The Ghosts of the School Curriculum: Past, Present and Future

Radford Lecture, Fremantle Australia, 2007

Jane Kenway

Faculty of Education, Monash University

Ghosts haunt the school curriculum. Charles Dickens' "A Christmas Carol" (1843) provides a starting point for thinking about these curriculum ghosts. In the Preface, he states that he has "endeavoured in this Ghostly little book, to raise the Ghost of an Idea" (2003). I also seek to raise the ghost of an idea, and to have a bit of fun with it by using the methodology of "hauntology" to consider the specters of curriculum past, present and future that haunt contemporary schooling.

"A Christmas Carol" (1843) begins with Scrooge being haunted by the ghost of his dead business partner Marley one bleak Christmas Eve. When he hears the sound of rattling chains he is startled but initially sceptical: "It's humbug still!" said Scrooge (Dickens, 2003/1843, p. 44). He cannot quite believe his eyes when Marley's ghost finally appears before him and tells him three further spirits will haunt him. The mean-spirited Scrooge measures his life solely in terms of monetary profits and losses. The ghosts that haunt him return from the dead to warn him of the consequences he will suffer in the afterlife if his living present remains defined in purely economic concerns. Indeed, Marley's ghost demonstrates the possible fate that awaits Scrooge after death. Marley's chains are decorated with "cash-boxes, keys, padlocks, ledgers, deeds, and heavy purses wrought in steel" (Dickens, p. 44). They are a heavy burden. A haunting can involve the return or the emergence of what has been ignored. What Scrooge has ignored are those acts that bind communities together, ethical acts that demonstrate humanity. The consequence of his ignorance is, as the ghosts of the story testify, a hereafter of remorse and grief over what was lost and what was never done. The ghosts teach Scrooge how to live his life in a more humane way.

The Scrooge State

Dickens wrote "A Christmas Carol" in 1843, a time of profound economic and social change in England, when the ill effects of industrialization were becoming increasingly difficult to ignore. "A Christmas Carol" is Dickens' denunciation and critique of capitalism

in the industrial era of the nineteenth century. He uses the shackling together of ghosts to imply bondage to capitalism during this period, stating:

> The air filled with phantoms, wandering hither and thither in restless haste, and moaning as they went. Every one of them wore chains like Marley's Ghost; some few (they might be guilty governments) were linked together; none were free . . . The misery with them all was, clearly, that they sought to interfere, for good, in human matters, and had lost the power for ever. (Dickens, 2003/1843, p. 52)

We are now in the post-industrial era of the 21st century; at least in much of the so-called developed world. Capitalism today takes a somewhat different form. It is commonly argued that the main factor of production in today's economy is knowledge. Indeed capitalism is now often equated with the knowledge economy.

The notion of the knowledge economy made a decisive entry into policy discourses when the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) published "The Knowledge-based Economy" in 1996. This report defines knowledge-based economies as "economies which are directly based on the production, distribution and use of knowledge and information" (OECD, 1996, p. 7). Since then, policy-makers around the world have developed policies that fuse various ideas about the relationship between knowledge, information, learning, the economy and society. Knowledge economy and associated discourses have become powerful levers and drivers of policy in such international and supranational bodies as the OECD and the European Commission. They are also used extensively in policy in many nations states such as the USA, UK, Australia, Canada, and Ireland particularly and by international organizations such as the World Bank that "assist" developing nations. Policies have been developed around notions of the knowledge based or driven economy or society; the learning economy or society, and the information economy or society. They have included a range of related terms such as knowledge assets, accumulation, workers and management. Notions of the knowledge economy hold considerable sway over the nation state and sub-national states and thus the school curriculum.

I mentioned earlier that Scrooge measured his life solely in terms of monetary profits and losses. When it comes to the crunch nation states in today's globalised polity and economy behave in a similar manner. Being competitive in the global knowledge economy drives much nation state behaviour. The success of policy, including curriculum policy, is ultimately measured in these terms. It is thus possible to talk of the Scrooge state.

What are some of the features of the Scrooge state when it comes to matters of curriculum policy and education policy more generally? Its main feature is that it is

always auditing; counting, measuring, comparing (benchmarking, setting standards) and thus standardising. It surveys and surviels the population and exercises control through the use of numbers; i.e., it manages through measurement, controls through counting and then motivates through money. The Scrooge state has an accountant's view of curriculum. It thinks, for example, through ledgers, graphs, spreadsheets and notions of value adding. The view is that everything that matters can be measured and micro measured, and that measurements are the best basis for policy judgements. It also has a cartographer's view of curriculum. It thinks maps, grids, frameworks and matrices. It names curriculum highways (e.g., "essential learnings") and pathways (e.g., "vocational learning"). Overall it seeks to keep schools on government-prescribed grids of knowledge.

Broadly, despite some differences of emphasis, Commonwealth governments of Australia over the last two decades and most Australian states subscribe to this accountants' and cartographers' view of curriculum. Such views are also evident on an international scale. Witness the work of the OECD and its Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). This assesses students around the world in mathematics, science, reading and problem solving. It publishes international league tables thus allowing nation states to benchmark against each other and so to adjust national policy in order to improve relative standing in subsequent testing rounds.

Dickens, Marx and Derrida

Returning to ghosts, it is interesting to note that Dickens wrote "A Christmas Carol" at roughly the same time that Marx (and Engles, 1848) wrote "The Communist Manifesto". Clearly Dickens and Marx share similar concerns about industrialisation. Nearly 150 years later, Jacque Derrida, the famous French post structuralist philosopher wrote "Spectres of Marx" (1994). This deliberately evokes the opening line of "The Communist Manifesto" which is: "There is a spectre haunting Europe; the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre" (Marx & Engels, 2002/1843, p. 1). In this book, Derrida refers to contemporary anti-Marxist attitudes and problematises the "new world order" of capitalism. He argues that despite attempts to exorcise the spirit of Marxism, it continues to have a haunting influence. "Spectres of Marx" is Derrida's critique of capitalism in the post-industrial era.

In "Spectres of Marx", Derrida invents the term "hauntology" to refer to the metaphysical logic of the ghost. For Derrida, the ghost rattles the very foundations of existence. The spectre is ambiguous he says, it casts into doubt what we think we know. Derrida's notion of hauntology is built on problematising the notions of presence and present. Derrida asks: "What is the being-there of a spectre?" (1994, p.

38). The ghost puts "existence as presence" into doubt. The ghost is but it does not exist. The ghost is neither present nor absent. What is present? What is absent? What is past, what is future, what is here or there, now or then?

Derrida also asks: "What is the time of a spectre?" (1994, p. 38). The ghost leaves traces of the past by conjuring those who are already dead. It invokes the future by conjuring the presence of those who are not yet born. The ghost confuses linear time. In other words, past, present and future no longer exist as discrete and consecutive points in time. Here we are reminded of the Ghosts of Christmas Past, Present and Future in Dickens' "A Christmas Carol". The ghost haunts because it disrupts the self-identity of the present – before and after, and, therefore, cause and effect.

For Derrida, ghosts help us to see the things that we remain unaware of. He uses the term "aporia" "to refer to what might be called the 'blind spots' of any metaphysical discourse" (Lucy, 2004, p. 1). "Blind spots" are the places that one cannot see. But blind spots also refer to things which one is ignorant or prejudiced about. They are both unintentional and deliberate failings of sight.

In terms of the Scrooge state, we suggest that, in general, current curriculum policies are presented as "assured knowledge". Such knowledge, Derrida says is "euphoric, without paradox, without aporia, free of contradiction, without undecidabilities" (Derrida, 1998). The ghosts of curriculum Past, Present and Future reveal the blind spots within the Scrooge state's view of curriculum, both its unintentional and deliberate failings of sight. However, the spectres of school curriculum destabilise the Scrooge state's seemingly solid foundations and call its present existence into question.

Ghosts of Curriculum Past

Let us go back to "A Christmas Carol". The Ghost of Christmas Past shows Scrooge a spirit of community and kindness contrasting this with his own sense of isolation. What returns to Scrooge is a set of values and feelings that derive from social bonds that are not dependent on economic concerns. They are not constrained by the business of business.

As I said earlier, the Scrooge state is ultimately concerned about the business of business and the global capitalist market in the form of the knowledge economy. Such concerns flow directly, although not necessarily overtly, into its current approach to curriculum policy. This is largely about steering populations in the schooling system through graphs and grids. Students and teachers are seen as either under control or dangerously out of control. The Scrooge state tends to collapse accountability with accountancy and ability with docility. Then it worries about the costs associated with teacher flight, that is, teachers leaving the Australian teaching profession in droves.

The curriculum as graph and grid seeks to regulate people, knowledge and power. But it is haunted by the ghosts of curriculum past where school populations controlled themselves to a much greater extent. These particular curriculum ghosts arose in association with more decentralised approaches to knowledge, freedom and individuality. They arose in more generous and generative times. The Ghosts of Curriculum Past for the Scrooge state include, for example, school-based curriculum development, the negotiated curriculum, student-centred curriculum, democratic curriculum.

And what of teachers? Currently, teacher education institutions are often expected by governments to train student teachers in compliance – student teachers are to be taught curriculum cartography and accountancy and of course this results in teachers thinking through maps and numbers and thus practicing parched pedagogy. In essence they become thin-thinking para- professionals. But the teachers who haunt curriculum accountants and cartographers are, for example, teacher researchers, teachers as critically reflexive practitioners or inquirers, indeed, teachers as relatively autonomous professionals who can be trusted to educate young people and who don't need to be constantly measured and managed. Once, they were educated to become responsible professionals with expertise, judgement and creative capacity. Their employers respected their capacities. Once, they were educated to be practical intellectuals.

Such Ghosts of Curriculum Past rattle the foundations of current curriculum policy. They cause unease in curriculum policy circles. They not only challenge state fantasies of control and compliant populations but also point to the undecidability of curriculum as it is practiced in schools. The logic of practice is that knowledge is not readily mapped, steered or measured from above. On the ground, in schools, curriculum is not straightforwardly about cause and effect, actions and consequences. Indeed, less regulated knowledges arise from below, through the intimacies of the immediate, the day-by-day. As Yates explains in her Inaugural Professorial Lecture at Melbourne University, curriculum theory:

> asks us to think about what is being set up to be taught and learned, what is actually being taught, what is actually being learned, why agendas are taken up or not taken up, who benefits and loses, whose voice is heard and whose is silenced… Curriculum is concerned with effectiveness, but also with expansiveness and voices, and who gets a say. (Yate, 2005, p. 3)

The Ghosts of Curriculum Past do not allow curriculum accountants and cartographers to forget the leaky logics of practice and all that they imply. They point to the policy problems that arise through an obsession with counting and cartography. This obsession minimises the importance of what cannot be counted or mapped as David Boyle (2001) makes clear in his provocative book "The Tyranny of Numbers: Why Counting Can't Make us Happy".

Animating ghosts

Ghosts invite educators to do more than mourn their passing and live with their loss in a melancholic manner. They invite us to ask our selves, what ghosts should we let rest? What insights from them should we try to bring to life again? What ghosts should we try to animate? My view is that we should animate the ghosts that have the most fecundity; those with the greatest potential to start us thinking in powerful new ways. By this I mean those that provide *the starting points* for fresh thinking about how to address enduring, current and emerging educational and social issues and problems.

The ghost of curriculum past that I'd most like to animate is the ghost of teachers as intellectuals. Intellectuals are those who have "a highly developed ability to think, reason and understand especially in combination with wide knowledge" (Soukhanov, 1999) Creative intellectuals are those with "the ability to use the imagination to develop new and original ideas or things" (Soukhanov, 1999). Wise intellectuals are those with the ability to make sound, sensible and reliable judgments based on knowledge and experience. Practical intellectuals are those who can put these abilities to practical use. Education systems that animate these ghosts will not be staffed by docile or compliant teachers – teachers who think thin. Rather, they will be staffed by teachers who are creative, wise and practical intellectuals. And being thus they will be able to produce students with the abilities to think, judge and imagine and to put these abilities to practical use.

The Ghost of Curriculum Present

The Ghost of Christmas Present shows Scrooge the "ignorance" and "want" that is manifest in his world but which he has refused to see. It tells Scrooge that if he continues to deny these things he will ultimately make them worse.

Unlike Scrooge, the Scrooge state does not value ignorance. It values knowledge; well, mainly certain sorts of knowledge; mathematical, scientific, technological, functional literacy and problem solving. This is also the sort of knowledge most valued by knowledge economy policies and which is assessed by PISA of the OECD. But, of course the Scrooge state also likes to "value-add" and it has added matters of identity and values to the curriculum in such a way as to give them quite a high priority. The Scrooge state has added values via such things as civics, citizenship and values education. The Scrooge state is concerned about social cohesion or, more accurately the lack of it and the possible flow-on effects of such a lack for its economic agenda. The Scrooge state is also concerned about national and sub-national identity and about how to ensure, in a world on the move, that its citizens, especially its most economically productive citizens remain loyal to the Homeland. Values, add value to

the curriculum. So, in Australia for instance under the previous Liberal Commonwealth Government, schools were exhorted to promote in students the values associated with "care and compassion, doing your best, fair go, freedom, honesty and trustworthiness, integrity, respect, responsibility, understanding, tolerance and inclusion". Indeed this list of values is on the poster "Values for Australian Schooling" distributed to all schools when Brendan Nelson was the Commonwealth Minister for Education. The Australian flag heads the poster and a ghostly image of Simpson and his Donkey provides the back-drop – almost foreshadowing the Liberal's subsequent push for specifically Australian values.

Clearly then the Scrooge state cannot be accused, like Scrooge himself, of ignoring "ignorance and want". Nonetheless it is still haunted by the Ghost of Curriculum Present. This ghost is alert to a major aporia in contemporary curriculum policy on the matter of civics and values – a major failing of sight and insight.

It is a fundamental curriculum insight that schools cannot be separated from society; that values are not just individual they are also social. Curriculum theorists around the world acknowledge this. They acknowledge that what goes on outside of schools has a strong bearing on what happens inside them. Schools are not self-contained units that can seal themselves off from the outside world and easily teach things that contradict that outside world. The history of socially critical curriculum and critical pedagogy in schools tells us how difficult it is to teach against the grain of society, how complicated it is for schools to produce new sorts of citizens and how sophisticated curriculum and pedagogy must be to do this.

If society offers students certain sets of values and the school offers a very different set, how is this to be dealt with? For example, when civics is not very civil, when it is difficult to trust business and political leaders, sporting heroes and the press, how do schools best teach honesty, trustworthiness, integrity, respect? When society is dominated by competitive individualism, consumerism and hedonism, how do schools best teach about the happiness that arises from community and from decentring the self? When old people and the young are abused by those who supposedly care for them, and when young women are raped by their football "heroes", how do schools teach about empathy, care, compassion and responsibility? When multi-culturalism has given way to sectarian prejudice on a global as well as local scale how do schools teach understanding, tolerance and inclusion? In a world where global "geographies of misery" and poverty give way to "global geographies of anger" (Appadurai, 2006) and war how can the notion of "a fair go" be restricted to "Australian values" and Australian populations? These questions become particularly pressing when government policies reinforce rather than challenge prejudice and violence. These are sub national, national, international and global curriculum issues that need urgently to be addressed.

So, how can schools possibly teach values, civics and citizenship without adopting a critical standpoint, which takes into its purview such multi scalar issues? The Ghost of Curriculum Present reminds us that ignorance and want remain, that values can't be taught, learnt and practiced in a vacuum; left behind at the school gate as students enter and leave, or enclosed within protected national or state borders.

Animating ghosts

One set of ghosts I'd like to animate here is associated with socially critical curriculum; this does not reproduce the Scrooge state's timid and minimalist moral agenda. I'd like to summon a socially critical curriculum with a strong "how to" element. It will seek to teach students how to behave honourably and with integrity in the now and the yet to be, in the here and in the there. But further, it will recognise that healthy societies and institutions need positive dissent (Sunstein, 2003), particularly if governments become actively involved in "Silencing Dissent" (Hamilton & Maddison, 2007). Students will learn how to actively intervene for good in socially and politically significant issues of the day. Such socially critical curricula would for example unashamedly offer such things as anti violence education. It would recognise that violence occurs in many forms and operates on multiple scales and ensure that all types and scales are addressed; from abuse to war.

The second set of ghosts that I'd like to animate is associated with the blind spots of civics and citizenship education. Systems and schools need to work with enriched and multiple notions of citizenship, notions that speak to emerging forms of citizenship in sundry circumstances. Civics and citizenship are most commonly linked to the politics associated with national and sub national governments. However, major changes in various fields have provoked us to rethink power and politics and thus also civics and citizenship. Politics and citizenship exceed government and the nation. Take three quick examples of the citizenship education that schools should include.

First, it is obvious that citizens need to understand the increasing significance of the international governmental landscape – what is called polycentric world politics. This involves international agencies, NGOs etc. They need to have a sense of what various international agencies such as the WTO, the UN or ASEAN do and what they mean for different peoples around the world. Citizenship education should not only seek to produce the national citizens but global citizens; universal citizens. For instance, such citizens today would have an understanding of debates about the WTO, free trade and fair trade.

Second, new ICTs are always "disruptive technologies". It is well known that they disrupt old business, old entertainment, old consumption and old educational models. But it is less well known that they also disrupt old models of citizenship. Media-savvy

citizens understand the ways in which media-consumer culture, in its many and varied forms, mediates and manipulates power, meaning and identity. They understand the cultural politics of our increasingly media and commodity saturated lives. They are able to distinguish between information, knowledge, entertainment and advertising (Kenway & Bullen, 2001) – to distinguish truth from spin, PR, "public communication" call it what you will. In a time when it is so difficult to tell the difference between these, as Burton (2007) makes clear in "Inside Spin: The Dark Underbelly of the PR Industry", media citizenship becomes more and more crucial. Media- savvy citizens also know how to actively participate in the cultural politics of the media and the commodity; how to be dissenting media citizens who, for example, can put into the public sphere stories "from below", stories that are other than mainstream and market driven. Being an active media citizen is not just about a fascination with the latest gadgetry in the age of personalised micro-media and so it is not just about techno-functional literacy, or even critical literacy. It is about the uses of media, the uses of culture for active citizenship. Current examples include web activist sites and various forms of self-publishing – news blogs (web logging) or what some call "citizen journalism".

Third, biotechnology is another disruptive technology that brings into focus new forms of citizenship that schools should address. Clearly, biotechnology has provoked much "Epochal thinking, many utopian and dystopian pronouncements and dire warnings of slippery slopes" (Rose, 2006). Biotechnology is not commonly thought of in terms of citizenship. However, in the worlds of biomedical technology and pharmaceutical biotechnology, for example, citizenship is very much an issue. Such technologies raise questions about what it is to be both human and humane? As Rose argues, we have already become "biological citizens" in a biosocial (first) world that is concerned about the changing relationship between biology, technology and "emergent forms of life". Herein, groups with similar genetic disorders or health conditions seek to have scientific, legal and political expertise put towards their own particular health concerns. They campaign for the public's hearts and minds as well as for funds. Biological citizens are implicated in bioethical debates about such things as genomic medicine, genetic counselling, reproductive technology (designer babies, saviour siblings), psychiatric, mind altering drugs (Prozac), smart (cognitive enhancing) drugs and cosmetic therapies. Often such biological citizens are "ethical pioneers" who must make decisions about their biological rights and responsibilities. They are "at the frontiers of the practical ethical dilemmas that will face more and more of us in the future" (Rose, 2006). Citizenship education would equip students with the scientific knowledge and the sense of scientific responsibility to allow them to be informed and prudent biological citizens. But they won't stop at this bioethical frontier. They will also learn about the "everyday bioethical" issues associated with global health inequalities and global health pandemics. They will learn about the links between

world poverty and early morbidity from preventable illnesses such as diphtheria, tetanus and malaria. They will raise questions about why life in the third world is seen as less valuable than life in the first world. They will learn about the links between bio-capitalism, pharmaceutical companies and global geo politics (Kenway, Bullen, Fahey, & Robb, 2006, chap. 5). And, as universal media-savvy biological citizens they will learn how to take active responsibility for humane intervention.

The Ghost of Curriculum Yet To Be

The Ghost of Christmas Yet To Be shows Scrooge his own lonely death. It does not show him what he desires to see. Scrooge wants reassurance that the decision he makes to change the present course of his life will change his future. Such reassurance cannot be given to him.

The Scrooge state is obsessed with the future; with "future proofing". Numerous curriculum policy and education system documents make proclamations about the ways the future will be and how schools must prepare students for it. As if living in the now is not enough. Such curriculum futurology is often focussed, instrumentally, on the world of work and on the new sorts of worker that the global knowledge economy will require. Individualised workers are called upon to be more autonomous, self–monitoring, reflexive, enterprising and cross-cultural in order to make themselves employable. The recent OECD report on "The Definition and Selection of Key Competencies Project" (2005) is an example of such curriculum futurology. It has identified three key areas for personal, social and economic well being in the 21st century. These are: "interacting in socially heterogeneous groups; acting autonomously; and using tools interactively". Further, the OECD has been the inspiration behind much "scenario building" and "futures thinking". But what are the blind spots of Futures thinking? Why does it choose certain "trends" on which to build its "scenarios"?. Which trends does it leave out and why? More generally what blind spots does the Ghost of Curriculum Future alert us to?

Scrooge's experience suggests that there can be no guarantees, no certainties about the future. Further, Derrida's notion of hauntology suggests that the narrow and linear view of history implied in much futures oriented thinking and curricula is problematic. Ghosts suggest that the present does not necessarily imply the future, just as the past is not necessarily replicated in the present. Futures curricula and futures thinking are guesswork based on the selection of certain trends and the diminishment of others; simply, they conjure up a future that may not happen, a future workplace that may not exist and a future worker that may not be called into being. They suggest certainty when only uncertainty is possible.

I noted earlier, the "being there" of the spectre is highly ambiguous. The ghost is both present and absent; it is in the present but also in the past and the future. This casts into doubt what we think we know. The Ghost of Curriculum Future suggest that "futures curricula" are possibly only the "now" dressed up as the "yet to be", today dressed up as tomorrow.

Although the ghost of the future indicates that the future can only ever be uncertain, this does not absolve us from taking some responsibility for it, for as Lucy points out "we are prone to forgetfulness and need ghosts to remind us of our responsibility" (2004, p. 114). The question of course is how do we take responsibility; with regard to what, on what grounds and in whose interests? The Ghost of Curriculum Future invites curriculum policy to take responsibility for an ethical, not just an instrumental view of the future. Indeed, I suggest that the only grounds for taking responsibility for the future can be ethical. I offer two examples, work and climate.

With regard to the world of work; ghosts of curriculum future ask: should the curriculum simply seek to instrumentally bring into being the "new" knowledge worker for the "new" global work order? Or does it have some responsibility to ask questions about the values and politics that are manifest or implied in this anticipated world of work – for instance industrial relations, casualisation, job insecurity, time poverty, work-life balance and more broadly, the end of the social contract between workers and employers? It is interesting in this context to note the role played by French school students in the recent industrial conflict in France. They took part in mass mobilisation to defeat the government's new workplace law the CPE (First Employment Contract) which unfairly discriminated against them in employment.

Taking ethical responsibility for the future means caring for nature, for the climate, for the weather and making this a top priority. This means acknowledging the severe and well documented high consequence risks for nature and humanity caused by consumption and excess, growth and greed and wanton waste in the over-developed nations of the world. It means the active pursuit of a more equitable relationship between economics and ecology. It even points to the importance of teaching students about what Singer (1993) calls the "paradox of hedonism"; the lack of connection between economic growth, happiness and well-being – including the well-being of all species. But, can an accountant's and a cartographer's view of the curriculum respond to such a ghostly call for responsibility and ethics? Is the moral philosophy of the Scrooge state sufficiently rich and robust? And is the Scrooge state too self interested to ask the curriculum to deal with genuine global, not just national or sub national problems?

When Marley spoke to Scrooge he said:

> I cannot rest, I cannot stay, I cannot linger anywhere. My spirit never walked beyond our counting house ... never roved beyond the narrow limits of our money-changing hole; and weary journeys lie before me! ... I am here ... to warn you, that you have yet a chance and a hope of escaping my fate. (Dickens, 2003, p. 48)

Ghosts evoke epistemological tremor. They haunt the places they have been excluded from and take the certainty (humbug) out of curriculum certainties. Further, haunting involves the return of what is and has been ignored. The ghosts lead Scrooge to question the very foundations of his existence. Towards the end of the book he says: "I will live in the Past, the Present, and the Future. The Spirits of all Three shall strive within me. I will not shut out the lessons that they teach" (Dickens, 2003, p. 110). Scrooge is haunted and his response is hospitality. Can the Scrooge state be similarly hospitable to the ghosts of Curriculum, Past, Present and Future? Can it "interfere, for good, in human matters" or has it "lost the power for ever" (Dickens, 2003, p. 52)?

Acknowledgements

References

Appadurai, A. (2006). *Fear of small numbers: An essay on the geography of anger.* London: Duke University.

Boyle, D. (2001). *The tyranny of numbers: Why counting can't make us happy.* London: Harper Collins.

Burton, B. (2007). *Inside spin: The dark underbelly of the PR industry.* Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Derrida, J. (1994). *Spectres of Marx: The state of the debt, the work of mourning, and the New International* (P. Kamuf, trans.). New York: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1998). *Intellectual courage: An interview, culture machine, generating research in culture and theory.* Retrieved September 23, 2007, from http://culturemachine.tees.ac.uk/Cmach/Backissues/j002/Articles/art_derr.htm

Dickens, C. (2003) *A Christmas Carol and other Christmas Writing.* London: Penguin. (Original work published 1843)

Hamilton, C., & Maddison, S. (Eds). (2007). *Silencing dissent: How the Australian government is controlling public opinion and stifling debate.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Kenway J., & Bullen, E. (2001). *Consuming children: Education-Entertainment-Advertising.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Kenway, J., Bullen, E., Fahey, J., & Robb, S. (2006). *Haunting the Knowledge Economy.* Routledge: International Library of Sociology.

Lucy, N. (2004). *A Derrida Dictionary.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Rose, N. (2006). *ABC Radio National - Background Briefing: 1 January 2006 - Will Biomedicine Transform Society?* [Transcript]. Retrieved April 22, 2006 from http://www.abc.net.au/rn/talks/bbing/stories/s1539272.htm

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2002). *The Communist manifesto.* London: Penguin. (Original work published 1848)

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (1996). *The knowledge-based economy.* Paris: OECD.

Singer, P. (1993). *How are we to live? Ethics in the age of self-interest.* Melbourne: The Text Publishing Company.

Soukhanov, A. (Ed.). (1999). Encarta World English Dictionary [Computer software].

Sunstein, C. R. (2003). Why Societies Need Dissent. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.

Yates, L. (2005). *What can schools do? Knowledge, social identities and the changing world.* Inaugural Professorial Lecture, Education Faculty, Melbourne University, Australia.