

## ITINERANT CURRICULUM THEORY: NAVIGATING THE WATERS OF POWER, IDENTITY, AND PRAXIS

---

ELIZABETH JANSON

*University of Massachusetts – Dartmouth*

CARMELIA MOTTA SILVA

*University of Massachusetts – Dartmouth*

---

*Conflicts in Curriculum Theory: Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies*

João M. Paraskeva / Palgrave Macmillan US / 2011

*Curriculum Epistemicide: Toward an Itinerant Curriculum Theory*

João M. Paraskeva / Routledge / 2016

### **The Silent Colors of the Epistemicide**

As U.S. public educators, we have been both the speaker and the subjects in the following words of Harriet Tubman: “I freed a thousand slaves, I could have freed a thousand more if only they knew they were slaves.” Tubman speaks of the need to decolonize minds (Thiong’o, 1994) and of the colonialities that continue to shape minds. We both have been shaped by our experiences as students, and now pedagogues, in the tumultuous sea of U.S. public education that has made us—as much as we have tried to resist the riptides of epistemicide (Santos, 2007b; Paraskeva, 2011), linguicide (Thiong’o, 2009), commodification, and anesthetization. For there are winds that can change the currents and create counterhegemonic movements, opposing an abyssal thinking (Sousa Santos, 2012) that occludes the colonized mind from seeing what is below the hegemonic current.

Educators stand before this water, throwing students into a race without ever getting them to dive into the depths of knowledge in order to reveal the seafloor that holds the remnants of knowledges, spiritualities, languages, and cultures destroyed as colonization and imperialism transformed the world as well as colonized minds, leaving colonialities as the waters of Lethe and Nepenthe—Drink the waters, choke on the waters, it doesn’t matter you will forget. The students who manage to swim

across are legitimized in the dominant knowledge. But, what of those who sink, who were never taught to swim, who didn't come with that knowledge? Identities, beings, and knowledges sink and become new adornments for the seafloor.

Having been in these waters, where at times we both sank, but both found our ways, we drank and choked on the waters. We have stood on the shore and thrown our students in until we gained the theoretical tools to understand how to navigate our positions of oppressed power within the U.S. public schooling system. We enacted *conscientização* (Freire, 2005) and *consciencism* (Nkrumah, 1964) in our present and past experiences. Paraskeva (2011) explains how Itinerant Curriculum Theory (ICT)

requires a kind of decolonial Freirean (1980) *conscientização* or the Nkrumah (1964) *consciencism*—a full blast decolonial delinking (Mignolo, 2012) —assuming not only that dominant traditional human rights approaches systematically have neglected the vitality of the strong questions—or how strong are the strong questions—but also that new possibilities open up for a mutually enriching exchange between counter-hegemonic human rights politics and progressive political ideologies.” (p. 11)

It was through *conscientização* (Freire, 2005) and *consciencism* (Nkrumah, 1964) that we began to decolonize our mind and praxis, complexifying the lines of curriculum and knowledge to see beyond the dominant knowledge. In this, we must continue to wrangle with what Paraskeva (2011) coined as the Itinerant Curriculum Theory (ICT) that “challenge[s] the cultural politics of denial, that produce radical absence, the absence of humanity, the modern sub-humanity (Sousa Santos, 2009, p. 30)” (ibid, p. 188). The cultural politics of denial define the curricular standards. What and whose knowledge is legitimate? This is why ICT involves us in “assuming a posture that slides constantly among several epistemological frameworks, thus giving one better tools to interpret schools as social formations. Such a theoretical posture might be called a ‘deterritorialized’ rather than a compositive device” (ibid, p. 151). We come with different experiences and knowledges, as do our students. We struggle in an ideological amalgamation that we have deterritorialized, but that is still composed of power that we must continuously decolonize, especially as rhetoric and policies continue to try to transform our minds and control our beings. ICT (Paraskeva, 2011, 2016) aids in our developing narratives of practice that are the

centerpieces of our essay as our aim is to find connections to teaching and learning practice.

Broadly speaking, Paraskeva (2011, 2014, 2016): (a) provides a well-framed critique of dominant traditional positivist and also counter dominant critical curriculum theories, denouncing how both perspectives were/are functionalistic; (b) in so doing, not only claims the curriculum field as ‘the epistemicide,’ but also denounces the epistemicide within the epistemicide; (c) calls for the need to deterritorialize and advances the concept of Itinerant Curriculum Theory (ICT) to address some dead ends with the radical critical platform and to lead the struggle against the epistemicides; (d) frames the laudable work of specific curriculum scholars within what he calls the ‘radical critical progressive river;’ (e) asks us to redefine the struggle for social justice as a struggle for cognitive justice; (f) challenges the very history of the field, by incorporating intellectuals and approaches related with key social movements such as Civil Rights and the Romantic critics; and (f) produces a new language that promotes new endless meanings for the field.

Paraskeva’s (2011, 2014, 2016) approaches have been explored in the field with symposiums and sessions at AAACS, Bergamo Conference, Curriculum and Pedagogy Conference, and Curriculum Summer Studies Collaborative. Milders (2016) has characterized Paraskeva’s approach as crucial and timely:

The hegemony of the modern Western Eurocentric platform has reached its irreversible end. This timely premise propels Joao M. Paraskeva's highly insightful yet occasionally densely argued volume on the implications of this end for critical pedagogy and the curriculum. This work builds on his earlier *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory. Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies* (2011) which made an important contribution to curriculum theory by providing a critical intervention into the field’s history: an analysis of the colonial matrix of knowledge production that has strongly affected the field of curriculum and pedagogy. In the present volume, Paraskeva seeks to expose the dynamics which have supported this matrix as *epistemicide*: the murder of knowledge. The ambitious nature of this enterprise stems from the fact that Paraskeva seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the epistemicidal nature of the Eurocentric curriculum. The alternative to the latter heavily leans on a

decolonised Marxism and is argued to remain effective as a curriculum theory without relapsing into the hierarchical and exclusionary theory that gave rise the epistemicidal curriculum. Although there is a risk of losing argumentative scope in such an interdisciplinary plethora of perspectives and debates, Paraskeva succeeds in offering a robust critique of, what he argues to be, the epistemicidal and eugenic dynamics of the Eurocentric curriculum, as well as an insightful analysis of what an alternative could look like. The most effective tool for this is ruthless critique. As Antonia Darder strongly argues in the volume's foreword, 'nothing short of liberatory ruthlessness can free us from the eugenic *dominance of the Western modern Eurocentric epistemological perspective*. (p. 1)

According to Paraskeva (2011, 2014, 2016), curriculum needs to champion the struggle against the epistemicides in curriculum, teaching, and learning. This struggle against epistemicides and for curriculum relevance is one that as pedagogues we are sentient of as we are enveloped in curriculum reforms in our classroom practices. The question called forth is: How does ICT speak to pedagogues in US public education? We answer with our lives.

Contrasting with Paraskeva's (2016) notion of ICT, Race to the Top and Common Core, the newest waves of U.S. educational reforms policies, are emblematic of a colonial education framework that technicalizes languages and knowledges for the market. As language educators, we are entangled within these policies that continually strip language from its potential for students and teachers to empower themselves through expression. Educators are responsible for teaching languages that are often unrecognized and treated as fact instead of discourses of dominance. Although Carmelia teaches Spanish, and Liz teaches English, as coauthors we are joined by other language teachers as students learn codified meanings in math, history, art, science, etc. Our two subjects are not the only languages that are having the liberatory nature usurped by the call for standardization. We must see math, history, art, and science as languages that are being oppressed within the technicalization of knowledge that constricts its emancipatory potential for humans.

U.S. education is a structural masterpiece of Eurocentric, Anglophone, white, patriarchal imperialism. As female critical transformative leaders, we are constantly trying to push against this domination within ourselves, our communities, and our

classrooms. However, the very composite of our school speaks to the way in which knowledge reflects gendered norms in the U.S. Here is the breakdown: in English language arts, 5 out of 6 teachers are female; in world languages, 3 out of 4 are female; in art and music, 3 out of 3 are female; whereas in science 1 out of 6 is female; in math, 2 out of 7 are female; in history, 0 out of 6 are female; and in the industrial and technological sciences 0 out of 5 are female. This is a sophisticated network of power that reflects the colonialities of knowledge and being. In order to counteract this power, we continue to strive to create for ourselves, colleagues, and students the 'communities of resistance' as proposed by Thich Nhat Hanh and echoed by bell hooks, "so that there are places where we can recover, and return to ourselves more fully" (hooks, 1994, p. 263). hooks (1994) proposes these communities of resistance after talking about how African-Americans and women play dumb and remain silenced in order for white people to feel comfortable.

This is a struggle to counteract our own thinking and being, which has been informed by a colonial legacy that has ascribed us roles within society and formed our consciousnesses. Through dialectical engagement, we continue to rupture the way hegemony works on us and through us. Anzaldúa (2007) claimed, "Soy un amasamiento, I am an act of kneading, of uniting and joining that not only has produced both a creature of darkness and a creature of light, but also a creature that questions the definitions of light and dark and gives them new meanings" (p. 103). In this way, we are questioning the dark and the light as well as the construction of what is perceived as dark and light, the oppressive dichotomies that do not allow us the liquidity of expression, which we frame through colonialities of being and knowledges that are revealed within Paraskeva's (2012) treatment of ICT.

### **Carmelia's Narrative:**

#### **ICT as a Critical Philosophy of Pedagogical Praxis in Teaching Spanish**

Paraskeva (2014) calls for ICT as a need "to address the complex issues that we are all facing under the pressure of a liquid momentum (Bauman, 1998), which characterizes the current terrestrial globalization (Sloterdijk, 2013)" (p. 2). He clearly articulates that ICT does not come with a prescribed recipe since it challenges the scripted nature of our curriculum crisis that is being driven by the standardization momentum. ICT is not an attack on particular epistemologies, but rather a process of awareness that challenges epistemicide, as well as addressing "humanized capitalism and tempered flamboyant forms of multiculturalism" (p. 3). As a

language and culture teacher, these neoliberal flamboyant forms of multiculturalism are disrespectful, denigrating and devaluing. Culture becomes a checkbox that needs to be completed as a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Results-Focused, and Time-Bound) goal for an administrator's evaluation, while it becomes a completely devalued form of culture that is stripped from its meaning. For example, in Spanish teaching, Cinco de Mayo represents an ironic faux celebration of culture rather than the implementation of an intercultural curriculum that challenges the colonization of the indigenous and the continued coloniality and provides an authentic opportunity to continually think about what it means to students to be Mexican American. I am bombarded with emails by companies trying to sell approaches to teaching Cinco de Mayo that involve purchasing somberos, sarapes, papel picado and piñatas. Never have I seen a lesson on the solidarity and resistance to European imperialism that historically defines the Battle of Puebla. Culture can be bought at a discount online, but what is being sold is dehumanization.

As a Spanish teacher, I focus my discussion on language dominance. I can use language in its dominant discourse to achieve a power position to work the midlines and play the role of Malinche, the traitor, who with the power of language was able to turn her back on the indigenous people for the Conquistadors. The commodification of language

is naturalized and disseminated ... through the use of de-historicized language, where terms such as freedom, democracy, autonomy, community, and solidarity acquire a new content and serve the logic of accumulating capital. By denuding language that is used to legitimize the current social and political (dis)order, we can recognize 'the limits and social costs of neoliberal philosophy that reduces all relationships to the exchange of goods and money. (Macedo, 2003, p.139)

The disregard in addressing issues of language and identity in schools is the purposeful neglect in acknowledging the linking of language and power (Norton, 2010).

Gloria Anzaldúa (2007), another scholar who wrote extensively about the entanglements of difference around language, refers to perceived language inferiority as "Linguistic Terrorism," where the lack of acceptance by the dominant

culture causes those who speak the non-standard form to view their own lingual form as illegitimate. This delegitimization is further internalized and used by members against each other within the subordinate language group. Anzaldúa is referring to the Chicano Spanish language which, similar to other forms of colonized Spanish, has the unique characteristics of being, first, the language taught to the indigenous people by the Spanish colonizer and second, the linguistic form that allowed these people to establish unique national unity apart from Spain. Chicano Spanish, because of its fusion in the historical trajectory and proximity to the United States, cultivates yet another tension in linguistic identity which, for many, creates a sense a shame in speaking their native or heritage language. One of my favorite quotes from Anzaldúa's poetry is: "So, if you want to really hurt me, talk badly about my language. Ethnic identity is twin skin to linguistic identity—I am my language." For Anzaldúa, it was in the power of her voice, in all of its identity complexity and richness, that she was able to overcome the oppression of a silence that represented a silenced reality, a form of nonexistence. Sousa Santos would argue that "[w]hatever is produced as nonexistent is radically excluded because it lies beyond the realm of what the accepted conception of inclusion considers to be its other" (2007, p. 1). Sadly, while being bilingual positively suits some members of the community, it is seen as an impediment for others, depending where it lies on the abyssal line (Sousa Santos, 2007). In my own bilingual experience, I continue to feel embarrassment in my speaking of Portuguese, not because I am not proud to be bilingual, but because of the negative conditioning that was engrained in my being. My Portuguese is not native Continental Portuguese; rather, it is Azorean American Portuguese, seen locally as a subpar dialect of the language. This view of my tongue affected the formation of my own identity, but far from my process of becoming is the process of becoming that began way before me. Of course, the hierarchy of European colonialism and present day coloniality (e.g., Grosfogel, 2013; Lugones, 2010; Mignolo, 2000; Maldonado-Torres, 2010; Quijano, 2000) expands its tentacles into domination through the colonial matrix of power that includes domination by race, class, gender, language, sexuality and other axes.

The results of colonialism are integrated into the many ways we see and define culture today. Coloniality is the aftermath that remains in the reproduction of textbooks, hidden school agendas, cultural normative patterns; it is seen within our self-images and is morphed into commonsense. As educators confronted with a common curriculum, we ask "how we can deal with these struggles in our own positions in ways that do not help reproduce privilege and essentialized binarism"

(Lin, 2008, p.80). The struggle within my own position has been at times swarming with hypocrisy due to my being able to morph between two cultures undetected by physical characteristics or by striking markers. In my teaching of Spanish, I have at times continued the coloniality of being, as I have corrected students' native expression and made it the version that "should" be taught in schools. As a "foreign" language teacher, I have in the past continued the cycle of inferiority, suppressing my students' cultural identities and teaching them to appreciate the language and culture the way the Academia Real sees fit, not the way their *antepasados* passed down, as they struggled to keep the semblances of the only thing the colonizers could not take away, their discourse with each other. The idea of what is valued and what is not is hidden in the foreign language curriculum with

issues about what language knowledge counts as legitimate, whose language is important enough to be included in the curriculum, why, and in what terms [issues that] have usually not been reviewed in terms of the linguaracism that choices of foreign language and foreign language pedagogy entail. (Macedo, et al., 2003, p. 101)

Spanish, the language of the colonizer, is never approached from that angle but rather from a superficial position removed from its historical progression.

Despite the complexities of Spanish, its complicities, and resistances, English continues its instrumental ascendance in many places in the world and especially in Latin America. According to an article titled *Mexico Plans to Implement Universal English Instruction* for example, Zehr (2009) stated that Mexico's educational policy was to "have all 12 million of the country's public primary school children learning English." Why is there a fairly new fascination with English but not Nahuatl, Yucatec Maya, or the other 66 indigenous languages spoken in Mexico? The Spanish language may have been introduced by the colonizers in the 16th century, yet the modern presence of coloniality includes English. The stench of language oppression is still present today, not only in Mexico but in the U.S., especially within schools through language policies and hidden and discernible curricula that promote homogenization and shame when students choose to expose aspect of themselves rather than developing pride within them for being multi-cultural, like myself. Relevant to this conversation, a careful argument is developed by Jupp (2013) that demonstrates cosmopolitan sensibilities as a possible means of historical, cultural, linguistic, and identitarian interlocation.



We fight for recognition from others (Fraser, 1998). Bonnie Norton explains, “identity references desire—the desire for recognition, the desire for affiliation and the desire for security and safety ... People who have access to a wide range of resources in a society will have access to power and privilege, which will in turn influence how they understand their relationship to the world and their possibilities for the future” (Norton, 2000, p. 8). Students in my charge need the opportunity to recognize their own histories and their own knowledges. They need to address questions like: Who am I? And more importantly as mentioned earlier: Whose am I? As well as: Whose knowledge do I know and why? I have to wonder, who would I be if I felt like my culture was valued as a resource as opposed to a burden? For me, that burden began as soon as I entered the school system where the ethnic shaming began with my name that continues to affect me today. My placement in the curriculum river started with a simple question by an educator: “Do you speak English at home?” That educator mapped out which arteries and veins I would be able to voyage through to the heart of my educational path, which filled me with the toxic currents that my river journeyed through. Education, for me, has an emotional charge that is hard to articulate.

Paraskeva (2014) articulates that ICT “confronts and throws the subject to a permanent unstable question of ‘what is to think?’” as well as, “pushes one to think in the light of the future as well as to question how can ‘we’ actually claim to really know the things that ‘we’ claim to know, if ‘we’ are not ready specifically to think the unthinkable, but to go beyond the unthinkable and mastering its infinitude” (pp. 6-7). Moreover, ICT is more than an explicit written curriculum, it is a way of viewing the world, as well as “an attempt to help us to think in another form of human being” (p. 7). What does that look like? How do we “reform,” which is a trendy catch phrase, yet not be sucked into neoliberal discourse and ways of being? What is needed instead is a complete decolonial demolition as opposed to a reworking of the imperial model which is infused with a colonial power discourse. A whole new discourse would need to be created to offer tools for curriculum to be more encompassing while inclusive of a world of knowledges and not a simple cultural knowledge that is housed within a western dominant epistemology which devalues all other knowledges.

### **Liz's Narrative:**

#### **ICT as a Philosophy of Pedagogical Praxis**

To understand ICT, we need to see it as a form of praxis that I think is easier to analyze through the narrative of experience in which people, as they read, are enacting ICT in their analysis in dialogue. As teachers who enact ICT, we also must be rearguard intellectuals who are

trained in academic knowledges but solidarily involved with the social actors, [our] task is to retrain [our]selves in such a way as to be able constantly to translate academic knowledge in non-academic knowledge, and vice versa, and to do with *con passionalità*. (Sousa Santos, 2014, pp. 231-232)

Rearguard intellectuals must challenge the epistemicides because it is through epistemicide that knowledges are destroyed and a hegemonic Western knowledge is strengthened and amassed. Paraskeva (2011) adds to this that

the struggle against epistemicides not only reveals multiple ways to pursue other forms of knowledge, besides those under the Western scientific epistemological umbrella, but also confirms that the dominant stream of modern science is a reductive, functional paradigm project edified by white males. (p. 166)

ICT requires us to challenge the rhetoric of scientific supremacy in U.S. public education, analyze other epistemologies, craft another way through our dialectical teaching and learning. In the following pages, I will reveal the way that my students, my colleagues and I grapple with ICT as we fight for social and cognitive justice.

Over the past months, I have teased my students, calling them my “little counterhegemonics” when they raised critical questions: Why do we always talk about “the American Dream” – don’t other countries have dreams? Who gave us the right to go overseas and spread our democracy? Who says we are right or best? Or, when the state test came around, they asked: What happens if we don’t take this test? Who designs it anyway? It doesn’t measure anything! When I told them about how La Raza studies and *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* had been banned from Tucson Schools, they looked at me confused and some asked: Why? How can a class be

dangerous? How can a book be dangerous? They asked about standardization and the curriculum, and about who said they had to learn that stuff and why.

I replied, "It's an 'epistemicide.'"

"Epistuhmawho?" one asked.

I smiled, "Epistemicide: the killing of knowledge." They nod in a collective consciousness, not of knowing the word, but certainly knowing the reality. As children of high stakes testing and standardization, they were constantly enacting and experiencing epistemicides without even being conscious of their complicity in an "epistemic blindness"—they were, also, through their words and actions recreating, creating, and resisting hegemony. As Andreotti (2013) has stated,

Since our education has constructed our ideas of what is good, ideal and normal, it is important to acknowledge our constitutive blindness to other forms of seeing, knowing and being in the world that do not fit what we can recognize through the frames of references we have become used to. (p. 84)

I daily try to identify and question our blindness with my students. For two class periods, for example, we discussed how we see violence, sexuality, and spirituality within United States, ultimately asking, What is each of our ideologies? Another, "ideauh- what?" word. I don't like to "translate" the words.

When my kids asked what ideology meant and said "bring it down now for us, Miss J," I didn't "bring it down." I said you tell me; you break the word down. They pulled it apart. Hegemony I spoke with them about, using metaphors to relate it, not translating it into one of their words, because the word itself has a history and power. There is knowledge conveyed by language and knowledge within language, in the words that I use in my classroom, in the texts that I *choose* to select (sometimes it is a "choiceless choice" —Common Core has taken that choice from me), through the tests that I give. But, in that moment, in my classroom, we shattered the snow globe that America tries to hide within. Letting our history, faults, and memories burst out; some American, some personal, and some cultural. Students began to wonder why they could watch a guy's head get blown off, yet the mere mention of sex in a book would startle them, eliciting giggles. We diverged from the standardized curriculum and instead considered a parents' protest letter from the

summer about Jeanette Walls' memoir *The Glass Castle*, in which Jeanette details issues of sexual assault and childhood abuse. A parent sent an email to our principal and us complaining about the summer reading selection because there were titles that had asterisks due to adult language and content, which this parent has taught his or her child to avoid, and complaining that songs with foul language are wrong and devalue society.

Talk about curriculum relevance: the kids latched onto this. And we discussed it in relation to the right to ignorance and the responsibility to keep our eyes open. I had pulled a quote from Macedo's paper in which he describes how a Math teacher said, "I have a right not to know the news," but, as Macedo (2013) writes,

While she has the right to choose not to know, as an academic and citizen in a democratic society, she has the responsibility of knowing what her leaders are doing in regards to policies full of barbarism, policies that enable horrors like the drone guided bombing of targets that invariably include the carnage of innocent civilians, women, and children which policy makers consider an 'unfortunate part of war' or simply 'collateral damage'. (p. 17)

The question was simple for my students, "Do you have a right to close your eyes to knowledge?" Because epistemicide is not just committed by those in power, but by the oppressed themselves, no? Do you have the right to close your eyes to knowledge? Their eventual response was no. And we analyzed the things that we think that we know, but don't know, considering how truth is portrayed in the media. We analyzed privilege, reminding me of our conversation from the beginning of the year where I asked them, "Does one man's wealth equal another man's poverty?" For me this related to Andreotti's (2013) statement that "modernity's 'shine' is articulated in ways that hide its shadow, its darker side, or the fact that for us to inhabit the shiny side we systematically and necessarily have had and still have to inflict violence on other people" (p. 86).

The curriculum designers want us to neutralize curriculum. In an effort to make everything perfect and repeatable, educators kill or silence subaltern knowledge, without considering the students' knowledge, identities, spiritualities—we make school into a box in which they are to be kept and moved at the ringing of the bell. How do we help them discover who they are, while letting them be in a constant

state of “being”? Neutrality in itself is a funhouse of mirrors, appearing one way but being another, reflecting back on kids a reality that distorts itself into neutrality and twists their image. It’s hard as an educator to avoid being neutral, while also recognizing the power you have to impose on students. It’s not my knowledge that is important. However, I don’t try to be neutral in all situations. I will refrain from stating my views, until *we*, as a class, have interrogated a question or an issue. They always want to know what I think. They want me to tell them *the* answer, which in their minds seems to be synonymous for “my” answer. Who am I to have “the” answer? And why is there only one answer? As I told them the other day, “Life isn’t a multiple-choice test, although some restrict it to that.”

As Unger (2005) said, “the world suffers under a dictatorship of no alternatives. Although ideas all by themselves are powerless to overthrow this dictatorship, we cannot overthrow it without ideas” (p. 1). Also, how do we know that what we are working for is what will be best for our society? What if we’re going down the wrong path? To say that we’re working for a society in which people actively participate in democracy and is socially just seems benign, but along the way what if we take some missteps and end up doing more harm than good? Perhaps, we should not fear action any more than we fear inaction. What violence is done while we wait for the promise of tomorrow?

I wish that there was more time to discuss how this all plays out. How we see epistemicide and hegemony every single day within our classroom. It’s the theory that provides a frame for the analysis when my kids say: Women are obviously less intelligent than men; look at history, where are the women? Or when an African-American student says: Why we reading this shit [A Raisin in the Sun] these people don’t even speak English. Or my kids conjecture and interrogate: What is colonization? What is the Contra Revolution? Africa has a language? It’s their fault that they’re poor. Welfare should be taken away. Why are we paying for them to be lazy? Why do we have to let immigrants in? Look what they did in Boston. Question upon question.

Questions provide an inlet into their minds, a river of knowledge, which cannot be dismissed as mere ignorance. These questions reflect their “knowledge” from their communities, cultures, parents, peers, media, and it is through questioning and reflection that they begin to change their waters—the color of their ideology perhaps changing—embodying the praxis of ICT.

## **Conclusion**

Those engaged in ICT must be rearguard intellectuals (Sousa Santos, 2014) who

always look back but they have received new mission from us to care for those of who lag behind and bring them back into the fight and to identify whoever keeps betraying us at the back and help us find out why. (p. 2)

Curriculum in U.S. public education can be an oppressive network of power that uses standardized language to colonize minds and to silence beings in processes of resistance, reproduction, and production, and this same curriculum advances this history of colonization and present day coloniality. Paraskeva (2011), referring to the work of Bourdieu claims,

the official language has been imposed upon the whole population as the only legitimate language, and that it is produced and maintained not only by the authors who claim the authority to write, but by the dominant curriculum forces that codify it and the teachers whose task is to teach based on that language. (p. 175)

Curriculum becomes a language that extends historical colonization and reflects the colonialities within schools as youth and educators learn to speak with colonized tongues. ICT becomes a way for rearguard intellectuals to challenge dominant knowledge paradigms and to resist epistemicides. We must see beyond the abyssal line as part of ICT in which we challenge the Western epistemological framework as the only legitimate framework. ICT refuses to let epistemicides go silently unnoticed but rather wrangles with the complexities and power of educational policies. Students must be seen beyond market values and given space to find the enunciatory potential of education that will help continue the struggle for social and cognitive justice.

## References

- Andreotti, V. de O. (2013). Toward decoloniality and diversality in global citizenship education. In V. de O. Andreotti (Ed.), *The Political Economy of Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 74-90). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2005). Speaking in tongues: A letter to third world women writers. In J.B. de Hernandez (Ed.), *Women writing resistance: Essays on Latin America and the Caribbean*. (pp. 79-90). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Anzaldúa, G. (2007). *Borderlands: La frontera*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Hubsta Ltd.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fraser, N. (1998). *Social justice in the age of identity politics: redistribution, recognition, participation*. Berlin: WZB.
- Freire, P. (2005). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. Cambridge, MA: Westview Press.
- Freire, P. (2009). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1989). Truth and method (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, trans.). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2013). The epistemic decolonial turn: Beyond political economy paradigms. In Mignolo, W. D., & Escobar, A. (Eds.) *Globalization and the decolonial option* (pp. 65-77). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jupp, J. (2013). Toward Cosmopolitan Sensibilities in US Curriculum Studies: A Synoptic Rendering of The Franciscan Tradition in Mexico. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 29, 48-71.
- Lin, A. M. Y. (2008). The identity game and discursive struggles of everyday life. In A. M. Y. Lin (Ed.), *Problematizing identity: Everyday struggles in language, culture, and education* (pp.1-10). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lugones, M. (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia* (September), 742-759.
- Macedo, D. (2000). The colonialism of the English only movement. *Educational Researcher*, 29(3), 15-24.
- Macedo, D. (2013, February). *Conscientization as an antidote to banking education*. Paper presented at University of Massachusetts Dartmouth Transformative Leadership class, Fairhaven, MA.
- Macedo, D., Dendrinos, B., & Gounari, P. (2003). *The hegemony of English*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

- Mignolo, W. (2012). *Local Histories, Global Designs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Milders, L. (2016). Curriculum Epistemicide: Towards an Itinerant Curriculum Theory. *Marx and Philosophy Review of Books*.  
<http://marxandphilosophy.org.uk/reviewofbooks/reviews/2016/2527>  
(Retrieved November 2016).
- Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism: philosophy and ideology for decolonization and development with particular reference to the African revolution*. London, UK: Heinemann.
- Norton, B. (2000). Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2014). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2016). *Curriculum Epistemicides*. New York: Routledge.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), 533-580. Retrieved June 6, 2015, from <http://www.unc.edu/~aescobar/wan/wanquijano.pdf>
- Santos, B. S. (2007). *Cognitive justice in a global world: Prudent knowledges for a decent life*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Santos, B. S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Santos, B. S. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking. <http://www.eurozine.com/beyond-abyssal-thinking/>. (Retrieved March 2017).
- Thiong'o, N. W. (2009). *Something torn and new: An African renaissance*. New York, NY: Perseus Book Group.
- Unger, R. M. (2005). *What should the left propose?*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Zehr, M. A. (2009, February 03). Mexico Plans to Implement Universal English Instruction. Retrieved January 15, 2017, from [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/learning-the-language/2009/02/mexico\\_plans\\_to\\_implement\\_univ.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/learning-the-language/2009/02/mexico_plans_to_implement_univ.html)