

11-22-2022

Using Currere and Lens-switching as Critical Inquiry - The Case Study of Voices of Baltimore: Life Under Segregation

Morna McDermott McNulty
Towson University, mmcdermott@towson.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/nwjte>



Part of the [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

McDermott McNulty, Morna (2022) "Using Currere and Lens-switching as Critical Inquiry - The Case Study of Voices of Baltimore: Life Under Segregation," *Northwest Journal of Teacher Education*: Vol. 17 : Iss. 3 , Article 6.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15760/nwjte.2022.17.3.6>

This open access Article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License \(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0\)](#). All documents in PDXScholar should meet [accessibility standards](#). If we can make this document more accessible to you, [contact our team](#).

Using Currere and Lens-switching as Critical Inquiry - The Case Study of Voices of Baltimore: Life Under Segregation

Abstract

This paper explores how experiencing the film *Voices of Baltimore: Life Under Segregation* (Homana, et al., 2017) becomes an avenue for practicing anti-racist critical self-exploration. The author considers how an experience of “lens-switching” in tandem with the process of currere (Pinar, 1978) creates nodes, or intersections, between the two where the narrative framework of the film viewer is interrupted by a different (and disruptive) narrative framework. Lens-switching becomes self-interrogation, through the four phases of currere, providing opportunity for historical dislocation; a process that alters self-perception – or, “decolonizing the mind” (Baszile, 2015, p. 124) – and then integrates an altered perception of self and its relation to justice, that leads toward action. The data included in this paper indicate how this film (and others like it) might provoke a call for replacing dominant White-centric “liberal” understandings of historical events like desegregation with a new language, and a new lens – one centered on Afro-centric narrative frameworks.

Keywords

currere, African-American history, curriculum, social justice, equity

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Cover Page Footnote

Special thanks for the support and keen editing eye of Dr. Denise Taliaferro Baszile

“The best arguments in the world won’t change a person’s mind. The only thing that can do that is a good story” (Powers, 2018, p. 488).

Introduction

This paper explores how experiencing the film *Voices of Baltimore: Life Under Segregation* (Homana, et al., 2017) becomes an avenue for practicing anti-racist critical self-exploration. The author considers how an experience of “lens-switching” in tandem with the process of *currere* (Pinar, 1978) creates nodes, or intersections, between the two where the narrative framework of the film viewer is interrupted by a different (and disruptive) narrative framework. Lens-switching becomes self-interrogation, through the four phases of *currere*, providing opportunity for historical dislocation; a process that alters self-perception -- or, “decolonizing the mind” (Baszile, 2015, p. 124) -- and then integrates an altered perception of self and its relation to justice, that leads toward action. The data included in this paper indicates how this film (and others like it) might provoke a call for replacing dominant White-centric “liberal” understandings of historical events like desegregation with a new language, and a new lens – one centered on Afro-centric narrative frameworks.

Voices of Baltimore, made in 2017 by three faculty members at Towson University in conjunction with seven notable African American figures¹, captures and preserves the rich oral histories of an aging and diminishing population of African Americans who 1) grew up in the Mason/Dixon border area of Baltimore, and 2) who lived through the era of legal segregation (i.e., Jim Crow south). The goal of the film was to record digitally and present these narratives through audio and film documentation. The narratives document the relevant lives of individuals who attended segregated schools and/or desegregation before and following the 1954 Supreme Court *Brown v Board of Education* ruling. In the words of Angela Davis (2013):

Regimes of racial segregation were not disestablished because of the work of leaders and presidents and legislators but rather because of the fact that ordinary people adopted a critical stance in the way in which they perceived their relationship to reality. Social realities that may have appeared inalterable, impenetrable, came to be viewed as malleable and transformable; and people learned how to imagine what it might mean to live in a world that was not so exclusively governed by the principle of White supremacy. This collective consciousness emerged within the context of social struggles. (para 23)

Rather than fitting history to fit the liberal or progressive White narrative, *Voices of Baltimore* becomes a challenge, to disrupt and reframe that understanding, and to merge with the realities of history as told through the stories of those who lived it. Essentially, the lens of the film parallels a new mental, or emotional, “lens” for the viewer.

The film -- both in the making of it, and its content (much of which occurred through emergence) -- is a work of *currere*. In the film’s introduction, Judge Robert Bell articulates the importance of reflecting on “how one lived,” and the importance of that to our shared history. It was the words of Judge Bell that invokes a call to *currere*:

¹ Judge Robert Bell, Treopia Washington Green, Dr. Walter Gill, Francis Gill, Evelyn Chatmon, Louis Diggs, Dr. Patricia Welch.

I suspect that when you get right down to it, the story of how one lived during a particular era is important to future generations, particularly if it's an era in which the society's supposed goals were undermined or were not being followed in the appropriate way and were inconsistent with the mandates of the Constitution and the laws. How people reacted to that and how they responded, is of course of relevance to those who come after, so as to ensure that perhaps, it won't happen again. And so, that entered my mind because she told me that it had to do with how we lived in a segregated society, a society which was antithetical to what was supposed to be the norm. And I thought that it was appropriate to sit down and talk about that. (R. Bell, in Homana et al., 2017, 05:20)

The seven film interviews were directed by one simple and open-ended question offered by the narrator and interviewer, Dr. Franklin Campbell Jones: *Tell us what it was like growing up in Baltimore during the Jim Crow era.* Although the interviews were conducted individually, each of the seven narrative journeys address the same four consistent themes that speaks to the idea of a community-currere; or a shared four-phase experience. Those shared ideas also became the four overarching themes of the film: 1. Call to action, 2. Insulation/isolation, 3. Community expectations, 4. Segregation- Then and now. Each of these four segments also brings forward one of the four aspects of the currere process.

The call to action theme was evidenced as each of the seven film participants explained how and why they felt compelled, at great personal risk, to become a part of history. Insulation/isolation was a duality used to describe how their historically black and segregated communities were places of security and support, whilst also being isolated from access to mainstream (White) social and economic capital. Community expectations was a predominant theme in each of their personal histories; how much their individual success rests on the support they received from the neighborhood and prevalence of high academic expectations. Segregation-then and now, the final film segment, brings their individual and shared histories forward, and to re-examine our telling of history so as to prevent the past from re-occurring in the future.

Lens-switching is a process of using multimedia to critically analyze one's own perception of racism and history. Because the history of the Civil Rights movement in the United States is often through a Eurocentric, or white-washed, lens, from recasting Martin Luther King Jr. as a man who had "a dream," while omitting his more critical socialist leanings to teaching children that Rosa Parks was simply "tired" on the bus, rather than a powerful organizer for the NAACP, we often recast our understanding of Civil Rights in ways that appease White liberal guilt. These same narratives oversimplify the complexities around race and justice that continue to perplex us today as well.

Art, Storied Inquiry and Lens-Switching

All art forms are modes of communication, and as such have the potential to express critical socio-political ideas, such as the Radical Black Art movement (See R.D.G. Kelley, 2003). Willinsky (2006) calls us to the task of encouraging educators to see themselves as public intellectuals in his argument that by making their work public, teachers might better envision themselves as curriculum leaders in which their standing as public (and moral) intellectuals can be enacted through the arts and media. In keeping with that goal, this paper focuses on the

medium of film, and argues that film becomes a means of active witnessing via the currere and lens-switching processes.

When used as a form of social discourse, film leads to “the production of artifacts” (Pinar et al., 1995, p. 593) that reveals existing conditions or experiences, and also “functions to create anew -- or reconceptualize -- that situation” (ibid). Lubow (2020) argues that documentary film and photography avoid the solipsism that evolved within so many other art genres that “turned away from realism” (para 3), and abdicated “both responsibility and power” (ibid). Active witnessing (as a function of film making and viewing) reclaims responsibility and power of an art process and narrative, becoming a form of critical pedagogy; anti-racist teaching ideally ought to be an act of witnessing. The goal of the film, like the street photography movement of the 1960s, was “not to reform life but to know it, not to persuade but to understand” (*New Documents*, n.d., para 5). It is this thread of turning toward, *or with*, another which brings the inner into outer being, and collective external systems into transformational entanglements with the sticky layers of individual identity re-construction. Witnessing is not merely watching, or seeing with the disembodied eye. Seeing, as such, decenters marginalized persons into the position of a spectre, ghost or apparition.

Ellsworth (2005) argues that a relational learning experience, “acknowledges that to be alive and to inhabit a body is to be continuously and radically in relation with the world, with others, and with what we make of them” (p. 4). Story telling relates us to the world through a language that facts and statistics alone cannot. Storytelling allows us to relate to another’s experience that is like our own and promotes empathy. Story telling assembles multiple points of voice, and interrupts singular (and stereotyped narratives). Through stories of lived experiences listeners/viewers of such stories have the potential to engage with a rich complexity of complicated intersections between individual and shared values. Often times, such intersections reveal as much contradiction as they do similarities. Many scientists refer to this as an act of “complementarity ... the concept that one single thing, when considered from different perspectives, can seem to have very different or even contradictory properties” (Wilczek, 2021, p. 23).

Lens-switching is a process of interruption, interrogation, and integration that aligns closely with a mode of currere which draws on critical race and feminist theories (Baszile, 2015). The goal is to interrupt and interrogate the white-washed historical narrative shared by the majority of film viewers (prior to watching the film). Additionally, shared aspects of the film participants’ individual stories, taken together, reveal a currere of community, or “educating through testimony” (p. 125). Lens-switching uses critical discourse through currere to dismantle Eurocentric ways of enacting resistance or defining what freedom, democracy or justice mean.

Currere to Witness and Challenging the White Narrative

Currere is a four-phase process (Pinar, 1978) that connects autobiographic examinations with education pedagogy and curriculum. Currere as a process, and the film *Voices of Baltimore*, are both forms of curricula that include autobiography as central to the learning process. In the first phase, **regressive**, an individual recalls the past. In the second, **progressive**, phase one pauses in the present to think about the future (bracketing), characterized by a reflection on the possibilities for the future in terms of how they manifest themselves in the present. The third, **analytical**, phase is when one analyzes the past in present time, and the future in light of the process of recalling the past. This may also be called recursion. As Pinar (1978) contends, the

analytic stage asks us to answer the following question, “How is the future present in the past, the past in the future, and the present in both?” (p. 312). Finally, in the **synthetical** phase, an individual determines meaning and encourages imagined transformation.

The four phases of *currere* impact my role as a viewer of the film by using those four steps when intertwined with lens-switching: 1) I recall my own history, 2) I reexamine that history using the film, which requires one to re-examine one’s identity/narrative as shaped by that history, 3) the past is reshaped by a critical re-examination of it in light of the present, and 4) in order to affect the future actions in one’s role as an anti-racist ally/accomplice. As an exercise in lens-switching, it is during the third phase of *currere*, in bracketing the past and future, that viewers with White privilege can “pause” their own narrative, and stand alongside (with-ness as witness, Apol, 2020), the *currere* of another; one which offers a different history. *Currere* in this fashion takes us from the “I” to the “we” (T. Poetter, personal communication, June 4, 2019).

The goal of lens-switching, from which pieces of storied experience of others can transform our own *currere* process, is to elevate the facets of a shared racialized experience living with/through an oppressive system but to do so without “essentializing” any position or narrative of a marginalized peoples (Baszile, 2015, p. 122). These facets of the collective stories (indicated in the four film themes) reveal shared qualities of history that resonate across past, present, and future events; qualities that are different than those shared experiences of persons benefitting from White privilege. The facets of historical experience translate into a story that is told “about” a people and the language they tell about themselves. The historical “Black experience” told in this film indicates a different way of being and interconnecting individual and community- a departure (by way of survival) from the language of rugged individualism and competition that permeates the ideology of free market designed to the benefit of White people.

Lens-switching, which involves critically engaged listening, alters the way in which we (the viewers) see ourselves. This extensive process of self-reflection (*currere*) becomes a way to shift the language used in the formation of identity and of our relationship... the obligation ... to others and to a transformation of structural inequities and the language we use to re-tell our history.

Whose narrative are we telling? Transforming histories of race and racism in the United States will take more than re-telling the same stories in wider spaces more often. It will demand a re-writing of an entirely new story about segregation and desegregation and about where we are today. Rather than fitting Black stories to fit the liberal or progressive White narrative with which so many of us were raised and conditioned, the challenge is to disrupt that narrative and reframe that understanding to merge with the realities of history as told through the stories of those who lived it. Rather, especially those of us who live with White privilege need to configure a White conception of self within a Black framework. Knowing the framework is partial and unfinished with intersections of class and gender threaded through and troubling any attempts to essentialize the outcome

To listen as witness, and to challenge one’s privilege means to re-evaluate what we understand about the history of segregation and de-segregation, to replace the existing White liberal framework of “progress” with a critical Afro-centric narrative built upon the *currere* of a Black experience. The second way in which this film acts as a form of *currere* is for the viewer - - most notably, *White viewers*² and the progressive liberal narrative that drives the dominant

² While “White viewers” cannot be assumed to share a singular point of view, the term here alludes to a White framework of history which reflects the interests that most align with White privilege and the dominant perspective of events.

assumptions about this moment in history. *Voices of Baltimore* is not singular as an experience of lens-switching or application of currere toward anti-racist goals, many notable musicians, artists and film makers have this capacity as well. However, it was this film-making and viewing experience that inspired the connection with critical race currere and a call toward the idea of lens-switching, as a process of currere for witnessing and re-casting history. As the author has argued elsewhere, (Vandiver, et al., in review):

We must comprehend and assume collective responsibility for incorrect narratives told on behalf of marginalized people. Since oral histories are essential to Black ontology and epistemology, we position the seven primary desegregation narratives as a form of resistance and *re-centering* of power into the hands of the marginalized. (n.p.)

Currere, Race, and the Telling of History

Currere through film is the process of engaging with an aesthetic narrative that unfolds the storied experience of an entire community (a shared currere) and how that experience intersects with the viewers own currere process when engaged with critical self-examination. Currere is a medium through which experience, self, and narrative itself are transformed. As Pinar (1978) suggests, “The method reduces the distance between the researcher and subject by making the researcher the subject and allows for deeper and clearer understanding of the present by outlining the past, present, and future” (p. 316). As a form of critical pedagogy, this process also includes a call for collective action, which “can therefore provide background knowledge for students to use in conjunction with understandings gleaned through the autobiographies to affect change” (Smith, 2013, p. 6).

Understanding the self and the other is a much more profound understanding than that of pedagogy content knowledge. Systemic racism affects the factors which an individual might take into consideration in the process of currere; factors that matter for someone of a Black lived experience which is different than those for someone with a lived experience of White privilege.

In responding to the film interview prompt, “Tell me what it was like...” the seven participants were examining the four phases of *currere*: **Regressive**: They recall the past. **Progressive**: They pause in the present to think about the future. **Analytic**: They analyze in present time, the future in light of the process of recalling the past. **Synthetic**: They call for transformation, collective action. In an online panel discussion held in 2021, Evelyn Chatmon shared a moment in the progressive phase, as she explained how during the filming, “All the bad emotions coming to surface – I could see it in my face (watching herself in the film) ... The minute I started talking about it, it became alive for me again” (E. Chatmon, personal communication, February 24, 2021). During this same panel discussion, the film participants reflected again on the experiences which they described while being interviewed during the film, unfolding different phases of currere of a community, and how that community of “we” affected the “I” they would each become:

-Regressive phase (looking at the past from the lens of the present): “Everyone cared for each other in the community. Even growing up at time there were White people who saw my potential and pushed me ... and there were White people who were as racist as the day is long.” (W. Gill, personal communication, February 24, 2021)

-Progressive moment (lessons from life): “When you have somebody telling you you’re special it helps you deal with things that are not good. People who are for you and people who are against you. I could be resilient because I had a bunch of people telling me I was special and that offset the racists and the people who spat on me.” (T. Washington-Green, personal communication, February 24, 2021)

-Synthetical moment (a moment of deeper understanding): “We are undoing the racist narrative about Black identity taught by White people and re- writing identity and history simultaneously” (E. Chatmon, personal communication, February 24, 2021)

The author illustrates elsewhere (Vandiver et al., under review) how the myth of meritocracy and the narrative of free market capitalism leaves together an invisible set of expectations and values which shape one’s four phases. This film making (for the participants) and viewing experience (for viewers) evokes the emergence of a critical race currere, one which specifically focuses on storied aspects of the different racialized experiences. A consistent pattern across all participants’ narratives, and within each of the four film themes, is the significance of one’s own regressive past, and the value of one’s own experience to a future committed to “a whole race of people” (P. Welch, in Homana et al., 2017, 31:05). Judge Bell reiterates that saying, “you weren’t just doing it for yourself, you were doing it for the good of the community” (45:03). In other words, *my story is your story* ... knowing that our success and failures, our pain and our joys are interdependent.

This is not to suggest that there is a single “Black” or “White” narrative. In a truly hermeneutic sense (Gadamer, 1977) the processes of lens-switching and shared currere avoid essentializing identity or totalizing narrative, of a person or an entire race. However, the author suggests that truth seeking is an event, or experience, in which we find ourselves changed. It is important to understand that this film is not intended to translate into a “single voice” (Baszile, 2015, p. 60) and that, “despite shared identities, movement participants are committed to divergent aims, and sometimes directly opposed strategies or tactics” (ibid). It acknowledges how the dynamics of race, gender, class and other important markers of self intersect and inflect in the perpetually evolving question: who am I? (p.119) and, “how might other people with other ways of knowing contribute to the conversation” (ibid) about history and identity particular to the construction of White identity which is uninterrupted by privilege (such as Eurocentric superiority, colonialism and exploitation; all rendered invisible by the guise of neoliberalism, free market competition and meritocracy) as part of the process.

So much of what transpired between 1954 and today remains left out of history books, resulting in racist assumptions about the success or failure of Black people and communities of color today. For instance, “when the neighborhoods desegregated, and the fabric of those relationships was diluted, it left an observable economic and resource gap in African American communities” (Vandiver et al., under review). At the same time, while those living in White America adjusted to the increasingly individualized and self-reliant culture of the 1980s, Black individuals began to fall increasingly through the systemic and economic cracks. Loss of community meant a loss of opportunities. Public integrated services became despairingly inequitable. Public pools, parks, community centers, and other services were closed or defunded. Home ownership was replaced with absentee landlords, fewer businesses and employment opportunities. Redlining and blockbusting suppressed the Black vote in traditionally African American communities. Industrial jobs disappeared, while more businesses privatized and deregulated, and capitalism skyrocketed in the 1980s. The once self-sustaining historically Black communities were disrupted, outsourced, and defunded. As expressed in section four of *Voices of*

Baltimore, “the retaliation of Black uprisings in the 1980s and 90s, and into the 21st century are public outcries of injustice and disservice in historically African American communities” (Hill 2016, in Vandiver, et al., under review).

Lens-switching folds itself into a community currere of “we” of shared values and experiences, and its re-telling in the film offers White allies and accomplices the opportunity to radically re-imagine their own, and to have a profound psychic change which, to have any effect, must be followed by action. Lens-switching is not a temporary feel-good event, it is a means to surrender perceptions of who we think we are. What does the story of segregation and desegregation become, and the language used to frame the narrative impact self-reflection and understanding of identity when told using a “Black narrative” lens instead of a liberal White framework? Lens-switching results in a new way of seeing and being in the world.

The film asks, *How are these narratives differ from the dominant narrative?* without assuming that all “Black experience are the same” (Baszile, 2015, p. 122). The answer to this question is embedded in regressive phase of currere, where we “remember the people, events, and moments of our educational lives that have marked our becoming in significant ways” (p. 124). The purpose of the currere process for these film participants was not simply self-awareness but that in the telling they can, “Carry the banner-rich knowledge to be handed off from generation to generation” (F. CampbellJones, personal communication, February 24, 2021).

As an alternative to a White-washed history of most textbooks, this narrative is also particular to the deconstruction of a White identity uninterrupted by privilege (such as Eurocentric superiority, colonialism and exploitation; all rendered invisible by the guise of neoliberalism, free market competition and meritocracy) as part of the process. Can we interrupt that? As a White person (who co-produced and co-edited this film) I asked myself, *What is my understanding of history of oppression in this society and how is my role, or sense of self, defined by the construction of this narrative?* Lens-switching means, “Undoing the racist narratives about Black identity taught by White people and re writing identity and history simultaneously” (F. CampbellJones, personal communication, February 24, 2021).

Instead of interpreting Black stories through a White liberal lens, White viewers ought to allow these stories to serve as a vehicle for re interpreting themselves, and how they use Whiteness as the patina upon which to paint history. Lens-switching becomes part of the synthetical stage, where, “one should attempt to extract the existential meaning of the present and to integrate the three other forms of intellectualization into a comprehensive whole that includes the physical self” (Khaled, 2014, para 19). The physical (and intellectual self) are re-positioned to avert revisionist history, and instead engages with a revised understanding of self. We must work to re arrange White privilege, rather than allowing unchecked White privilege to re-arrange history.

Discussion and Further Considerations

The term code switching commonly refers to students who use one language or code of social interactions at home and another set of codes in school. Critical engagement with visual media such as film creates a lens-switching as an opportunity for White allies to switch their own liberal historical narratives with a set of truths lived by “Others” such as the film participants. Like currere, the active viewing experience of lens-switching, “reduces the distance between the researcher, the subject, and the self” (Smith, 2013, p. 8). It becomes an opportunity to engage critically and dialogically with the film participants, a process through which the “I” of my own

currere is critically interwoven with the currere of the film participants (as unfolded through their story-telling narration). How does currere inform my work as a White ally/ “accomplice”? As one White male film viewer articulated:

Before watching, I had been educated that segregation stayed in the south. The film, being focused on Baltimore, made me question the history I was taught to be proud of. The film made me want to learn more about behind-the-scenes history and what is actually happening. (personal communication, February 24, 2021)

This process of film viewing as critical self-reflection supports the theory that “decolonization requires us to exercise our sovereignties differently, and reconfigure our communities based on shared experiences, ideals, and visions, creating a relationship framework” (Walia, 2015). One film viewer stated during a group discussion how this film created a, “lived history from the participants’ point of view,” and how “looking back is looking forward” (personal communication, February 24, 2021).

What does this mean for me as a White person with privilege committed to anti-racist praxis and community justice? Baszile (2015), speaking of Grace Lee Boggs asks, “What compels us to act?” (p. 162). Lens-switching through currere provokes as two-sided transformation: Self and systemic, or what Tipu’s Tiger (2015) calls “revolutions within revolutions” (p. 89). Using the film with this goal in mind creates a deep critical listening and a means for repositioning ourselves in history from another point of view (albeit temporarily), long enough so that upon a return to our own consciousness, we can find ourselves changed. Lens-switching as a means for active “witnessing.” Film and story-telling are potential ways of creating what Apol a “with-ness” (2020, p. 3) which is relational.

In our four phases of an “I and Other” co-currere process, White privilege becomes a site of “witness” from which one can carry the message. It is not to “stand beside” and “watch/report” with an epistemology or ontology of justice, but to be intertwined across and through every facet of being, or becoming, within a collective persistent positionality of action, to: 1. Function “not only as an observer of political crises but also as a participant in them” (Engels in Apol, 2020, p. 71), and 2. To focus on “the ways that social structures are embodied as lived experiences” (ibid).

This process is not without its limitations. First, the author agrees with the argument made by Gatzambide-Fernandez that, “art does not change anything” (2009, p. 78). Neither documentary film making nor film viewing are inherently liberatory actions. Rather, the suggestion is that lens-switching, as a process of currere, invites opportunity toward “creative solidarity” (ibid). A documentary film, by virtue of being an art form, does not inherently transform anyone’s thinking. It is what we do with it that matters. As Desai (2009) argues, we need to “develop a politics of the imagination in schools and universities that strategically uses the power of the image to ‘unframe’ the serious issues that we face today by asking critical questions that envision alternative just futures” (p. 25).

Second, we must be ever aware of the, “tension between concerns over a racialized solipsism and the rejoinder that arguing against autobiography is akin to catering to the power relations that the critics are trying to avoid,” in order to remain “self-reflective, progressive and critically cognizant” (Smith, 2013, p. 6).

Most importantly, this paper avoids overgeneralizations such as that there exists a singular Black historical narrative. Instead, the author argues that lens-switching, “antagonizes

many of these assumptions by considering intergenerational factors within Black narratives to offer greater nuance and complexity” (Vandiver et al., 2021, in review).

The film *Voices of Baltimore*, when actively viewed using lens-switching and currere processes, provides a tangible way for White allies to become accomplices, those who are “compelled to become accountable and responsible to each other,” because, “that is the nature of trust” (ibid). Lens-switching as a means of moving from ally to accomplice means to challenge the consolidation of the progressive narrative into a recycling of old paradigms that frames as social justice coalitions and allies within acceptable terms. In other words, “The ally paradigm ideologically positions Whites as those who assist and people of color as those who need assistance, thereby maintaining oppressive hierarchies” (Powell & Kelly, 2017, p. 42). Necessary re-examination of one’s positionality in relation to privilege and an active willingness to transform that system are necessary for any approach for White accomplices. They are, “realized through mutual consent and build trust. They don’t just have our backs; they are at our side, or in their own spaces confronting and Unsettling colonialism” (Indigenous Action Media, 2015, p.86).

Because the film makers did not follow up with viewers to determine how watching the film might have changed their actions, I acknowledge that this concept is still largely theoretical, and that more studies will have to be conducted to assess the long-range theory-to-action implications. As film narrator Franklin CampbellJones asks “Where do you feel you fit into this story?” He concludes, “the story isn’t over and the work isn’t done and there is a lot of work to do. Some of us go to sleep with this on our minds” (personal communication, February 24, 2021).

References

- Apol, L. (2020). *Poetry, inquiry and Rawanda: Engaging with the lives of others*. NY: Springer.
- Baszile, D. (2015). Critical race/feminist currere. In M. HeB. Schultz, & W. Schubert *The Sage guide to curriculum in education* (pp. 119-126). SAGE Publications, Inc., <https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781483346687.n19>
- Davis, A. (2013) ‘Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Closures and Continuities.’ *Birkbeck Annual Law lecture, London 25 October 2013*. Retrieved from <http://criticallegalthinking.com/2013/11/25/transcription-angela-davis-freedom-constant-struggle-closures-continuities/>
- Desai, D. (2009). Imagining justice in times pf perpetual war: Notes for the classroom. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 6(2), 6-26. doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2009.10411734
- Ellsworth, E. (2005). *Places of learning: Media, architecture, pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Gadamer, H. (1977). *Philosophical hermeneutics*. Translated and edited by D. Linge. University of CA Press.
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2009). Toward creative solidarity in the “next’ movement of curriculum work. In Malewski (Ed.) *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 78-94). Routledge.
- Homana, G., McNulty, M. & CampbellJones, F. (Directors). (2017). *Voices of Baltimore: Life under segregation*. [Film]. Project Voice Productions.
- Kelley, R.D.G. (2003). *Freedom dreams: The Black radical imagination*. Beacon Press.
- Khaled, P. (2014). *Curriculum, currere, Autobiography: Do you see what I see?* International Infrastructure Conference (IICON 2014) E-Proceedings, 3-4 December,

2014. Kuala Lumpur: IUKL Publication.
- Lubow, A. (2020). Capturing life as they see it. *New York Times*; art section, p. 11.
- Indigenous Action Media (2015). Accomplices, not allies. In C. Milstein (Ed.), *Taking sides*, (pp. 85-97). AK Press.
- New Documents. (Feb 28-May 7, 1967). Modern Museum of Art. Exhibition. Retrieved from <https://www.moma.org/calendar/exhibitions/3487>
- Pinar, W.F. (1978). *Currere*: A case study. In G. Willis, (Ed.), *Qualitative evaluation: Concepts and cases in curriculum criticism* (pp. 316-342). McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Stattery, & Taubman, M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. Peter Lang.
- Powell, J. & Kelly, A. (2017). Accomplices in the academie in the age of Black Lives Matter. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, 6(2), 42-65. doi.org/10.31274/jctp-180810-73
- Powers, R. (2018). *The overstory*. W.W.W. Norton Publishers.
- Smith, B. (2013). *Currere and critical pedagogy: Thinking critically about self-reflective methods*. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 10(2), 3-16. doi.org/10.14288/tci.v10i2.184317
- Tiger, T. (2015). Dangerous allies. In C. Milstein (Ed.), *Taking sides*, (pp. 48-64). AK Press.
- Walia, H. (2015). Decolonize together: Moving beyond a politics of solidarity toward a politics of decolonization. In C. Milstein (Ed.), *Taking sides*, (pp. 40-48). AK Press.
- Willinsky, J. (2006). How to be more of a public intellectual by making your intellectual work more public. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 3(1), 92-95. doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2006.10411583
- Wilczek, F. (2021). *Fundamentals: Ten keys to reality*. Penguin Press.
- Vandiver, M.J., Homana, G., Vandiver, K. & McDermott, M. (in review). What about Isaac? Using Voices of Baltimore: Life under Segregation to foster a complicated discussion about Brown v. Board: Success? Failure? A Set-Up? And ... What Now? For the *Journal of Interdisciplinary Humanities*.