

Curriculum: Different Questions, Different Translations

Alice Casimiro Lopes¹
State University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

He destines them to translation, he subjects them to the law of a translation both necessary and impossible; in a stroke with his translatable-untranslatable name he delivers a universal reason (it will not longer be subject to the rule of a particular nation), but he simultaneously limits its very universality: forbidden transparency, impossible univocity.

Jacques Derrida, *Tower of Babel*

Nowadays, the questioning of dichotomies is increasingly accepted. We question the dichotomies: subject / object, theory / practice, denotation / connotation, truth / rhetoric, understanding / interpretation. This questioning has been based on deconstruction, on the criticism of logocentrism, the criticism of the centered subject and the immanence. To assert with Derrida that there is nothing outside the text or with Laclau that any meaning is discursive does not cause so much surprise, even among their critics.

Such approaches make questionable fixed boundaries among disciplines, while favoring increasingly contextual discussions. One has to contextualize to produce meanings. In this process, contexts are also produced. Contexts, as I frequently repeat, are not fixed spaces, or nations, or cities, or schools, or territories. Contextualized research leads to the simultaneous construction of subjectivations and objectivations. When we investigate already known objects in a new discursive context, at the same time, new objects and subjects are created. This is the case of the investigations presented in this issue of TCI. Questions usually not addressed in the field of curriculum gain new contours when investigated by curriculum researchers.

In the first article, Clarissa Craveiro and Felipe Aguiar present how the wordsmith tools can be useful in curricular research. In the second article, Maria da Concepción Barrón Tirado and Frida Díaz Barriga focus on the relationship between management and curriculum. Ronaldo Linhares, Caio Alcântara, Maria José Loureiro and Fernando Ramos, from an interinstitutional research, investigate the perception of Brazilian and Portuguese teachers about their practical experience with the use of mobile technologies. Heather Coe, on the other hand, discusses curriculum conceptions, aiming at the construction of the curriculum of the heart. Different texts, different objects, different subjectivities, different interpretations and new conclusions. With these papers and others conversations and readings, we will produce other readings/writings, in the constant translation that constitutes the field of the curriculum. Maybe in our next World Curriculum Studies Conference (<http://www.iaacs2018.info>)



TO CITE THIS ARTICLE PLEASE INCLUDE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING DETAILS:

LOPES, Alice Casimiro (2016). **Curriculum: Different Questions, Different Translations**. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* 13 (2) <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci> <access date>

that will be held in Melbourne, Australia, in the early part of December 2018, we can discuss that and other conclusions about curriculum.

Notes

¹ alicecasimirolopes@gmail.com

