 1995; McKittrick 2006; Thobani, 2007). Althusser’s interpellation is important here, particularly the thinking about how the material is engaged, that “an ideology always exist in an apparatus, and its practice or practices, that this existence is material” (Althusser 2001: 112). As aforementioned, my interest concerns the variegated ways in which the Diasporic-subject becomes interpellated into this national being/subject. At the same time this newly found place/space of transnational identity, that is, identity as identifying with the archival procedures of the state, and as ritualized into the normatzed and as governing the material choices and practices for Diasporic bodies. In effect, and as Thobani (2007) trumpets, the Diasporic body comes to be exalted into being, into this accepted subject/subjectivity of the state. Yet, these processes of exaltation are embodied through the legal classification of immigrant, insofar as the ‘immigrant’ has come to be
represented through a historical polity of racialisation. Coming to know the human through this mitigated place of immigrant means speaking about the different bodies across time and space, to understand how particular geographies come to count, be ‘preferred’, be accepted and also about the particular relationships with North-South geographies. Ultimately, these capillary-like relations (Foucault 1995) are deeply embedded within a colonial-capitalist agenda, materializing through the auspices of globalization, in which the irreducible moment speaks to race. North-South movements of peoples have been historically and continue to be ushered imperially through socio-economic relations. Being-becoming the nation-state subject of this place popularized as Canada (Turtle Island) involves the expropriation of Indigenous lands. It involves movement from ‘underdeveloped’geographies. It involves the centering of particular Euro-cultures and bodies. It involves bodies of the Diaspora installing onto itself state practices/policies that accord privilege, privilege that concomitantly articulates complicity with the colonial governmentality of the state.

**Multiculturalism and the Production of the National-subject**

Doing citizenry involves having relationships with the land and the state; it involves Trudeau’s policy of multiculturalism, which supposedly allowed for a legal turn from the colonial perception of white Canada to an inclusive Canada, which welcomed with open arms bodies of Southern geographies. Although promising, multiculturalism as a legal policy represented many limitations concerning questions addressing the historical socio-cultural context about citizenry, difference and identity, systemic racism, power and privilege. Multiculturalism, however, has given the Canadian state the agency to re-inscribe the nation through bodies of difference, primarily through the organization of
racial differences as these differences come to be articulated through the celebratory trope of culture (Ahmed 2000; Bannerji 2000; Thobani 2007). Hence the material tensions immanent within the coloniality of nation-state come to be masked through the normatizing of Diasporic-silence. Multiculturalism, then, allows for the Diasporic-subject to legally perform her/his citizenry through one’s subjectivity of accepting these standardized social practices as engendered through the state. At the same time the question of authentication always remains suspect regarding citizenry and the Diaspora. Belonging to a nation involves a particular discursive material production of bodies. It involves social relations of production. It involves the act of the Diasporic-subject recognizing the ritualized dispositions of citizenry, an interpolating act that concomitantly continues to produce what it means to be human by way of centering this variegated articulation of the Euro-Enlightenment subject in relation to the abject tangentialized subject of difference. Perhaps we also need to remind ourselves that this discursive material production of citizenry is underscored by the expropriation of Indigenous lands; the extermination of Indigenous peoples; the colonial conquest of Indigenousness in which the axiological, the ontological and the epistemological ways of coming to know across time and space have been deemed universally inferior in their totality. What multiculturalism has yet to do is own up to how these different cultures, as located through histories of conquest, come to be re-located within the imperial West and at the same time how this re-location becomes constituted through the exploitation of local peoples, and the underdevelopment of racialised geographies (McLaren and Farahmandpur, 2005; Rodney, 1982). Multiculturalism must disentangle the politics of movement embedded within the congeries of the nation-state, globalization and the
Diaspora, inasmuch as this politics of movement is about the material as constituted through race.

I am interested in a particular movement of the Diasporic-subject as engendered, as Fanon (1967) notes through alienation and through this sense of a double consciousness (see Du Bois, 1989) insofar as the Diasporic-body becomes, through this alienation transformed into the Othered-subject in order to come into being as this agentive-subject within the territory of the globalized metropolis. It seems as if this Diasporic subject through some ontological sense of desire always already longs to consume the material pleasures of contemporary neo-liberal capitalist spaces at the expense of alterity, that is, the particular expression of consciousness that come to be articulated anachronistically as the ‘Other’. In that, the post-plantation Diasporized-body as abject comes into the human through these possibilities of abject as materially located through the capitalist sphere of doing things. Multiculturalism as absorbing of these Diasporized-bodies wills the subject into sovereign belonging. We must remember though that sovereignty is a historical variant co-producing of Euro-modernity that imperially bound certain bodies as ontological artifacts to particular territories, imperial in the sense that sovereignty is always already in relation to that which is abject, that is bodies as located externally and internally to particular geographies. These underlying assumptions of producing these augured ideas of sovereignty are immanently Eurocentric (Shohat and Stam: 2009; Hardt and Negri: 2000) are well steeped within the governing edict of transnational capitalist corporations, which ultimately fashion the material desires of globalization. Sovereignty as producing of the national subject presents itself through hegemonised signifiers, which through, as aforementioned, particular artifactual
signs such as flags, anthems, and museums (see McClintock, 1995) have come to historicize in a totalizing way the nation-state into being. Yet, sovereignty in our contemporaneous moment, as discursively formed through schooling and education, and as embedded within corporate culture organizes bodies of difference through certain reactionary programs entitled by means of the governing tropes of “diversity” and “equity”, the sole objective being about maximization of profits, which irreducibly speaks to the historic exploitation of racialised peoples. The corporatized culture of schooling and education ensues a particular type of citizenry, one in which the determinants have been buttressed through historical trajectories to colonization, which ultimately produced a particular humanism that enabled some moral sense of sovereign citizenry through a host of cultural articulations and expressions all fashioned in the name of ‘development’ (see also Giddens 1990,1991; Foucault 2007; Habermas 1998; Appadurai 1996). So be it survival, self-determination or resistance, sovereignty as socialized through the West promotes performative forms of relations that marked Diasporized desire. Hence, the sociality of sovereignty comes to be governed through these neo-liberally fashioned values and attitudes. If we are thinking about pedagogies of the Diaspora we must cogitate about the way in which Diasporized histories come to be displaced from schooling and education, in that, we must think of education through all bodies alike, that knowledge resides within the experience of all peoples. We cannot continue to think of knowledge as being some commodified package (see also Giroux 2001; Apple 1995; McLaren and Farahmandpur 2005), purchased at the local supermarket, named as education, all in the pursuit of modernity and development.
Sovereignty Through Diasporic Sensibilities

Location of the Diaspora is central to understanding contemporary questions concerning transnationalism and citizenship, in that, local knowledges about community, settler, immigrant, race, nation-state must be engaged dialectically when talking about citizenship, sovereignty. Diasporic sensibilities allow for an articulation that moves the discourse of nation-state citizenry beyond that of its binary confines, from dislocation and belonging or home and exile, to invite more of a historical reading that takes into account, enslavement, imperialism, expropriation of Indigenous lands, extermination of local peoples, genocide, settlerment and migration. Moreover, what we are left with by means of nation-state and sovereignty and as being produced through various rituals embedded within schooling and education and mass media technologies, is this sense of the performative nature of citizenry coming to be engendered through ethnocentric curricula and pedagogies. So, within the culture of schooling and mass media public sphere, the sense of community and the self comes to be disciplined through these regulatory procedures of citizenship. Re-writing Diaspora then is about asking relevant questions about power and privilege, about how the variant Diasporic bodies come to understand their citizenry, their material realities, how Diasporized bodies make sense of belonging, about how Diasporized bodies recognize their complicity regarding Western imperial relations with the South, which concomitantly have produced these Diasporised subjectivities.

Historically, sovereignty concerned colonial conquest of Indigenous lands. Cartographised through territories and borders, and legitimised through legal constitutions, the acquisition of land through time has inevitably run its course, though
presently there still seems to be some conflict between imperial countries, notably Canada and Russia in particular, regarding the geography of the Antarctic and sovereignty, the conflict being about natural resources beneath the ocean, the reserves of oil and gas. Yet, the historical procedures of sovereignty has shifted from the colonial conquest of Indigenous lands, to a sense of bio-sovereignty in which Diasporised-bodies engage in particular performative procedures as inculcated through militarized capitalist transnational cultures of modernity and as culminating as this subject of citizenry. Sovereignty then becomes dependent on the performative, which surreptitiously shifts the contours of racism onto the discursive space of class. The cry from the capitalist print is that long gone are systems of enslavements, legal institutionalizing of apartheid, Civil Rights movements, anti-racism/anti-colonial struggles, and that racism has retracted itself. But racism has always been a transhistorical experience; racism has always been in relation to the ‘Other’. Racism has always been about modes of production, exploitative social relations, capitalism and global territorization. In contemporary neo-colonial times, we are presented with different articulations of racism through state policies that work to exclude and position certain customs, values and cultures that have historical epistemological roots within Eurocentric traditions. The experience of racism then may not be in the sense of acquisition of colonies, but more so through particular modes of production in which the Diasporic-subject moves into different spaces of the capitalist public sphere thereby producing the unfreedoms of desire in the form of aestheticised commodities. Race and capital have been vital invariants to the movement of the Diaspora and remain critical for Diasporic-bodies to come into the spirit of post-human sovereignty in a time when power and privilege have been embedded in the
commodification of state-culture. Having an invested interest in these polities allows for Diasporized bodies to transport their subjectivities into a particular quality of civic life. Yet the race to modernity involves relocating subjectivities within the colonial capillaries of the technological nation-state in which the racialization of space approaches its fecundity through public sphere socio-politico culture that historically has its epistemes augured in Euro-Enlightenment forms of knowledge. Modernity then, in and of itself becomes dependent on this sovereign Diasporised subject in ways in which Diasporised bodies take up the imperial subject position of the national-subject, insofar as the colonial rule contingent to particular bodies becomes shifted to envelope racialised bodies in ways that operationalize capital through these racialised bodies complicit with the continued destabilization and underdevelopment of Southern countries. This, in a sense, speaks to the embodiment of transhistoric territorilization, in that, the body as propertized through sovereignty becomes the local territory of the nation-state and concomitantly endowed with the governing politics of capitalist socio-cultural modes of production.

Supposedly, we are in the post-racial epoch, yet the proteanism of coloniality articulates itself through institutions, schooling and education, capitalist media, citizenry, and state governance, tacitly mediating translocal communicative exchanges of the Diaspora. The resurgence of class debates has centered the post-racial. Urged through the discourse of militarized imperial globalization, mass media conversations do well to place and locate conversations about exploitation, poverty, employment, housing and issues concerning social justice as ontologically spatial to all bodies, trumpeting in a sense that within the governing democracy we all face oppression as discontinuous from colonial histories. Hence, the postracial is inserted and, to some extent contiguous to the
postcolonial allowing for the economic disposition to become the determining variant regarding what it means to be human, what it means to be this re-scripted post-modern citizen as constituted through the pluralization of difference and as materializing through fragmented communities. The paradox here, and what I have come to frame as the ambivalence of the Diaspora, is that as racialised peoples of the Diaspora come to claim their humanism by contesting the systemic forms of discrimination through race, gender, class, religion and ableism, they have willingly participated and continue to participate in these hegemonic relations of the West in which the Diasporized body comes into power and privilege as they oath themselves into being this sovereign national-subject, where ultimately the transformed Diasporic-subject benefits through the active complicity of citizenry. Today with the retooling of globalization, we are faced with pointed questions about human rights and the redistribution of material goods, where ultimately, the call is for reparation. There has been an urgent engagement for social justice needs within the nation-states of the West. My concern, is while we engage in contesting the location of equity within the Western metropolis, the imperial agenda between North-South countries are left well in place. Presently, part and parcel of being human is about belonging/identifying with a particular nation-state. It is about borders and territories imperially marking and inscribing the human condition through the culture of bounded geographies. Yet the Indigene has always resided within and beyond these contours and continues to resist these scripted material enticements of the coloniality of globalization. As constituted through the Indigene, Diasporic sensibilities allow for the movement of peoples as governed through the coloniality of globalization to be counter-hegemonic by the same neo-liberal humanitarianism of the Western nation-state. In a sense then, I am
arguing that colonial forms of citizenry can come to be underwritten through Diasporic movement. However, by no means is this some naïve utopian claim to citizenry without a sum critical read concerning the interplay with different histories, about the politics of resistance, self-determination, survival, that for different bodies these desires play out differently. Citizenry, sovereignty within the capitalist production of nation-state is about militarized violence and displacement while at the same time producing a movement that has come to be discursively contoured through the tropes of immigrant, refugee, illegality, and foreigners. Keeping with the culture of the imperial order these tropes are essentially race that continue with histories of colonial time to mark the ‘Other’. To invite a Diasporic citizenry through a thinking of a postnational humanism is to then have to work with the colonial historical trajectories of Indigenous expropriation, transatlantic conditioning of African enslavement and the desires of difference.

**Pedagogy of Diaspora**

Diaspora provides the impetus to usurp historical questions of settler nation-state citizenry by centering complicit capitalist flows of movement, be it labour, goods, services, or commodities. Yet, what historical trajectories constitute this settler national subject and concomitantly invite Diasporic inclination to permanently participate within these Northern constellations of the human condition? Isin and Wood (1999) amplify certain variants of sovereignty, that of, *territoriality, autonomy* and *legality*, that these variants as underpinned through militarized violence posit rights, power and privilege to certain bodies, insofar as the body becomes interpellated into the human condition of citizenship. Where the Diaspora intervenes is through a particular Indigenous governmentality that is not readily organized and inscribed as the historical settler nation-
state subject came to be reified through the said *territoriality, autonomy* and *legality* of sovereignty. Diasporic bodies come into the variegated forms of the human condition as located within the public sphere of the metropole, transformative of a divergent mode of socializing. One inculcated through the dispositions, expressions, articulations, practices, perceptions, and attitudes (Bourdieu 1991) to the Enlightened-subject. Yet, these newly found dispositions immanent to the West offer no guarantee for the Enlightenment public sphere, such that to say the Diasporic-subject becomes circumscribed and enveloped in ways that stabilize and fecund the colonial desire of the West is by no means finite and totalizing, for Diasporic-bodies carry with them across space and time histories of resistance, histories of colonial encounters, embodied knowledges that anachronistically speak through the lived experience of transatlantic plantation life. Depending on the degree of decolonization different polities emerge that can help dissipate entrenched colonial attitudes. However, while the Enlightenment public sphere struggles to reconfigure itself through these transplanted Diasporic-polities, the imperial lacuna between the West and Southern countries expands itself in ways that furthers dependency on the North, one of which is through increased migration. Migration as capitalistically imbued, allows for Diasporic-bodies to move into the status-quo of power and privilege through education/occupation/skilled labor. Yet education has delimited certain spaces for the ‘Othered’ body which, have come to mark the participatory process of citizenship. This demarcation speaks very much to a necessary class analysis of the social field, which more often than not becomes discursively pinned to debates concerning equality and meritocracy. My interest, however, concerning citizenry as constitutively formed through the Diaspora is about accountability and responsibility; it is about the quality of
civic life as negotiated through difference. It is about questions regarding the redistribution of Indigenous land. It is about understanding how a series of political configurations, a series of nation-state policies come to self-regulate citizenry/sovereignty in particular spaces, and at the same time how these spaces come to be resisted and contested by Diasporic bodies of difference. But, historically citizenry has been fixed, homogenous and always already relational to the nation-state, however with the emergence of Diasporic-fields, in which Diasporic-domains in its material presence come to articulate a query which speaks to the broader colonial experience as reified through the inter/intra policies of the imperial formations of the nation-state, the social of the public sphere comes to coalesce itself through cultural difference thereby formulating new polities of representation, which variably culminate into a disquiet predicated about the sum historical indissoluble ethnoracial embodied property. Yet, the Diaspora disseminates knowledges in which institutionalized recognition has been a struggle. Coming to belong, or to identify with a particular nation-state often places the Diasporic-subject in contradictory relations to which they have claimed sovereign membership. My interest is with finding ways to challenge the way of being/becoming/performing the national-subject as a bounded relationship with the state. As a method, I intervene through Diasporic sensibilities that speak to the colonial specificities that privilege power ethnocentrically within local institutions. I am particularly concerned with how contemporary Diasporized national-subjects come to be regulated. What are the contemporary polities of resistance to Diasporized citizenship?

Perhaps too, we should consider the Diasporic-body desiring to come to be the national-subject, to think about the particular socio-cultural variants being resisted and
the particular variants being desired and performed. But what are the contemporary forms of desire, resistance and orientations of belonging? In Toronto, in the summer of 2010 during the occasion of the G20 Summit, there were historical forms of resistance in the downtown public sphere of Toronto. Various interest groups marched together for a collective call for social-change/social-justice. At the centre of the disquiet was bringing critical awareness for the urgent need to de-imperialize concurrent transmissions of globalization. Put another way, to undo neo-colonial forms of inter-intra state policies that work to maintain particular geographies in ‘underdeveloped’ axes and also problematize the quality of life, the quality of what it means to be human for particular bodies deemed illegal, refugee, terrorist, and so forth. Yet resistance to the G20 Summit was taken up broadly through different political locals, accorded by different bodies, underpinned through race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, in which the irreducible question invariably speaks to the relationship with human rights and becoming the subject of the sovereign citizen. I am thinking about these points of engagement, these points of resistance culminating through shared experiences of the Diaspora, in that the Diaspora is a politics of doing, a politics of becoming, a politics of action.

I think it is important to note that the G20 was well steeped in violence. My politics is not with condoning violence, but more so with placing a historical vector on violence to understand how citizenry, and the settler nation-state materialized through this index and how violence plays out in the contemporary moment to will citizenry. How might we read a pedagogy of violence as a political act of resistance that ultimately works to de-interpellate the subject into the human? How do we come to understand the legitimized protective forces of the state as constitutive of violence? Moreover, the G20
protests marked spaces of embodied resistance that endowed belonging differently, that called attention to the unequal distribution of goods, to the question of rights, justice for all, to articulate a critical sense of citizenship that necessitates resistance. Watching this violence play out on my television screen was quite appalling for I was watching two competing forms of violence, legitimized violence as installed through the state and as inaugurated through various apparatuses, from uniforms, badges, horses, batons to de-legitimized violence, forms of resistance as imbued through critical memory of histories of anti-colonial/anti-imperial/anti-racist revolutions. What I was witnessing was in a sense the contestation of bourgeois public sphere, in which the diverging forces form themselves through the interests of human rights, social justice, equality and some sense of freedom. For me these performative acts of illegitimized violence speak to histories of transformation, histories of resistance for African peoples. Interestingly enough however, the dominant mass media articulation in its presumably neutral, objective, omnipresent posture worked quickly to frame the uncertainties and unresolved tensions of the G20 protests. Yet, in many ways the G20 protest was about the material. My concern, however, is with the location of the material, that the contestation of the material as imbued locally might not necessarily speak to the ownership of the means of production, but more so to the equitable distribution of commodities, goods and services, and contemporary questions about civil rights, which systemically leave imperial transmissions well in place. If the collective responsibility of the protest spoke to the interest of equity then I am arguing for an anti-colonial dialogue that works to de-imperialize North-South relations.
I think it is safe to say that contemporary forms of desire, resistance and orientations of belonging precipitate the alterity of the Diaspora, in ways in which the practice of Diasporized-culture even when commodified and packaged becomes primordially endowed through transoceanic embodiment, which inherently conveys transhistorical/transatlantic expressive meanings of emancipation/freedom/liberation of enslaved peoples. What I am suggesting here is that these forms of desire, resistance and orientations of belonging as immanent to the alterity of the Diaspora are not mutually exclusive, but more so dependent, constitutive on the immutable ethnocentric Euro-Enlightened subject. What I am interested in is in having the primacy of the “counter-culture of modernity” (Gilroy 1993), these said Diasporized-cultures develop polities of the present where, through spaces of professional occupation Diasporized-bodies come into spaces of privilege which then become ahistorically performed as their own. So if we are thinking about the spatiality of race and the way in which currency/capital is accorded to the abject-body, or as Cheryl Harris (1995) aptly notes whiteness as property, I am thinking of particular professional occupations from medical doctor, lawyer, engineer, to academic/teacher. I am thinking about how these embodied privileged spaces of the Diaspora speak to the delimitation of Diasporic communities as they become colonially uncertain through racialised difference. I would imagine that this calls for a discussion concerning the complexities with the colonized body of difference, historic specificites of colonialism, and the production of whiteness as privileged, gendered and classed within the congeries of globalization and the nation-state. My concern here is with knowing how these disjunctures come to be whitened and simultaneously blackened through Diasporic-alterity.
I also think it is important to discuss the tropes of emancipation, liberation and freedom in the context of the Diaspora as these tropes become situated in the West. Too often the Diasporic-subject becomes framed as the consumer of post-modern capitalism, as ahistorical, as turning one’s back from the native homeland, as coopting with the imperial gender, as being complicit with contributing to the impoverishment of Southern countries, as all but desiring to be this Enlightened national-subject (Jameson 2005; Appadurai 1996; Scott 1995; Gilroy 1993). Part and parcel of my writing is in a sense working to reclaim the Diasporic subject from these enclaves, to instead re-frame the discussion differently concerning the transatlantic experience of the Diaspora and what it means to be human, while at the same time working with the politics and ethics of these essentialist notions that come to totalize the experience of the Diaspora. In doing so, I am not dismissing these essentialist claims. I am, however, marking them as some of the possibilities and I am willing to work with them dialectically as they come to configure the social, the lived experiences of Diasporized peoples. How then do we begin to theorize the Caribbean beyond the borders of its archipelago? How do we begin to theorize the Caribbean beyond its boundaries as it materially articulates itself in its embodiment in the presence of the West? I am framing these spaces as distinctive for I believe these spaces need to be theorized through specific histories, that situate the colonial differently as the colonial comes to reside within the West and the imperialized South. I also recognize these colonial histories are interwoven and constitutive. However, I am arguing that the colonial comes to be nuanced in the West, that is arguably distinguishable from how the colonial comes to be located in the South. In this regard, the matter of culture-and-decolonization is of the utmost importance to this discussion, in
that culture and decolonization can help articulate a theory concerning the socio-cultural experience of the Diaspora as these synchronistic experiences become situated in the archipelago of the Caribbean.

**Conclusion**

Notably, theory must be specific to particular historical conditions as contingent across place, time and space. Given the geography of the Caribbean, we must then speak about certain constitutive variants such as transatlantic-blackness, Indentureship, post-independence, race and culture. However, with the congeries of white settler nation-state differing itself in the Caribbean in ways in which the inauguration of this event called Independence ushered a form of governance where the body historically designated as the abject-plantation-subject becomes relocated to the public sphere as citizen, as national subject, as human. I am asking then, and as precipitated through these specific histories of colonialism, what does it mean to have this sense of a collective national consciousness for local peoples as residing within these colonial designated spaces of enslavement and plantation? Frantz Fanon (1967), in his *Wretched of the Earth*, essentially broached this question. Fanon spoke about the necessity of having a national consciousness that spoke to the histories of colonialism. For local peoples to have some sense of national liberation would entail having the critical consciousness to engage daily in lived anti-colonial moments. He cautions about the pitfall for such, that the colonial can re-present itself in ways in which the local takes up the subject position of the *bourgeois* thus repeating the colonial through different practices and different bodies. However, this discourse of *national consciousness* can be quite problematic. In fact, I think it is laden with contradictions and yet necessary to invoke in particular spaces. Take
for example when this sense of *national consciousness* becomes invoked by the dominant body in a particular settler nation-state space, belonging then, the human, becomes performed through particular colonial continuities of racialization of the ‘Other’. Hence, belonging, unbelonging, migrancy, Diasporic conditions become ontologised within a given geographical domain (Ahmad 2008). However, the spatial polities of race become nuanced in ‘underdeveloped’ countries. Within the spatial commune of the Caribbean as lived, fashioned and performed through the local heterogeneous transhistorical peoples, the discursive inscriptions of the governing edicts of capitalist, neo-colonial procedures of globalization form ahistorically the dominant mode of political orientation. This concomitantly constitutes what it means to be human, that as incited through the interests of self-determination, and as Fanon (1963) notes, the demiurge has been colonially assimilated, that self-determination of local peoples becomes procured through the material conditions of colonialism. Fanon was quite mindful to distinguish between nationalism and national consciousness, that national consciousness becomes conditioned through culture, that for colonized peoples culture ought to be determined through decolonization, decolonization which can come to qualitatively frame local peoples with de-imperializing attitudes. Having said that, my politics is not with discounting the material, but more so with the manner in which the material becomes engaged and re-produced as its own imposition through understandings of ontological belonging. What I am interested in is the experience of the Diasporic body concerning these contemporary questions of identity, as they come to be historically shaped through the social conjunctures of the many cultural formations of modernity.
I am considering then a necessary theory that speaks to this present contiguity. I am imagining then a theory that dialectically intervenes through the interstices of anti-racism, anti-colonial/anti-imperial, cultural studies, disability and critical feminist studies; one that speaks to the complex histories immanent to our lived social world.
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION – THE AMBIVALENCE OF THE DIASPORA

In this study, I set out to discuss how everyday Diasporic life comes to be organized through race. My purpose was to suggest theoretical sensibilities germane for schooling and education. It is my hope that the thinking articulated here ought to help with putting in place transformative practices for social change and social justice. I believe Diaspora offer spaces for alternative ways of knowing and understanding that is relevant for social science research. Diaspora offers different ways of writing citizenry into the governing nation-state. To recall, my learning objectives concern the way in which Caribbean-Diasporic peoples come to understand race within the public-sphere of their governing nation-state. It concern how African–Diasporic peoples come to maneuver and negotiate their everyday socio-cultural terrain. My objectives were thought through the following research questions: What are the ways in which the Caribbean-Diaspora comes to understand and experience race? By what means does the experience of race organize and inscribe the identities of the Caribbean-Diaspora? I engage theses questions through an autoethnographic approach whereby the data was entrenched within the lived experience of blackness. I reviewed particular discussions concerning the Diasporised subject as emerging through Pan-Africanist nationalism and how this sense of nationalism becomes politically nuanced through movement and positionality of Diasporic peoples. I questioned how this movement and variant positionality of Diasporic peoples becomes implicated through the theoretical frameworks of the post-and the anti-colonial. By way of contextualizing the data, I drew on Frantz Fanon’s experience of the Diaspora, personal memory and cultural artifacts to discuss the variant and invariant
subjectivities of the Diaspora. I foreground the study by writing autoethnography by way of Diaspora as method.

Yet, writing autoethnography through Diaspora as method is about disembedding the complex cultural practices that have been historically silenced through the colonial racial schema. In our contemporary epoch, to write Diaspora suggests speaking through particular constellations of imperialism, transnationalism, the nation-state, the national-subject, race, culture, ethnicity, religion, migrant, refugee, and given the events of 9/11 the emerging classification of terrorist. When I embarked on this research I was attempting to make sense about how race/blackness comes to be read within the lived social of the everyday public sphere. In doing so, my interest is with a strategic practice of writing that articulates a conceptual framework that speaks to the ways race comes to entangle the sociality of Diasporized peoples as contextualized through the imperial space of the West. But writing Diaspora across space and time is complicated, hence my hesitation to provide some working conceptualization of the Diaspora throughout the study while at the same time I am thinking through the transatlantic experiences of African peoples as they come to be located through the Caribbean Diaspora. Writing Diaspora is in a sense about charting the experiential terrain of peoples who have dwelled in places/spaces, which through struggle and resistance have worked to change their social conditions inscribed through the vestiges of colonialism. Undoubtedly, these moments are interwoven through the different histories of anti-racism, anti-colonialism, feminisms, and anti-imperial movements, which essentially mark and shape Diasporic culture. To say Diasporised bodies have been central to the production of modernity and the building of the nation-state is quite an understatement, yet much work needs to be
done with historically tracing these local lived realities of the Diaspora in coming to be this national-subject and simultaneously being placed outside the configurations of the nation-state. As placed in the West, culture, Diasporized-bodies, and race-ethnicity have been read in particular ways that have preoccupied the discussion here. How these lived moments have been interpreted and engaged by local peoples and at the same time by theorists/scholars is concerning for me. If, then, theory comes to be determined through the relationship with the *is* and the *ought*, I have been more interested with the relationship whereby Diasporised-bodies in the pursuit of being this national-subject come to integrate or assimilate their way of being through interpreting and relating their social practices through histories of Enlightenment culture as these histories become spatially distanced from blackness. What we are left with is a series of discontinuities as these discontinuities continues itself through particular cultural predilections. Culture, then, as de-autochthonized becomes autonomous within the sociality of globalization. Always already heterogenized within the global West, how then do Diasprized-subjects make sense of cultural affiliations as discursively produced through its ontology? How Diasporized-subjects work to agentize race within these given cultural moments is quite important, indeed this speaks to the process of racialization about the way culture becomes embodied and reified producing the necessary material needs for Diasporized-bodies.

Thinking about Diasporic subjectivities involves recognizing lactification procedures as epidermalized through the inferiorization of the abject subject, that of blackness (Fanon 1967). It involves understanding how power, knowledge and privilege come to be enacted and simultaneously circumscribed through the spatial procedures of
racialization. The learning objective here is with finding ways the Diasporised bodies come into some sense of agency, in particular how in the many ways Diasporic-Indigeneity, local historic ways of knowing the Diaspora come to engage, come to dialogue with Euromodernity. My interest too has been with the everyday conceptualization of desire by the Diasporic-subject, about the way desire comes to be manoeuvred, and concomitantly producing of subjectivities, to think about how the choices of Diasporic-bodies come to be contingent or mutually exclusive upon Indigeneity and or Euromodernity. Needless to say, these moments speak to questions of accessibility, about the memory of Indigenous ways of knowing. It speaks to the contradictions of the culturally mediated past and present, to the movement of African peoples in which ontological histories encounter the colonial of modernity, an encounter which coalesces the Indigeneity of the Diaspora, the colonial-civility of Euromodernity into this national-subject, that of sovereign citizenry within settler nation-state. I want to locate this encounter as ambivalent to the Diaspora, in that if we are speaking about race-racism and the ensuing relations of the imperial state and how power-privilege becomes ascribed to the dominant bodies, anti-racism-anti-colonial theorizing are central. However, what I am admonishing concerns moreso local communities of the Diaspora, where I am concerned with the African body, blackness, gender, sexuality and disability. Discussing these lived moments as they become centrally navigated and contoured through race and everyday racism calls for a specific theorizing that wills an understanding of what it means to be human. It means ethnographically engaging these abject spaces-places, which undoubtedly are rife with uncertainty, transgression, spirituality, pedagogies, limitations and possibilities of the human. It involves coming to
know, coming to make sense of one’s complicity within local performatives of
domination. It is my sense that modernity cannot be neatly periodized to present-day
Diasporic-Indigenous spaces. With this sentiment my telling of the Diaspora saw a turn to
the desiring Diasporized-subject, where essentially I am writing to come to situate what
spaces-places are made possible through these subjectivities of desire as they come to be
racially underpinned to the material, to expressions, to attitudes and cultural dispositions
of the Diaspora, ultimately culminating to an identity that disrupts the manichean
confines of what it means to be human. Moreover, these disjunctures articulate the
conflicts, the tensions regarding the future, past and present as these moments have been
historically mediated through the desires of colonial-civility and Euromodernity.

Regarding the cosmopolitan-citizen of the Diaspora, I turn my attention to Fanon
(1963) and national consciousness, national culture, alienation, abjection and
decolonization, that these moments in its transnationalism have been uneven, insofar as
they have been embodied through a historical perception of time that speaks
concomitantly to the past-present. I am suggesting that these moments in its metropolis
spatiality constitute, represent, national consciousness, national culture, alienation,
decolonization, as emerging from the colonial are part and parcel of modernity. Yet, as
noted in previous discussions here, capitalism necessitates the continued colonial
production of modernity and saturates itself throughout North-South geographies. I am
suggesting then that Diasporised-subjects come to avow and congruently disavow their
development within capitalist-modernity through embodied polities of the archetype
abject-blackness as lived through essentialism-anti-essentialism, authenticity, cultural
homogeneity-heterogeneity and ethnic sameness-difference. At the same time, I am
writing not to reduce the Diaspora as to always already being fashioned through the permanence of change, I am suggesting that the Diasporic culture immanent within the political sites of resistance calls for recognizing the everyday sociality of intertextual histories as they culminate into the lived experiences of modernity. I am evoking anti-colonial educational discursive practices imbued through Diasporic sensibilities that have the potential to resist and disrupt hegemonic patterns of knowledge about Diasporic identity, which have historically subverted possibilities for transformative work, including ethical relations and solidarities in local, national and transnational academic spaces. What I want to leave here with is in a sense to provide a conceptualization for schooling and education that in effect provides a peopling for the decolonized future. I conclude with some thoughts about writing this study.

Identity, Culture, Ethnicity you are confronted

Irreducible are you, you are raced

Indigene, tradition, embodied histories of the Atlantic, you are remembered

Orality, vernacular, must you be silent?

Some say blackness, some say ontology

Nation-State, Globalization, Citizenry, all colonially imbued

Colonial-civility saturates the human

Mass media populates the narrative

Embedded within the public sphere is the Diaspora

Modernity continue to usher the social

Local peoples long to be sovereign

The post-racial beckons?
Race speaks independent of histories, independent of some perception of time,

Independent of place, and space

Culture, the Indigene, de-ontologised

Diasporized-bodies epistemologised through Euro-Enlightenment

Subjectivites continue to negotiate

Belonging, home, nostalgia, shifts

Diaspora carries on through the temporal, through the spatial.

Through desire, abjection, anxiety and fantasy

Where lies the human?
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