Journal of the American Association for the
Advancement of Curriculum Studies

Report on the Fourth World Curriculum Studies Conference, organized by IAACS (International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2-5, July, 2012.

Peter Appelbaum
Arcadia University

We are all reminded at every business meeting of AAACS that we are affiliated with IAACS, the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. Our membership in AAACS automatically makes us members of IAACS. The mission of AAACS is tied directly to that of IAACS and in turn to the internationalization of our field.

> At this historical moment and for the foreseeable future, curriculum inquiry occurs within national borders, often informed by governmental policies and priorities, responsive to national situations. Curriculum study is, therefore, nationally distinctive. The founders of the IAACS do not dream of a worldwide field of curriculum studies mirroring the standardization and uniformity the larger phenomenon of globalization threatens. Nor are they unaware of the dangers of narrow nationalisms. Their hope, in establishing this organization, is to provide support for scholarly conversations within and across national and regional borders about the content, context, and process of education, the organizational and intellectual center of which is the curriculum. (IAAACS mission statement)

As one of several attendees from the United States at the Fourth World Curriculum Studies conference sponsored by IAACS, I was asked to provide a personal reflection on the conference to share with the American Association.

It was an honor to take part in the fourth world conference. The meeting enabled all of us to interact with curriculum studies scholars from every continent, representing 20 different countries and 60 different universities.

The conference was organized by Elizabeth Macedo and an executive committee of Alice Casimiro Lopes, Carmen Teresa Gabriel, Maria de Lourdes Tura, and Maria Inès Marcondes, of Brazil, and a local organizing committee of Débora Barreiros, Miriam Leite, Rita de Cássia Frangella, Rosanne Dias, and Rozna Gomes de Abreu, and took place at the Hotel Pestana Rio Atlantica overlooking the gorgeous beach and walkway of Copacabana, in Rio. Presentations were in English, Portuguese, and Spanish, with all plenary symposia simultaneously translated into the other languages for an audience with headphones and rapt faces. Our theme was "Questioning Curriculum Theory," and we were surely not disappointed in the provocations and challenges offered by each and every presentation.

Dr. Zhang Hua, President of IAACS, delivered the opening keynote, focusing on the influence of the Brazilian critical pedagogue Paulo Freire on historic curriculum movements in China, demonstrating once again that the internationalization of curriculum studies is nothing "new" to our contemporary historic moment. Few would have predicted how the perspective of Freire would shed new light on the periodization of Chinese curriculum history that Dr. Zhang offered. Given the often-assumed role of curriculum theory and policy in the repeated developments of a "new China" and the potentially political applications of Freirean theories, the presentation disrupted stodgy curriculum history as progress toward contemporary practice, challenging those in attendance to consider what Ann Winfield and Petra Munro have described as a "remembrance pedagogy" that challenges curriculum scholars to live in relation with the past rather than "in" the past (Winfield & Munro 2011). The juxtaposition of Freire with theories prevalent in post-revolutionary China that were borrowed from the Soviet Union placed Freire's work in new contexts while also recasting the histories of Chinese curriculum that might be proposed today.

A series of invited sessions were similarly provocative. Nicholas Ng-a-Fook from Canada shared his work crossing borders among curriculum theory, autobiography, narrative field studies, difference, and teacher education. A panel of representatives from the Brazilian Association of Curriculum Studies (AbdC) – Ana Maria Saul, Antonio Flavo Moreira, and Antonio Eduardo Ferraço – demonstrated the range of creative and influential work blossoming in Brazil these days, from reclaiming a mainstream role for Paulo Freire in educational policy, to the analysis of pedagogical systems and units as laying the groundwork for pedagogically political projects, to the ethnography of the quotidian as overcoming the intention to lock the quotidian in pre-established categories. Speakers from the "Southern Cone" of Latin America – Uruguay, Argentina, and Chile – used their own local projects to consider transnational curriculum issues in South America. And William Pinar and William Doll shared a closing session on post-modernism and complexity theory. Yours truly had the honor of creating a session on "radical pedagogy in post-structural time" with South African Wayne Hugo.

Aside from the opportunity to enjoy the Brazilian Winter sun and the cultures of Rio, highlights for me centered around the cross-national conversations that took place in each conference session. The symposium on the potential of *ubuntu* organized by Lesley Le Grange, Yusef Waghid, Peter Beets and Chris Reddy from South Africa not only engaged in the theme of Africanizing school and university curriculum, but provided a platform both in and out of the session for scholars from Asia, North and Central America, Australia and Europe to reconsider curriculum discourses and their implications. On the one hand, the spirit of *ubuntu* seems to offer a variety of generative discourses connecting indigenous culture and the environment to community and social justice. On the other hand, like many hope-inducing discourses, conversation opened up paths of critique that implicate *ubuntu* and other cultural practices in forms of conservative cultural reproduction that limit opportunities for disenfranchised and marginalized members of society. Such cautionary complexity lurked as well in the several symposia on curriculum in Taiwan, as well as "The state of the debate on curriculum in Latin America: the southern cone case." Each of these symposia brought together a group of eminent scholars from a particular region in the world in front of a global, trans-national audience, sparking parallels and contrasting comparisons with the ways that curriculum theory and practice brushes up against teacher education, educational policy, and national debates about citizenship and democracy. Those debates about citizenship and democracy were also addressed by a collection of Canadian scholars who spoke on the "Glocal complexities of citizenship education curriculum for newcomers," and by a group of Brazilian scholars who addressed the theme of theoretical and methodological aspects of research with everyday educational networks ("- Aspectos teórico-metodológicos e teórico-epistemológicos das pesquisas com os cotidianos de redes educativas").

Most of the paper presentations at the conference were directly tied to the theme of "Questioning Curriculum Theory," and indeed, it seemed that curriculum theory was questioned in every possible form and by every possible epistemological, political, narrative, ideological, and disciplinary perspective, reminding every participant how contested and disruptive our field is in this historical and geographically shifting moment. In this respect, I believe that our own local affiliate of IAACS, AAACS, is appropriately "in synch" with the internationalization movements taking place in curriculum studies around the world. We are asking with our 2013 conference theme whether curriculum studies can, should, or should not, be understood as displacement, transference, or action.

Yet, while our own call for contributions in 2013 laments the likelihood of scholarship as complacent perseveration simultaneously perpetuating cycles of epistemological and cultural domination, perhaps providing pleasures of articulation and self-promotion without necessarily challenging those forms of domination, I honestly did not feel that same sort of ennui and anguish in conversations with scholars from Japan, Australia, South Africa, Brazil, Mexico, Canada, China, and so on who attended the World Conference. There were only several scholars attending from the United States, and our minority status allowed a different relationship to the notions of counter-western theory, displacement, transference and action when these discourses are co-opted and transmuted around the world, or used in ways that their original coiners might not have anticipated. Whereas we might mourn the loss of alternative theories and practices squelched by centuries of imperialism, colonialism and their aftermath, the creolization of culture evident at a trans-national conference questions the questioner of curriculum theory. Such questioning at once both denudes and cloaks the bodies of discourse and hubris of action promulgated in the Brownian motion of ideas and alchemy of theory and culture that takes place in such settings. For this reason, my experiences at IAACS in Rio are igniting my enthusiasm for our upcoming meeting this April in San Francisco: I want to see how we are bringing that questioning of curriculum theory into our own work here in the United States, and how that questioning has spurred new forms of scholarship and practice.

My "deployment" of the term "creolization" is highly charged. One might challenge AAACS to explain itself and the cavalier tossing out of such a term by its current President. After all, it is AAACS that undertook the highly contested task of proposing a "canon" for our field. That AAACS Task Force, under the initial leadership of Bill Shubert, and later under the chairmanship of Patrick Roberts, and with contributions from the task force members Nina Asher, Erik Malewski, and Janet Miller, used interesting criteria to formulate a list of "key texts in the intellectual history of curriculum studies" (AAACS Canon Project) that, in the professional judgment of the committee, would constitute "a base-line of curriculum studies expertise." From the start, the idea of this project set in motion severe criticism associated with the very concept of a canon project. Any short list of key texts is going to leave out important texts that many would think should be included. At the same time, any representation of the history of our field in the United States would necessarily reflect the racialized, ideological limitations of that history. One could only welcome condemnation of any so-called canon, and applaud that condemnation for recognizing our problematic legacy. Of course there have been numerous critiques of the project itself as complicit in various forms of intellectual imperialism, cultural reproduction, and hegemonic epistemocide of contrasting traditions around the world (Paraskeva 2012). The Canon Project Committee was sensitive to these potential reactions to a proposed canon. In their report, they wrote,

> The committee discussed at length the challenge of being inclusive while avoiding tokenism or broadening the list beyond what was felt to be a useful core. Thus, the committee ran into an inherent conflict: by attempting to name texts that met the criteria for the project it necessarily did not include many important works that might have brought more diversity to the list. While we, the committee, dislike the fact that the intellectual history of the curriculum studies field lacks, among other forms of difference, intellectual, racial, gender, and class diversity, a comparison of that history to the present day field illustrates both how far we have come and how far we have to go. If nothing else, it is the committee's hope that the curriculum studies canon will encourage, through concrete understanding of the field's historicity, curriculum scholars to see their own work in complicated conversations with this history, and to imagine and work toward a curriculum canon of the future that will represent a plurality of diverse voices, experiences, and ideas.
>
> Finally, it should be noted that inclusion of a particular work on the list does not equal committee endorsement of the ideas or perspectives expressed in that work.

The canon project places the history of curriculum studies in the United States directly in our faces, both its substantial accomplishments and its severe limitations.

Soon after the report from the Canon Project Committee, AAACS formed two new task forces, one focusing on the internationalization of curriculum studies, under the leadership of Andrea Baldwin, and the other focusing on the role of curriculum scholarship in policy and practice, organized and led by Robert Helfenbein and Todd Price. Both task forces have been active in placing the canon list in the context of curriculum scholarship outside of the United States in non-English languages, and in relationship with a range of perspectives on curriculum policy and educational practices broadly conceived. How this work might influence our work within AAACS and the scholarship of individual members remains to be seen, but there is the promise of more than "translation" across and among cultural and linguistic boundaries. At the very least, we are committed as an organization to making parallel and contrasting traditions of curriculum studies visible and to using such work to transform our fundamental assumptions and practices. As noted by Patrick Roberts in his spring 2012 introduction to the new North American Literature section of the *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, "the seeds of our own anxieties about whether or not the work we do "counts," about whether or not our work has influence, about whether or not we are in fact a "field," about whether or not our intellectual commitments are fairly categorized," (Roberts 2012) are always embedded in and implicated in our scholarly efforts. We can read the recent support of these new task forces in this way, most overtly, as José Augusto Pacheco (2013, and in this issue) proposes, as instruments with which we strive to frame the curricular movements and self-definitions of worldliness that constrain and enable our work.

At the Fourth World Curriculum Studies Conference, signifiers of legitimacy were bandied about left and right – references to William Pinar, William Doll, Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe; sentences that included ideas from cultural studies, public pedagogy, the quotidian, complexity, and so on. Does research wielding these signifiers eclipse curriculum theorizing grounded in, for example, the non-action of *wuwei* (Moon 2012b)? When Alan Block (2012) interrogates the placement of evaluation and objectives in the work of Ralph Tyler, noting that "the reification … suppressions and barbarisms that accompany that process …are rarely the subject of our classroom pedagogies," does this critical work somehow obscure the contributions of Indonesian theorist Ki Hajar Dewantara (Aletheiani 2012), Chinese scholar Tao Xingzhi and Cuban activist Raúl Ferrer (Price 2012), Jamaican artist and activist Marcus Garvey, or Korean educational theorist Tasan Chong Yag-yong (Moon 2012a)? Indeed it might be so argued, as once more we publish an article on Tyler while awaiting wider dissemination of the work of the presenters at the 2012 meeting of AAACS in Vancouver, Canada who were part of a special session on the internationalization of curriculum studies chaired by João Paraskeva.

Yet surely a critique of the insidious ways in which assessment rhetoric is implicated in the violence we label school, eloquently crafted by Block, is critical at this historic international juncture, given the ways that evaluation and measurement of objectives overtake most any other discourse in seemingly every corner of our globe. In contrast, curriculum studies scholars in Rio last summer applied signifiers of legitimacy like those in the last paragraph in ways that interwove the insights such language promises with nuanced changes in their purpose and direction. To imagine an old-fashioned debate regarding canonical versus exo-canonical scholarship and writing in curriculum studies would have been absurd. I am left ruminating on the intangible differences afforded by such a trans-national, inter-national experience. The differences may have something to do with what Desai (2012) recently named the "methodology of rematriation/repatriation" and the "tactic of solidarity" in a critique of the canon project (pp.162-3). Echoing much of the AAACS discussion from 2008-1010 concerning the commons, rematriation of curriculum studies might focus, suggests Desai, on active redistribution of power, knowledge, and place, and the dismantling of settler colonialism, doing curriculum work in community as opposed to on communities. A proposed reflection on the cosmologies of our communities would imply that the chain of value of curriculum studies is shaped by a community's understanding of the relationships between human knowledge and/within the cosmos. A defensive response to Desai from AAACS might ask how a critique of one artifact such as the canon might be misunderstood and misinterpreted when taken out of the broader context of the work of the association. However, our centering of "the commons," our work with bringing non-English, non-American, curriculum scholarship into the work of a broader community of curriculum scholars, our engagement with communities of practice and activism around responses to the common core, and so on, in no way simplify our relationship to cultural constructions such as a canon, both as an interrogation of our own genealogies and as a counter-weight to naïve ignorance of our histories, nor do they relinquish the need to place the dilemmas and controversies promoted by isolated, out-of-context reception of our efforts. Again, a defensive stance might ask, "what more can we do? We confront our legacies, including those of colonialism, slave-trading, and the uses of education and educational practices for the social reproduction of these and other institutions of inequality; we recognize the ways in which our association's affiliation with an international association committed to the internationalization of our field can be constituted as complicit with internationalization misconstrued as "Americanization" and the "capitalist free-market wild-west of enterprise," and we construct our annual themes to directly address these sites of contestation." Yet, I repeat, there is a characteristically different tone to the scholarship at the international meetings when compared with our local AAACS conferences, a tone that shifts away from adding on traditions and perspectives from "outside" to one of plurality without a center.

To bring us back home, at our own meetings of AAACS there has been a massive paradigm eruption that bypasses the canon debates even as the debate rages on. In a quick perusal of last year's conference program, within which we challenged ourselves to probe the meaning of the internationalization of curriculum studies, asking internationalization within globalization for whom, how, where, when, and so on, I count no fewer than fifteen of the sessions outside of theme-related special sessions and invited speakers devoted to complicated conversations that avoided privileging of any one school of thought, cultural tradition, or theorist's perspective, in favor of interweaving and juxtaposing scholarship from anywhere and everywhere. These included: "Curriculum, schooling, and teacher education: International perspectives;" "New pedagogical spaces and new literacies;" "Curriculum theorizing: Debating the debate;" "Embodying internationalization: Graduate students' experiences in curriculum inquiry, parts I and II;" "Curriculum studies and life stories;" "International complicated conversations;" "Critical curriculum exegesis in the neoliberal momentum;" "Best practices in curriculum studies: Whose internationalization?;" "Métissageing the tensioned places within internationalization and curriculum: Life writing in times of crisis;" Internationalization – voices and silences;" "Internationalization of instrumentalism? An international dialogue amongst Korean, Iranian, and Canadian educators;" "Education for sustainable development;" "Teacher education in neoliberal global times: International perspectives;" "Local curriculum studies in a global momentum. Whose Internationalization?;" and "Navigating post-colonial pathways: Theorizing from international narratives." Almost every one of these sessions presented contributors from more than one country in the world in the same session. The complicated conversations at our own conferences have a flavor similar to that of the international conference. I claim we are witnessing a paradigm disruption that will have serious echoes for some time to come.

How do we guarantee that this disruption comes to represent a major transformation in our field? One small step would be to move beyond supplying space for some of us to translate curriculum scholarship of other traditions and from languages other than English to including the insights and questions of these long-standing educational traditions and challenges to Western epistemology in our own personal practices (Paraskeva 2011; Jupp, 2013). As Stephen Carpenter and Jennifer Sandlin describe in their recent introduction to a recent issue of the *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, ignorance is often not the accidental kind, thought of as a gap in knowing or as an epistemic oversight easily remedied once noticed (2012, p.99). Thanks to our own efforts in charging our new task forces with important work, any ignorance of other traditions of curriculum theory, epistemologies, and curricular practices that have not typically influenced the field within the United States, within which most members of AAACS reside, is now of a different type: it becomes the sort of ignorance actively produced for purposes of domination and exploitation, perhaps best noted as "indifference." *The Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*'s "Perspectives" section of volume 9, Number 2, for which Carpenter and Sandlin's comments serve as an introduction, focuses on the ways that indifference and ignorance function as pedagogical and epistemological sites, in particular on recent intersections of coloniality and ignorance as promulgated by recent changes in curriculum policy and legislation in Arizona. Sharma's article in that section, "Immigration, Incarceration, and Cultural Exclusion," echoes AAACS's own interests in establishing an active task force on the connections among curriculum studies, policy and practice, stating that "policy is a cultural construct, the product of a deliberate configuration of dominant ideologies, political interests, economic contests, and social issues, embedded within power relations of privilege and exclusion" (2012, p. 135).

The tensions among the components of such configurations and among the various approaches one-might take to a critical perspective on these configurations were powerfully evident to me as I participated in a local *Favella* Tour led by DJ Zezinho, Founding Director of the Rochinha Media School (http://rocinhamediaschool.org/) in the *favella* known as Rochinha. *Favellas* are areas of Rio hugging the hills, overlooking the posh neighborhoods and beach communities below. They are historically areas of poverty ignored by the Brazilian and State governments, where marginalized members of colonial Brazil were left to fend for themselves; over time they have gained reputations for crime and violence, drug trafficking, and organized crime syndicates, whether justified or not. Recent government policing claims to have reduced and in some cases eliminated much drug violence. Zezinho organizes ad hoc walks in and around his *favella*, attractive to tourists curious about *favellas*, or those interested in an off-the-beaten-path exoticism. On one level, these tours are a form of education for those affluent enough to travel to Rio from around the world, typically uninformed about the history and politics of Rio that frames the lives of those who live in *favellas* and those who employ residents of these *favellas* down below. It is striking to learn about the ways that residents have found to organize their own communities, provide public services, and establish a vibrant cultural life on the margins of official society. On another level, these tours are a form of education for residents of the *favella* who get to know tour participants as real people who want to know more about the *favella* community and not just have a good time in Rio. Most important, Zezinho pours the money paid for these tours back into his Media School, renting space, buying equipment, and devoting time to the support of his students, who end up hosting parties for the community and mentoring newer members of the school.

Because of the ways that the tours are part of a broader effort to contribute to the local life of the *favella*, Zezinho's friends and acquaintances, small business owners and the occasional passerby are glad to chat with the tourists, share stories of their lives, and answer questions. The juxtaposition of this complex enterprise, crossing cultural and pedagogical boundaries and unabashedly promoting the rights and privileges of *favella* residents, full of hope and innovation, and offering multiple pathways to teaching and learning, with the conversations among curriculum scholars and researchers in the Hotel Pestana, themselves often mired in a globally common frustration about the distance between theory, policy and practice, was startling. Because of my own work with a "para-educational" community organization merging arts and politics, the Spiral Q Puppet Theater (http://spiralq.org/), I was fascinated by the successes of the grassroots curriculum theorizing and praxis Zezinho has accomplished, the range of visitors from around the world that are now thinking about the complex dynamics among politics, culture, community and education thanks to having participated in these tours, and the potential that involvement in such organizations has for informing our work in curriculum studies. Many of these community-based programs are independently inventing their own concepts and theories, in the context of new forms of pedagogical intervention in social issues, within a highly active, international network that enables them to share their experiences with each other, and learn from the experiences of others. We might label this community-rich form of curriculum "scholarship" a "cosmopolitan sensibility" (Hansen 2008): a sensibility that would be pursued to support people in working through the tensions that accompany global and local change in our time, positioning them to reconstruct cultural and individual values, traditions of educational practice, and varied modes of cultural criticism, rather than abandoning them in the face of the ceaseless pressure of globalization. The cosmopolitan begins with the inescapable difference between humans that compels our ethical and political observations in education (Jupp 2013; Pinar, 2011; Todd 2011).

My brief encounter with Zezinho and Rocinha echoed the excitement generated every time I participate in a Spiral Q Puppet Theater event (such as PeopleHood, an annual parade and celebration of the West Philadelphia neighborhood), balancing the mindful and provocative conversations at the World Curriculum Studies conference with the sort of zeal William Pinar (2009) writes about as juxtaposing the abstract and the concrete, the collective and the individual, history and biography, politics and art, public service and private passion. As Sobe (2009) points out, the efficacy of studying "vernacular cosmopolitanisms," actual, existing cosmopolitanisms such as those sparked by the interactions during a *favella* tour or community-generated street theater, is nothing new to suggest, and indeed promises much for comparative education and for a richer understanding of the internationalization of curriculum. This is not to say that cosmopolitanism is any sort of "answer," but rather to suggest that the concept can be employed in ways that both support and block our commitments and perspectives, locally and globally. Cosmopolitanism itself can get mired in a defanged "comparativeness" (Popkewitz 2008), indexing ways of being in the world while also operating on a micro level, yet failing to generate new forms of cosmopolitanism itself. In the case of the *favella* tour, the micro-level of analysis of *favella* history and politics, along with the increased understanding of the potential for *favella* values to infuse contemporary democratic efforts in Brazil, despite the complexities of the history and politics, might be a potent opportunity for rethinking the politics and economics of academic scholarship, as a parallel effort to bring thinking actors together from around the world to engage in conversations about teaching, learning, community, and the creation of sustainable educational institutions that are intimately interwoven with their communities.

"By way of definition, *cosmopolitan sensibilities* refer to *the careful, creative, and reflective study of one's own and others' intellectual traditions as a means of leveraging subjectivity and creating non-determinist, critical, and ethical dispositions*," writes Jupp (2012). He suggests further that cosmopolitan sensibilities refuse a now tired-and-ahistorical polemics on the proliferation of new-and-better-refined discourses, potentially sublating Anglophone-centric and Statesian discourses or their refined proliferations; if this were indeed the case, then we could embrace cosmopolitanism – defined in such a way – as going beyond Anglophone-centric and Statesian curriculum discursive strategies, promoting carefully historicized curriculum research, critical intercultural dialogue, and heterogeneous internationalization within an ethical stance as opposed to some "unbiased moral principles." This brings me back to how my experiences at the Fourth World Curriculum Conference sets up an excitement about what will happen this year at our own AAACS meeting in San Francisco. In the call for proposals for this year's conference, we ask ourselves to consider the following questions:

> How can we fight for a just society and just school, and just curriculum with a just theory? How can we engage and create a just theory? A question we are tempted to ask, "Who determines the we?" can only be asked in a discourse that already has those included and those excluded by criteria. Who defines a just theory? Who sets the limits? When we ask these questions, we construct an ideological neutral teacher, student, and policy designer who would not experience their own understanding of their social and cultural reality as having common elements; meaning the limits would be experienced differently as would the justice of a particular theory. If to interpret society is to change it, how can we produce any change with blemished theoretical tools? Can we head on a global theory? What

> do we really want? Do we want to change the field? Do we want to change curriculum theory? Do we want to change society? Do we want to challenge the Western modern discrepancy between social experience and social expectations? What are we doing now? What now is helping us to participate in the great conversation that is curriculum theory, and what are you doing to help AAACS make these kind of things possible? How can we engage in a theory that is aware of different historical patterns within the West and beyond the West and between West and non-West platforms? How can we produce a theory that doesn't seek a predominant pattern? In what ways does the lack of such a theory make the pleasure of wanting such a theory even more pleasurable than any seemingly perfect theory could be?

In Paraskeva's (2012) editorial introduction, he takes us into such territory, committing AAACS through its journal to challenging the sociology of absences, that is, challenging how certain non-western epistemologies have been rendered as non-existent. While he calls for us to take on these challenges without fostering what he terms 'indeginestoude' (Paraskeva 2011), or a kind of romantic exoticism of indigenous knowledges that would further colonialize non-Western epistemologies and practices by assuming an itinerant posture of a deterritorialized thinking, he insists that our work through our Internationalization Task Force has successfully denied any mystification of indigenous cultures and knowledges. The key strategy will be to extend this work in consort with our task force, calling in the scholarship of each of our members for a democratization of knowledges grounded in emancipatory, non-relativistic, cosmopolitan ecologies, a "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." As we learn from cosmologies and knowledges other than our own, in particular 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), we would be transforming our field against the kind of "Western thinking" one might label "abysmal thinking" (with Paraskeva), rooting out among other things systems of visible and invisible distinctions.

Jupp (2013) asks us to accomplish our work while avoiding the double-bind of "what's next?" Instead of riding the next "new wave" of trendy theory and provocative discourse in opposition to the mainstream curriculum work of "what works," I urge each of us to read the published papers of IAACS scholars from Brazil, some of which have already appeared in the IAACS journal, *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* (http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/tci), alongside the new translations and analyses of non-American scholarship published by our AAACS colleagues in this very journal. The caveat is that mere translation of texts of any form, or even serious attempts to sincerely occupy new spaces of discourse and practice, are often considered doomed to fail. Andersen-Levitt, in the context of anthropologies of education, writes, "Wherever borrowing occurred, however, the literature on borrowing suggests that it was probably selective, designed to suit local interests and needs … Moreover, even where anthropologies of education flow from a common source or share common literatures, one can expect them to diverge over time because when researchers import an idea, they "creolize" what they borrow, transforming it to make it their own" …"Creolization is a process rich in creativity. It means that when an idea is borrowed it never remains the same; hence, one must always expect national or regional or linguistic variations" (p. 21).

My own thinking about creolization has been influenced more by border pedagogies than ethnographies of education; in some instances of border pedagogy, people are working and constructing creolized theories not so simply labeled as locally bounded, and instead dwell in the “uncanny valley” of intercultural, liminal terrains that simultaneously exist in and out of those categories (Appelbaum 2011). Borders are concrete lines of differences, whereas borderlands are permeable, ill-defined areaswith no specific borders. We are no longer looking in from a critical standpoint outside, as might be the case with epistemologies of ignorance and their three fixed dimensions that situate knowledge along parallel, independent paths. Instead, we are *in* the borderlands, wherever and whatever they might be, with whatever shifting sense of difference and continuity they imply, sliding along gradients of culture and concepts, rather than jumping into crevasses. The intercultural wrestles with difficult experiences of power and authority while celebrating in this difficult work the joys of the uncanny. Parallel cultures, either geographically or in the realms of knowledge and ignorance, obfuscate in some ways the critical issues of power and the interrelationship of subordinate and dominant groups. Border pedagogues make the uncanny the point of their work, so that the haunting of what we know, do not know, and cannot know become the tools of practice. In this way, these theorists look for new mirrors because they promise new gazes, rather than anticipating what they might reveal. They enjoy the uncanny expectation as a defining feature of what is special about the intellectual challenges of their work in the borderlands, living the embrace of critical multiculturalism. This might be, in Paraskeva’s terms, a struggle for social and cognitive justice; in Jupp’s terms, this would be a return to Maxine Greene’s critical engagement, including progressive complexity and aesthetic understanding of traditions-in-the-making and traditions-for-curriculum-performance that are recovered in teaching and learning, a creative undoing of the culture wars’ double binds through the embrace of multiple traditions at the same time. For Kumar, a historic survey of curriculum studies in Brazil brings us to the current emphasis on everyday life and enunciation as event, each represented as duration in images that reconfigure the very meaning of representation. This notion of the everyday, the quotidian, was evident in a number of the presentations at the Fourth World Conference, demonstrating specific concepts that we might borrow in a borderland of curriculum studies enacted through our own alliances and intellectual commitments.

References

Aletheiani, Dinny Risri. 2012. Indonesian curriculum theorist: Ki Hajar Dewantara. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, April 10-13.

Anderson-Levitt, Kathryn. 2012. *Anthropologies of Education: A global guide to ethnographic studies of learning and schooling*. Berghan Books.

Appelbaum, Peter. 2011. Carnival of the uncanny. In *Epistemologies of ignorance and studies of limits in education*, Erik Malewski and Nathalia Jaramillo (eds.), pp.22-239). Information Age Publishing.

Baldwin, Andrea. 2012. The case of Jamaica's Marcus Garvey. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, April 10-13.

Block, Alan. 2012. Toward objectives and assessment: Means of Control. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*. 8: 1, http://www.uwstout.edu/soe/jaaacs/upload/v8_Means_of_Control.pdf.

Desai, Chandi. 2012. Do we want something new or just repetition of 1492? Engaging with the "next" moment in curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*. 8:2, pp.153-167.

Jupp, James. 2013. Undoing Doublebinds in Curriculum: On Cosmopolitan Sensibilities in U. S. Curriculum Studies. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*. 9: 1,

Kumar, Ashwani. 2012. Curriculum studies in Brazil: An overview. ? *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*. 8: 1, http://www.uwstout.edu/soe/jaaacs/upload/v8_Studies_in_Brazil.pdf.

Moon, Seungho. 2012a. Tasan Chong Yag-yong: Practical learning school in Korea and Neo-Confucianism. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*. 9: 1,

Moon, Seungho. 2012b. Wuwei (non-action) and school reform: What does the

"non-action" pedagogy imply? Presentation at the Journal of Curriculum Theorizing Conference on Curriculum Theory and Classroom Practice. Dayton, OH, October 18020.

Pacheco, José Augusto. 2012. Curriculum studies: What is the field today? *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*. 8: 1, http://www.uwstout.edu/soe/jaaacs/upload/v8_What_Is_The_Field_Today.pdf.

Paraskeva, João. 2011. *Conflicts in curriculum theory. Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. Palgrave.

Paraskeva, João. 2013. Editorial Note. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*. 9:1

Pinar, William. 2009. *The worldliness of a cosmopolitan education: Passionate lives in public service*. New York: Routledge.

Popkewitz, T. S. (2008). *Cosmopolitanism and the age of school reform: Science, education, and making society by making the child*. New York: Routledge.

Price, Todd. 2012. Las Etapas de la Educación: Literacy, Communism and Democracy from Tao Xingzhi to Raúl Ferrer. Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, April 10-13.

Roberts, Patrick. 2012. Living in view of the past. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies.* 8: 1, http://www.uwstout.edu/soe/jaaacs/upload/v8_Patrick_Note.pdf.

Sharma, Sunita. 2012. Immigration, incarceration, and cultural exclusion. *The Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*. 9:2, pp. 135-137.

Sobe, Noah. 2009. Rethinking 'cosmopolitanism' as an analytic for the comparative study of globalization and education. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*. 12:1, http://www.tc.edu/cice/Issues/12.01/12_01_Sobe.html.

Todd, Sharon. 2011. *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.