

Whose Internationalization?

Joao Paraskeva
University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth

At the 11th Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in New Orleans, some of us¹ got together in a discussion panel regarding the Internationalization of the field. While we were all struck by the importance of the theme, some of us expressed reservations regarding some internationalization dynamics. I raised a serious reservation over the way such Internationalization has been paved. Going back to my notes, my disquiets (shared by many scholars in Africa, specially Southern Africa and Latin America) were: What does one mean by ‘internationalization’? Whose internationalization? Which language dominates this ‘internationalization’? Whose voices have been silenced? Whose knowledge has been systematically dismissed, ignored and produced as non-existent? To me, the Internationalization move could not ignore the struggle for social justice that is indeed a struggle for cognitive justice. For me, the emphasis should be put on what I called epistemicides—that is, the way Western European epistemologies have been produced and reproduced in such a way as to engineer other non-Western epistemic forms to be non-existent. This pattern has been visible in some waves of the Internationalization. From this crucial debate a decision was made to establish what we called “The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force,” charged with the responsibility of engaging in the study and translation of material from non-Western, non-white scholars, and examining their possible contributions for the internationalization of the field. This group decided to put a session together for the AAAC’s 12th Annual Meeting the following year, to be chaired by Andrea Baldwin, with me serving as the discussant.

While in New Orleans, I was also cordially invited by Peter Appelbaum to be the Program Chair of the 12th Annual Meeting to be held at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. I accepted the invitation and suggested the name of Maria Alfredo Moreira, a Professor at the University of Minho and a Visiting Professor at the University of Washington, Seattle, to work as co-chair.

Maria and I start working and talking immediately about the theme for the 12th Annual Meeting. While it was quite clear in our heads that the theme should cover the emerging wrangle over globalization-internationalization, it was not that easy to encapsulate in a brief call for papers the towering

¹Those present included: Alvaro Hypolito (Federal University of Pelotas), Andrea Baldwin (Northern Caribbean University, Jamaica), Dinny Risri Aletheiani (Arizona State University), Elizabeth Macedo (State University of Rio de Janeiro), Erica Dávila (Arcadia University), Joao Paraskeva (UMass Dartmouth), Jim Jupp (Georgia Southern University), Karen Ferneding (Southern Arkansas University), Lia Oliveira (University of Minho), Maria Alfredo (University of Washington), Peter Appelbaum (Arcadia University), Seungho Moon (Oklahoma State University), Susan Mayer (Brandeis University), Todd Price (National Louis University).

ideas and notes that we took from the meeting in New Orleans. For us (Paraskeva & Moreira, 2012), ‘the beginning of the new millennium may well be the moment in history that demonstrates how internationalization has conquered the epicenter of the curriculum field.’ Within the theme, we argued that ‘internationalization, conceptualized and developed within various epistemological perspectives, has become an inevitable and legitimate ‘macro project’ for the present and future of the field of curriculum studies’; Having been around so many Annual Meetings both nationally and internationally, it was clear to us that ‘internationalization reinforces the tensions over the direction of curriculum studies through the attempt to develop a broader conversation.’

With this in mind, we decided to invite our colleagues to engage in a different debate over the ‘internationalization’ of curriculum studies; as we have advanced in prior years; challenges to the emancipatory potential of a “pedagogical stance” within curriculum studies have demanded that we examine how the field works with, through, and around these critiques. We challenge our peers:

to rethink and consider the very meaning of the internationalization endeavor; to examine how can this [new] scholarship within the American Association can help address issues related to the problematic of internationalization and globalization. What kind or kinds of internationalization(s) and globalization(s) are we talking about? Who directs the internationalization and globalization? Who has been globalized? Who has been localized? Who is globalizing whom? Whose internationalization are we talking about? Are there any asymmetrical power relations in such processes? What kinds of circuits and mechanisms of economic and cultural production and reproduction does internationalization promote and/or silence? What is the effect of such conversations, or lack thereof, in the day-to-day lives of teachers and students? What are the real impacts of internationalization on advancement of curriculum theory and its development? Finally, the question remains whether or not curriculum studies, as a field, is on a collision course with internationalization and globalization. (Paraskeva & Moreira, 2012)

The field reacted in a very positive way to such a call for papers and we had a great wave of outstanding papers, symposiums, and presentations. Bill Pinar cordially accepted our invitation to produce the keynote address and in his address he supported some of our concerns as well. One of the most heated sessions was undeniably the one titled *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force*. The purpose of this symposium was to pay attention to non-Western, non-white voices in education and examine their contributions to the field. We invited scholars:

(a) to examine the work of a non-Western curriculum theory/theorist; (b) to describe the background, major concepts, and contribution of the theorist/theory, and to link it with existing/previous theories; (c) to explain the purpose for selecting a particular scholar and, (d) the significance to the development of curriculum studies and, (e) the relevance to the internationalization of curriculum.

In this special symposium, Dinny Risri Aletheiani from Arizona State University presented the paper *Indonesian Curriculum Theorist: Ki Hajar Dewantara*; Todd Price from National Louis University presented *Las Etapas de la Educación y Revolución: Literacy, Communism and Democracy from Tao Xingzhi to Raul Ferrer*, Andrea Baldwin from Northern Caribbean University, Jamaica presented *The Case of Jamaica’s Marcus Mosiah Garvey*, and Seungho Moon from Oklahoma State University presented *Tasan Chong Yag-yong: Practical Learning School in Korea & Neo-Confucianism*.

In this ninth volume of JAAACS, we begin our new International Literature Section by publishing

this last paper by Seungho Moon. In addition, we look forward to the opportunity this new journal section will provide for others involved in this important project to publish their work in coming issues. In *Tasan Chong Yag-yong: Practical Learning School in Korea & Neo-Confucianism*, Seungho Moon translated the work of Tasan Chong Yag-yong (1762-1836) and positions this work within the cultural context of his time, providing curriculum scholars with multiple perspectives on Korean understandings of human nature, knowledge, and pedagogy. Drawing from *Silhak* (實學; *The School of Practical Learning*) in Korea, Confucianism and Neo-Confucianism have been introduced to international audiences, but current understanding of Confucianism overlooks the complexity with/in it. As Seungho Moon argues, the work of Tasan Chong Yag-yong provides a context for considering what knowledge was considered important in 19th-century Korea and the implications for contemporary issues regarding morality, student experience, and educational equity. Seungho Moon offers the reader an examination of Tasan's ontology, epistemology, and pedagogy through *Silhak* thus contributing to the internationalization of curriculum studies by exploring little-known philosophical orientations.

In responding to the panel papers, I centered my discussion on what I called curriculum *epistemicides*, that is, both the works of the collective *Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force* and the works of Raúl Ferrer (Cuba), Ki Hadjar Dewantara (Indonesia), Marcus Mosiah Garvey (Jamaica) and Tasan Chong Yag-yong (Korea) could be seen as part of a struggle against curriculum millenary epistemicides (Paraskeva, 2011; Paraskeva forthcoming) through the production of what I called Itinerant Curriculum Theory (ICT) (Paraskeva, 2011).

The educational and curriculum theorist needs to be seen as an epistemological pariah who is challenging and challenged by a theoretical path that is inexact yet rigorous. Such itinerant theory(ist) provokes (and exists in a midst of) a set of crises, and produces laudable silences. It provokes an abstinence of theoretical uniformity and stabilization. The theory(ist) is a volcanic chain, who shows a constant lack of equilibrium, is always a stranger in his/her own language. He/she is an itinerant theory(ist) profoundly sentient of the multiplicities of lines, spaces, and dynamic becomings. Such a theoretical course is defined by a cutting edge, a “Malanganian” and “Pollockian” set of processes, not because it is abstract but because oppressive in its freedom. It is not a sole act, however; it is a populated solitude. This itinerant theoretical path, claims a multifaceted curriculum compromise, and “runs away” from any unfortunate ‘canonology.’ (Paraskeva, 2011)

ICT, as I have argued, challenges the sociology of absences, challenges how certain non-western epistemologies have been rendered as non-existent. I noted that such a theoretical position was not fostering what I called ‘indeginstoude’ (Paraskeva, 2011). In fact, by assuming an itinerant posture of a deterritorialized thinking, bringing to the fore the works of Ferrer, Dewantara, Garvey and Tasan, the 2012 AAACS panelists have worked in opposition to the mystification of indigenous cultures and knowledges (Paraskeva, 2011). Moreover, I claimed that some of these works need to be seen within what one might call ‘southern epistemologies’. ICT, as I argued elsewhere (Paraskeva, 2011; see also Sousa Santos, 2009), respects three fundamental pillars: (1) learning that the South exists, (2) learning to go to the South, and (3) learning from and with the South. In so doing, ICT is a commitment to an ecology of knowledges:

a call for the democratization of knowledges that is a commitment to an emancipatory, non-relativistic, cosmopolitan ecology of knowledges, bringing together and staging [of] dialogues and alliances between diverse forms of knowledge, cultures, and cosmologies in response to different forms of

oppression that enact the coloniality of knowledge and power. We need actually to learn from the South (since) the aim to reinvent social emancipation goes beyond the critical theory produced in the North and the social and political praxis to which it has subscribed. (Sousa Santos et al., 2007, p. xiv; c.f. also Paraskeva, 2011)

Such ecology of knowledge is a call against the modern Western thinking that is an abyssal thinking (Sousa Santos, 2007). It is a system of visible and invisible distinctions, and the invisible sustain the visible. The invisible distinctions are established through radical lines that divide social reality into two distinctive realms: the universe of this side of the line and the universe of the other side of the line. The division is such that the other side of the line vanishes as reality, becomes nonexistent, and is simultaneously (re)produced as nonexistent. Everything that is produced as nonexistent is radically excluded for it lies beyond the realm of the accepted conception of inclusion (Paraskeva, 2011).

Since the day we met to present and discuss together our papers in New Orleans, Andrea Baldwin, Dinny Risri Aletheiani, Seungho Moon, Todd Price and I have been engaged in lively a dialogue, exchanging drafts of papers, making comments, and exciting crucial critiques. The article that you see now—*Tasan Chong Yag-yong: Practical Learning School in Korea & Neo-Confucianism* by Seungho Moo—is a result of a long itinerant, deterritorialized, decolonial walk, a mirror of a complex dialogue among many of us. With this project—quite embryonic still—we hope to address many of the important questions that have been raised regarding the ‘Internationalization.’ The members of the AAACS Internationalization Taskforce hope others of you within the organization also see this humble work as a step forward in the struggle against curriculum epistemicides. The struggle against curriculum epistemicides is a *curriculum turn*. It is a struggle for social and cognitive justice.

References

- Aletheiani, Dinny Risri (2012). *Indonesian Curriculum Theorist: Ki Hajar Dewantara*. Paper Presented at Special Session The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force. 12th Annual Meeting, American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Baldwin, Andrea (2012). *The Case of Jamaica's Marcus Mosiah Garvey*, Paper Presented at Special Session The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force. 12th Annual Meeting, American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Moon, Seungho, (2012). *Tasan Chong Yag-yong: Practical Learning School in Korea & Neo-Confucianism*. Paper Presented at Special Session The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force. 12th Annual Meeting, American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Paraskeva, Joao, (2011). *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory. Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies*. New York: Palgrave.
- Paraskeva, Joao, (2012). Discussant Comments. Special Session The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force. 12th Annual Meeting to be held at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Paraskeva, Joao and Moreira, Maria Alfredo, (2012). Curriculum Studies in Times of Globalization. Whose Internationalization? Call for Papers 12th Annual Meeting to be held at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Price, Todd, (2012). *Las Etapas de la Educación y Revolución: Literacy, Communism and Democracy from Tao Xingzhi to Raul Ferrer*. Paper Presented at Special Session The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force. 12th Annual Meeting, American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Sousa Santos, Boaventura, (2007). Beyond Abyssal Thinking: From Global Lines to Ecologies of Knowledges. *Review*, pp. 1 – 66.
- Sousa Santos, Boaventura, (2009). *Epistemologias do Sul*. Coimbra: Almedina.