

Editor's Introduction

DECOLONIZING AND DE-CANONIZING CURRICULUM STUDIES:
AN ENGAGED DISCUSSION ORGANIZED AROUND
JOÃO M. PARASKEVA'S RECENT BOOKS

JAMES C. JUPP

University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

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

Over two years ago, I began discussing the idea of a symposium to be organized around João Paraskeva's (2011, 2016a) recent sole-authored books for the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (AAACS). After much discussion, collaboration, toil, and editorial support,¹ I am publishing the results of that symposium in my role as Editor of International Literature for the *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (JAAACS)*. The first version² of this symposium (Price, Moreira, Sússekind, Barbosa de Oliveira, Paraskeva, & Jupp, 2016) emerged as a special session at the AAACS 2016 annual meeting at George Washington University in Washington, DC organized by Peter Appelbaum, Brian Casemore, and myself. The symposium was transnational and included presenters Maria Luiza Sússekind, Inês Barbosa de Oliveira, Maria Alfredo Moreira, Todd Price, and respondent João Paraskeva. The symposium was attended by several senior and established scholars including Janet Miller, Tero Autio, James Henderson, Antonio Carlos Amorim, Michael Uljens, Elizabeth Macedo, Robert Helfenbein, Peter Appelbaum, Rose Ylimaki, and Susan Mayer among other notable curriculum studies scholars. Generally, I think what pulled these senior and established scholars to the symposium and what sparked this JAAACS special section were the themes of intellectual and curriculum history, themes that are emblematic of AAACS as an organization.³ As a note, several articles in this special section including those by Sússekind, Barbosa de Oliveira,

Price, Paraskeva, and Schubert along with this introduction all provide readings of intellectual and curriculum history that inform transnational curriculum studies' shared labor.

As Chair of the 2016 symposium and Editor of this special section, my intentions in bringing this project to publication in *JAAACS* were twofold. First, I wanted to advance the work of the AAACS International Task Force. Organized under AAACS President Peter Appelbaum with continued support of President Molly Quinn, the Task Force emerged over several years as an alternative forum for the "internationalization" of curriculum studies.⁴ Following Paraskeva's interrogations regarding whose internationalization was being pursued at the 2011 AAACS Business Meeting in New Orleans (Appelbaum, 2011), the Task Force spontaneously formed. Under the steady leadership of Andrea Baldwin since 2011, the Task Force has been a regular feature on AAACS annual programs (e.g., Baldwin, Moon, Jupp, Risri Aletheiani, Paraskeva, 2013; Baldwin, Risri Aletheiani, Miyazawa, Moon, Price, & Paraskeva, 2014; Baldwin, Risri Aletheiani, Price, Moon, & Paraskeva, 2012; Moon, Risri Aletheiani, Price, Lopez, & Jupp, 2017). At present, the Taskforce's intellectual production includes one edited book (Paraskeva, 2016b), and as Editor of this special section, I dedicate the work here to the future historicizing scholarship of the Task Force.⁵

Second, I wanted to highlight a discussion of Paraskeva's (2011, 2016a) recent sole-authored books, yet in doing so, my intention exceeded that of advancing a single scholar's contributions. Specifically, in regards to Paraskeva's contributions, I believed that the field had variously ignored or sidelined his contributions long enough, and by AAACS 2016, I thought the time had arrived to discuss, critique, and debate his substantial (while imperfect) contributions to curriculum studies. Notwithstanding, in addition to advancing Paraskeva's contributions, I sought to pursue a larger historicizing trajectory in curriculum studies.

In the spirit of AAACS' focus on intellectual and curriculum history, this larger trajectory begins to suggest a different historical location and division of labor for curriculum studies that could move the field beyond reconceptualist understanding of competing discourses (e.g., Pinar, 1988; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, Taubman, 1995) and discursive refinements (Malewski, 2010). From my perspective, both the Task Force and Paraskeva's contributions were beginning to position curriculum studies within a longer transnational and historical panorama that directly or indirectly referenced historical western colonization and present day coloniality as backdrops.

Importantly, I am not referring to historical colonization and coloniality as another (always new, until old) more fashionable and expansionist social science “discourse,” “framework,” “paradigm,” or “analytic” to throw on top of often ahistorical cultural or legal studies’ bone piles. Rather, I am referring to a curriculum studies that moves beyond understanding its history singularly as a 1970s revisionist spat with Ralph Tyler and US-based curriculum development forces towards a newly critical, historicized, and politicized engagement in longstanding traditions of educational and cultural criticism from various georegions. In my discussion and conclusion section, I return to and elaborate on this historicizing trajectory for which the Task Force and Paraskeva’s contributions have become emblematic in the field.

Having narrated its influences and emergent trajectory, I introduce the *JAAACS* special section organized around Paraskeva’s (2011, 2016a) recent sole-authored books with the following contours. First, I scaffold the special section by discussing and characterizing Paraskeva’s conceptual grammar, including his deployments of the notions of colonization, coloniality, decolonization, southern theory, epistemicide, linguicide, abyssality, and itinerancy. Second, I provide a note on translation with special emphasis on the recolonizing problematics of translation, mutuality of purpose, negotiation of meaning, and cosmopolitan sensibilities. Third, I provide an overview of the five review essays and two commentaries that comprise the special section. Finally, in the discussion and conclusion, I return to and elaborate on the potentials of a transnational South-North dialogue in curriculum studies.

Paraskeva’s Conceptual Grammar

Characterizing Paraskeva’s conceptual grammar is a challenge. Paraskeva reads forward toward futurity but also studies in several historical traditions of cultural and educational criticism based on a vast knowledge of US curriculum theory and history. Given the space constraints here, I can provide only a gloss of Paraskeva’s complex conceptual grammar for readers needing a foothold as they approach the special section.

Before beginning, it is necessary to situate Paraskeva’s contributions to curriculum studies within broad concerns regarding Marxian historical struggle and emancipation (e.g., Lenin, 1902/2016; Freire, 1970/1998; Gramsci, 1971/2003; Marx, 1844/1982) and related directions in education theory and critical pedagogy

(e.g., Apple, 2000; Counts, 1932; Freire, 1970/1998; Giroux, 1988; Kliebard, 1995).

Importantly, Paraskeva includes yet critiques and moves beyond transplanted and colonizing Western European thinking platforms toward recognition of what has been broadly termed decolonizing southern theory. Emphatically, Paraskeva insists that uncritical engagements in Western European thinking platforms (i.e., positivist-scientific, liberal-progressive, even Marxian-critical ones) and their combinations serve only to advance White supremacist, patriarchal, eugenic, racial-ethnic cleansing projects of historical colonization through present-day coloniality. Yet simultaneously, Paraskeva resists over-simple reversals of Western European thinking platforms with ostensibly “new,” “discovered,” or “recovered” southern platforms. Instead, Paraskeva’s (2011, 2016a) sole authored books reviewed in this special section but also his edited (2016b) and collaborative edited (Paraskeva & Steinberg, 2016) books encourage critical, historical, and transnational readings. Rather than developing over-simple reversals, Paraskeva drives at dialectical perspectives of Western European thinking platforms from a Global South perspective (e.g., Achebe, 1959; Cabral, 1969; Du Bois, 1960/1972; Dussell, 1977/2011, 2000; Mariategui, 1928/2007). For the purposes the gloss here, I provide only a broad outline of Paraskeva’s conceptual grammar, and by doing so, I hope to engage readers toward deeper and more thorough readings of his work and its underlying sources.

Paraskeva’s conceptual grammar moves along three broad dimensions emphasizing (a) the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being; (b) epistemicides, linguicides, abyssality, and the ecology of knowledges; and, (c) poststructuralist hermeneutic itinerancy. The first dimension of Paraskeva’s conceptual grammar draws on decolonial intellectual production (e.g., Cabral, 1969; Dussel, 1977/2011, 2000; Mariategui, 1928/2007; Mignolo, 2008, 2009; Quijano, 1992, 2000; Walsh, 2012). In following this line, Paraskeva’s contributions modestly relocate curriculum studies work within the arc of historical colonization rather than dyed-in-the-wool 1970s revisionist narratives.⁶ In relocating the historical arc, Paraskeva draws attention to the notion of coloniality as the continuation of historical western colonization in the present. In his writings, Paraskeva advances and refines notions of coloniality as educational project infused in public pedagogy and formal academic curricula. Under the aegis of globalizing capitalism, the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being emerge as militarized “free” markets, “universal” disciplinary knowledge, “individual” consumers, and patriarchal northern “leadership” toward a “developed” world. In this way, the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being

variously occlude, extinguish, and rid the world of local power structures, knowledges, and practices in advancing colonial projects and violating alternatives. For Paraskeva, the present day world system maintains and continues the relationships of historical colonization in a different form through coloniality. In this special section, Barbosa de Oliveira, Moreira, and Janson and Motta Silva provide discussions focusing on coloniality.

The second dimension of Paraskeva's conceptual grammar draws on southern epistemologies (e.g., Barbosa de Oliveira, 2012, 2017b; Thiong'o, 2009; Santos, 2006, 2009; Santos, Nunes, Meneses, 2007; Süsskind, 2014, 2017). In following this line, Paraskeva's contributions emphasize the deficitary and threatened status of Global South intellectual traditions. Variousy occulted, ignored, or disappeared in Global North knowledge creation and selection processes, Global South intellectual traditions are understood as regional, derived, or inferior copies of Western European thinking platforms with their assumed generalizability or universality, against which the southern intellectual traditions provide at best a "particular case" and at worst under-developed thinking or backwards "superstition." Working through Santos (2006, 2009) Thiong'o (2009), and others, Paraskeva describes Global North knowledge creation and selection processes in the natural and social sciences as epistemicides and linguicides that are both symbolic of and part and parcel of material coloniality. In articulating epistemicides and linguicides, Paraskeva emphasizes the abyssal line or abyssality confronted and crossed by non-universal, localized, indigenous, black, brown, and mestizo epistemologies and traditions and resultant identity violence performed on identities. With disappearing knowledge traditions across the abyssal line, Western condemnation to abyssality is an enormous, tragic, and eugenic cleansing of localized geo-regions' knowledges and practices whose existence is increasingly tenuous in an age of whitening globalizing capitalism. As a counter to abyssality, Paraskeva follows Santos (2006, 2009), Santos, Nunes, and Meneses (2009), and others in arguing for an insurgent and alternative cosmopolitanism that combats existing epistemicides and linguicides through a democratized ecology of knowledges. Importantly here, this ecology of knowledges validates, advances, and emphasizes deployment of historically specific, localized, and necessarily racialized knowledges as part of a decolonizing resistance against the universal visions of globalizing capital. For Paraskeva, preserving and advancing the historically specific and localized knowledges and languages that underlie cognition—and through cognition cultural practices and social relations—represent the fundamental struggle for social justice. In the special section that

follows, Süssekind, Barbosa de Oliveira, and Moreira provide discussions on southern epistemologies.

The third dimension of Paraskeva's conceptual grammar draws on poststructuralist hermeneutic itinerancy (e.g., Deleuze & Guatari, 1987; Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982; Foucault, 1972; Mignolo, 2008; Slattery, 2006) or what he calls Itinerant Curriculum Theory (hereafter ICT). Drawing on this line of work, Paraskeva's ICT emphasizes processes of reading, writing, and ultimately knowing as a sliding dialectic of understanding that works through the exigencies of historical immanence and the *poesis* of transcendence that is key to teaching and learning (see Price, 2017). Importantly, Paraskeva works in curriculum studies *not* through a single or particular discourse or project but instead understands the field as fluid and interactive, creating convergences in several predominantly Western European thinking platforms. Valuing *and* condemning US-centric and Anglophone curriculum discourses, Paraskeva emphasizes the historical critical-progressive curriculum river as fluid resource in the struggle for curriculum relevance in schools and universities. Nonetheless, Paraskeva also condemns the shortsightedness of the field that understands US-centric and Anglophone university production simply as "the field" without recognition of alternative traditions of educational and cultural criticism. In a dialectic of loving yet mercilessly hard-hitting critiques, Paraskeva's ICT requires both recognition of the US-centric and Anglophone curriculum river's insights and advancements, yet simultaneously, he emphasizes the river as the very root of epistemicide and linguicide in extinguishing alternatives. For Paraskeva, ICT provides a hermeneutic for greater historical understanding of curriculum studies and for grappling with and critiquing curriculum studies' violent past of epistemicide and linguisticide. In the special section that follows, Süssekind, Janson and Motta Silva, and Price provide discussions of ICT, and Paraskeva provides a major cascading update on ICT in his commentary.

Reflections on Translation

This special section also requires a note on translation. Implicitly or explicitly, translation provides a major concern and theme for directions in transnational curriculum studies laid out here. In doing transnational curriculum studies, the challenge of translation presented itself front, center, and repeatedly in the course of writing and editing articles by Süssekind, Barbosa de Oliveira, Moreira, Motta Silva, and Paraskeva, all of whom are speakers of varieties of Portuguese, Spanish, English, and other languages. Each of these scholars, though native speakers of

Portuguese, produced articles in English that translated their thinking for this special section,⁷ requiring engagement in the recolonizing problematics of translation and, by extension, the subthemes of mutuality, negotiated meanings, and cosmopolitan sensibilities.

In transnational curriculum studies, we have heretofore only begun to approach the recolonizing problematics of translation inherent in working with non-Anglophone scholars whose intellectual formation takes place in other bodies of educational and cultural criticism. Generally, the problematic and complexity of translation is well-documented in the work of European hermeneutic traditions including the work of Chladenius, Schleiermacher, von Humboldt, Dilthey, Gadamer and others whose collective hermeneutic efforts created a dialectic of translation that moved back and forth as “method” for reading, interpreting, and philosophizing both “the classics”⁸ and as a means of reading social science documents and other texts. Specifically toward the special section now, transnational curriculum studies require profound engagement in the questions of whose languages are of most worth and, by extension, whose intellectual traditions are of most worth? (Jupp, 2013b; Razfar, 2011, 2012)⁹ Through to the present, efforts to internationalize curriculum studies have generally advanced the coloniality of knowledge through using “international” English as *lingua franca*. This use of English emphasizes the assumption that curriculum studies’ internationalization represents an expansion of the US-centered and Anglophone field’s third paradigm (Pinar, 2003, 2006, 2008, 2013; Schubert, 2008, 2009, 2010). At the least, the challenges of working across differences of language and intellectual tradition need greater attention in order to confront and correct curriculum studies’ coloniality as represented in its emphasis on US-centric and Anglophone understandings of the field. At worst, without remediation and reparation transnational curriculum studies will continue to advance a US-centric and Anglophone field and hoard US-centric senior scholars’ “prestige” along the way. Moreover, attention to the coloniality of Romance languages’ (Spanish, Portuguese, and French) role in both historical colonization and present-day colonial relations requires more attention along with the model of “international” English in relation to a hierarchical linguistic cleansing of indigenous languages and cognition. Work in this special section foregrounds the scholarship of intellectuals whose backgrounds include several languages, and here I strive not to “solve” the recolonizing problematics of translation in one simplistic reversal but rather to better grapple with and reflect on remediation and reparations in the context of transnational curriculum studies.¹⁰ This grappling with the recolonizing problematics of translation assumes a post-epistemicidal ethics.

As editor and organizer of this special section, I reflect on my experience working in translation through narrating three subthemes: mutuality, negotiated meanings, and cosmopolitan sensibilities. Naively, I agreed to edit the special section out of a critical enthusiasm for the project and the need to address a general and persistent coloniality of knowledge in curriculum studies. The always already recolonizing problematics of working in English and publishing in English academic venues loomed in the background of the early conceptual and drafting stages, and then these problematics surged forth with a vengeance in the revision and finalizing stages of publication. As an Anglophone and Hispanophone interacting with Lusophone intellectuals, I recognized very early the Latinate discursive features and syntactical structures¹¹ in the first round of essay submissions, yet I simplistically thought that each author could “work through” the reviewers’ and my comments in the revisions as though they all had an Anglophone, English, academic essay in their back pocket all along or had all received academic training in the US. Obstinate pushing back, the Latinate discursive features, syntactical structures, and ultimately, cognition did not simply just “go away” in the revision process. To the contrary, they became a major concern of attending to the meanings of the contributors’ essays and “correctly” rendering these meanings for *JAAACS*’ Anglophone readership. In the end, the revision process worked with translations from Lusophone intellectual traditions into Anglophone ones in ways that both resisted and re-centered US-centric and Anglophone curriculum studies. Clearly, within this successful resistance, the special section also participated in the recolonizing problematics of translation. Writ large, work calling itself “decolonial” should attend much more to this double-bind dynamic (Spivak, 2012) as part of doing the emotional and intellectual labor which, in transnational contexts, is always in translation. By moving beyond anxious hand-wringing, we must also learn to responsibly exercise power and influence through a collective mutuality of purpose, negotiation of meaning, and cosmopolitan sensibilities rather than retreat to erudite quietisms, modesties, and impossibilities.

Overall, as Editor, I am indebted to the contributors’ mutuality of purpose when I was asking for revisions that trimmed sentence length, suggested Anglophone discursive features, or situated arguments for what I perceived to be the needs of *JAAACS* readers’ horizon of intelligibility. As much as I could, I attempted to preserve and work through the presentation of contributors’ arguments, yet I found myself and the authors in a tight double bind of communicating the exigencies of Anglophone and US-centric academic readership’s expectations and publishing

venues without ostensible “errors” in discursive features and syntactical structures. Additionally, I am grateful to the contributors’ negotiation of meaning with me and the JAAACS editorial team during the back-and-forth of the revision and editorial processes. In all review processes (but emphatically amplified here), the negotiation of meaning moved both ways between editors and authors as, in final revisions, instances occurred where the authors simply required JAAACS’ editors to listen and be receptive, in paradoxically moving us as “activist” scholars into psychically feminine identitarian roles. Despite mutuality and negotiation, in reflecting on the process I continually asked myself as Editor once and again: Am I recolonizing the work? Are my contributors colonizing their own Global South national fields? And, most importantly, what are the ethical relations with black, brown, indigenous, and mestizo traditions and epistemologies? In transnational intellectual work, I think these are worthy and important questions that must deepen a transnational curriculum studies whose labor necessarily will extend what I have tried to articulate elsewhere as cosmopolitan sensibilities (Jupp, 2013a, 2013b). Mutuality, negotiation, and cosmopolitan sensibilities seem key to the emergent transnational curriculum studies field that is really taking its first steps, and in a larger sense, to any hopes for alternative left interlocutions and complex solidarities and alliances required in a broader political sense to combat globalizing capitalism.

In taking up the recolonizing problematics of translation, Gayatri Spivak’s (1988, 2012) work on subaltern voice, translation, reading in other traditions, and the burden of English begins to provide an instructive translation pedagogy. Putting aside Spivak’s understandable hand-wringing anxieties that accompany her elite positionality as subaltern within Ivy League university prestige economies, I agree with her concerns regarding the recolonizing problematics of voice and translation. Presently unsurprised by Spivak’s (1988) earlier conclusions that subaltern voice is necessarily mediated in academic discourse¹², nonetheless, Spivak’s (2012) recent reflections drive more at ethics in the relations of readership, interpretation, and praxis communities. Preoccupied with ethics in these relations, Spivak emphasizes the problematics of reading works from different literary traditions including a new comparative literature disciplinary canon which she urges literature professors to ignore. Contrasting to studying a comparative literature disciplinary canon, Spivak argues that the continuation of the Birmingham School’s root project on race, class, gender, sexuality, and other identity markers depends on rigorous aesthetic education in a global age that critically attends to who represents whom and why with special attention to power asymmetries within the circuits of transnational interlocution (Dussell, 2005; Spivak, 2012; Yúdice, 1991, 1992, 2003). Spivak’s recent

positions align with those of Paraskeva (2016a, 2016b), Paraskeva and Steinberg (2016), the Task Force (Appelbaum, 2011), and especially Süssekind (2017), Barbosa de Oliveira (2017b), and Moreira (2017). All of these scholars add critical depth and reflective dimensions on the circuits of intellectual interlocution that comprise a critical transnational curriculum studies that is aware both of the gifts and wounds from the historically US-centric and Anglophone field of curriculum studies.

The Five Articles and Two Comments

Having provided a trajectory and a note on translation, I characterize the contents of the special section here. Better than I could have planned, each of the contributors to the special section defines and marks an area of intellectual or pedagogical praxis organized around Paraskeva's (2011) *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory* and other recent books (Paraskeva, 2016a, 2016b, Paraskeva & Steinberg). First, Maria Luiza Süssekind's (2017) review essay titled "Against Epistemological Fascism: The (Self) Critique of the Criticals" provides a thorough overview of Paraskeva's contributions to curriculum studies with more depth than the gloss above. In particular, Süssekind emphasizes the position that the critical progressive curriculum river emblematic of Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman's (1995) exegetical coverage of the discourses provided both an advancement of the field but also a tragic epistemicide in its execution, legacy, and transnational interlocution.

Next, Inês Barbosa de Oliveira's (2017b) "Itinerant Curriculum Theory against Epistemicides: A Dialogue between the Thinking of Santos and Paraskeva" serves to ground Paraskeva's thinking deeply within the work of Boaventura de Sousa Santos. In particular, Oliveira provides a reading of the towering figure of Santos in contemporary Lusophone human science, critical theory, and philosophy. In making the connections between Paraskeva and Santos, Oliveira provides an in depth reading of Santos' intellectual career that follows on her recent book (Oliveira, 2017a) *Boaventura and Education*. For the readers who want access to Santos' bibliography as it relates to Paraskeva's contributions, Oliveira's reading provides that and more.

After that, Maria Alfredo Moreira's (2017) "'And the Linguistic Minorities Suffer What they Must?' A Review of Conflicts in Curriculum Theory through the lenses of Language Teacher Education" locates Paraskeva's influences squarely within the problematics of teacher education in Portugal, and in doing so, becomes a key teacher education praxis reflection on the significance of Paraskeva's body of work.

Moreira explicates how certain new conceptual tools, especially related to Thiong'o (2009) through Paraskeva (2011, 2016a), make for a more rigorous critical formation in language teacher education. Additionally, Moreira takes Paraskeva to task for failing to recognize that post-epistemicidal work already exists that respects practitioners and students' local knowledges, a blind spot in Paraskeva's (at times) top-down theoretical voice.

Following Moreira, Elizabeth Janson and Carmelia Motta Silva's (2017) "Itinerant Curriculum Theory: Navigating the Waters of Power, Identity, and Praxis" provides a practitioner reflection that takes Paraskeva's ICT into teacher identity and praxis. Defying theory-practice splits that often truncate education research or classroom practice discussions, Janson and Motta Silva reflect on ICT as a means to battle epistemicide both in their own lives and in the lives of their students. Beyond the (now standard) US-centered multicultural education typical of both teacher education and education graduate programs, both Janson and Motta Silva demonstrate how Paraskeva's ICT reinvigorates critical and transnational multicultural praxis aligning it more closely with Latin American insurgent cosmopolitanism (Dussell, 1977/2011, 2000; Marcos, 2001; Quijano, 1992, 2000; Santos, 2006, 2009). Certainly, as Janson and Motta Silva demonstrate, openings for anti-epistemicidal praxis exist, and teachers' autobiographical praxis narratives can serve in advancing that discussion.

Finally, Todd A. Price's (2017) "Teacher Education meets Itinerant Curriculum Theory" brings Paraskeva's contributions in curriculum studies into teacher education policy arenas. Describing the new audit culture in teacher education, Price seizes on Paraskeva's notion of the critical-progressive curriculum river as a means to de-link curriculum studies from teacher education in the hopes that ICT can advance a revision of US education's purposes from bottom to top. Besides describing and providing an example of working through ICT, Price's genealogy of policy documents over the last half century is important for those who want to understand what happened to schools of education in the post-Sputnik era and how federal policy increasingly standardizes "the classroom teacher" in the US' leadership toward what Price has called "the new Taylorism." In the end, the essay posits ICT and associated intellectual habits as necessary educational protein to reinvigorate curriculum studies and its influences.

Finally, both João Paraskeva (2017) and William Schubert (2017) provide response essays to articles in and topics related to the special section. Paraskeva graciously

engages scholars inside and outside this issue who have taken up ICT, and in doing so, provides another important cascading installment of both doing and thinking through ICT as a critical means of coming to know. Schubert provides a synoptic text of the US-based and Anglophone field and its present conflicts, and in doing so, necessarily historicizes and requires readers to recall the conflicts in curriculum theory not as canon but as genealogy of an admittedly US-centered and Anglophone field.

Discussion and Conclusion

In my discussion and conclusion, I return to the potentials of a transnational South-North dialogue of which Parakeva's work is emblematic in transnational curriculum studies. Between the time when I initiated this special section and now, Parskeva's (2016) *Curriculum Epistemicide: Toward an Itinerant Curriculum Theory* won the 2016 American Educational Research Association Division B's book award. Given the centrality of books as medium in curriculum studies (Schubert, 2010; Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, & Carol, 2002), this award represents the top recognition in the US-centered and Anglophone field, and it speaks well of the possible dispositions of a field that is in plain and needed renewal with special emphasis on better historicized work. Nonetheless, as I mentioned before, Paraskeva (2011, 2016) paradoxically provides loving yet mercilessly hard-hitting critiques of curriculum studies as a field. I think that this "achievement" is especially significant, if not to dyed-in-wool adherents of a discursively expansionist US-centric and Anglophone field, at least to a new generation of scholars set on better historicizing reconceptualist curriculum studies' trajectories and thinking through its critical uses in the present. Importantly, Paraskeva and authors in this special sections' critiques are meant not to dismiss the inherited reconceptualist curriculum studies legacy nor pick up the cheap discursive tactic of its death, moribund state, or arrested development, but rather, these authors seek to engage, critique, and provoke curriculum studies' legacy for serious, meaningful, and activist scholarship in the present moment. Like scholars in this special section, I believe this re-engagement is needed for a better historicized and transnational curriculum field, though the historicized work will necessarily break free from reconceptualists' logic and intentions in initiating such a project.

Regarding better conjugating the historicized field, review essays in this special section all followed an historical arc of western colonization, present-day coloniality, and reflexively, scholars asked *what is to be done in research, teacher education, policy*

studies, and classroom practice? I think that this is a fundamentally different approach in doing curriculum studies because it relocates the US-Centric and Anglophone field, not within a revisionist reconceptualist canon that “made” its own academic history in an argument with curriculum development, but rather this different approach requires a more modest recognition of working historically through multiple geo-regions’ traditions and returns curriculum history to, more broadly speaking, a type of intellectual history. Such a return will recognize both hegemonic and non-dominant traditions’ potentials¹³ and perhaps future syntheses.

Regarding better conjugating the transnational field, review essays in this special section all emphasized Global South understandings within a reflexive yet insurgent cosmopolitanism. Again, this is a fundamentally different approach to doing curriculum studies that recognizes multiple historical traditions of educational and cultural criticism not vertically from above as the field expands around the world in the third paradigm of the US-centric field, but rather, this different approach strives for a South-led transnational curriculum studies South-North global dialogue that emphasizes Southern voices, epistemologies, and readings of the Global North from the periphery. This explicit Global South inflected dialogue deepens transnational curriculum studies in ways necessary for this moment. *Let’s unfold a new yet better historicized transnational curriculum studies field through the special section that follows...*

References

- Ang, I. (2016). Stuart Hall and the tension between academic and intellectual work. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 19, 29-41.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Achebe, C. (1959). *Things fall apart*. New York, NY: Ballentine.
- Acuña, R. (1972). *Occupied America: The Chicano's struggle toward liberation*. San Francisco, CA: Canfield.
- Anaya, R. (1995). *Bless me, Ultima*. New York, NY: Time Warner. (Original work published 1972).
- Appelbaum, P. (2011, April). AAACS business meeting. All conference session at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in New Orleans, LA.
- Baldwin, A.; Moon, S. Jupp, J. C.; Risri Aletheiani, D; & Paraskeva, J.M. (2013, April). The internationalization of curriculum studies task force session. Symposium at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in San Francisco, CA.
- Baldwin, A.; Risri Aletheiani, D.; Miyazawa, K.; Moon, S.; Price, T.; & Paraskeva, J. (2014, April). The internationalization of curriculum studies task force session. Symposium at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Baldwin, A.; Risri Aletheiani, D.; Price, T. Moon, S. & Paraskeva, J. (2012, April). The internationalization of curriculum studies task force session. Symposium at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in Vancouver, Canada.
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Brown, A. L. & Au, W. (2014). Race, memory, and master narratives: A critical essay on U.S. curriculum history. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44, 358-389.
- Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: University Press.
- Cabral, A. (1969). *Revolution in Guinea-Bissau*. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Counts, G. S. (1978). *Dare the school build a new social order?* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Original work published 1932)
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Dreyfus, H. L. & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1972). *Socialism and the American Negro*. New York, NY: Folkways Record and Service Corp. (Original speech performed 1960)
- Dussel, E. (2000). *Europa, modernidad, y eurocentrismo*. *Sur-Sur*. México, DF. Consejo Latino Americano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Dussell, E. (2005). 13 Transmodernidad e interculturalidad (Interpretación desde la filosofía de la liberación).
<http://www.afyl.org/transmodernidadeinterculturalidad.pdf>. (Retrieved January, 2013)
- Dussel, E. (2011). *Filosofía de la liberación*. México, D.F. Fondo de Cultura Económica. (Original work published 1977)
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge & the discourse on language* (Trans. A.M. Sheridan-Smith). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogía del oprimido* (51st re-printing.). México, D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores. (Original work published 1970)
- Giroux, H. A. (1988). *Border crossing: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gonzalez, R. (1967). *I am Joaquín/Yo soy Joaquín*. New York, NY: Bantam.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York, NY: International Publishers.
- Hendry, P. (2011, April). Bringing history back: Curriculum theory's lost memory. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in New Orleans, LA.
- Hendry, P. (2012, October). Creating a New Eden: The Ursuline Mission of spiritual universalism in French colonial Louisiana. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the Curriculum & Pedagogy Group in New Orleans, LA.
- Hinojosa, R. (1994). *The Valley/Estampas del Valle*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press. (Original work published 1973).
- Janson, E. & Silva, C. (2017). Itinerant curriculum theory: Navigating the waters of power, identity, and praxis. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-16.
- Jupp, J. (2013a). Toward Cosmopolitan Sensibilities in US Curriculum Studies: A Synoptic Rendering of the Franciscan Tradition in Mexico. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 29, 48-71.

- Jupp, J. (2013b). Undoing double binds in curriculum: On cosmopolitan sensibilities in US curriculum studies. *The Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 9, 54-72.
- Jupp, J. C. (2017). AERA Division B book award letter of recommendation for João Paraskeva's *Curriculum Epistemicides*.
[https://www.academia.edu/31057765/AERA_DIV_B_BOOK_AWARD_LETTER_OF_REC -- Jo%C3%A3o Paraskevas Curriculum Epistemicides](https://www.academia.edu/31057765/AERA_DIV_B_BOOK_AWARD_LETTER_OF_REC_-_Jo%C3%A3o_Paraskevas_Curriculum_Epistemicides)
- Jupp, J. C.; Price, T.; Moreira, M. A.; Süsskind, M. L.; Barbosa de Oliveira, I.; Janson, L. & Motta Silva, C.; Parakeva, J. M; & Schubert, W. H. (2017, April). Decolonizing and de-canonizing curriculum futurity: An engaged discussion on João Paraskeva's *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. Symposium at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Antonio, TX.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- LaCapra, D. (2001). *Writing history, writing trauma*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ladson Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97, 47-68.
- Lenin, V. (2016). *¿Qué hacer?* Madrid, España: Alianza Editorial.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). Sobre la colonialidad del ser: Contribuciones al desarrollo de un concepto. In S. Castro-Gómez and R. Grosfoguel (Eds.), *El giro decolonial: Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global* (pp. 127-167). Bogotá, Columbia: LESCO Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Malewski, E. (Ed.) (2010). *The curriculum studies handbook: The next moment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Marcos, S. (2001). *Nuestra arma es nuestra palabra: Escritos selectos*. New York, NY: Siete Cuentos Editorial.
- Mariátegui, J. C. (2007). *Siete ensayos sobre la realidad peruana*. México, D.F. Biblioteca Era.
- Marx, K. (1982). *The economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844* (Ed. D. J. Struik). New York, NY: International Publishers. (Originally work published 1844.)
- Mignolo, W. D. (2005). Mignolo, W. D. (2005). *The idea of Latin America*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2008). La hermeneútica de la democracia: El pensamiento de los límites y la diferencia colonial. *Tabla Rasa*, 9, 39-60.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). La opción decolonial. *Letral*, 1, 1-22.

- Miller, J. (2010). A response to Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández: Communities without consensus. In E. Malewski (Ed.), *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 95-100). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Moon, S.; Risri Aletheiani, D.; Price, T. A.; Lopez, L.; & Jupp, J. C. (Chair). (2017, April). Toward a decolonized curriculum future: Re-provincializing histories of curriculum studies reconceptualization. Symposium at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in San Antonio, Texas.
- Moreira, M. A. (2017). 'And the linguistic minorities suffer what they must?': A review of *Conflicts in curriculum theory* through the lenses of language teacher education. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-17.
- O'Gorman, E. (2016). *La invención de América*. México, D.F.: Fondo de Cultura Mexicana.
- Oliveira, I. B. (2012). *Currículo como criação cotidiana*. Petrópolis/RJ : DP et Alii.
- Oliveira, I. B. (2017a). *Boaventura and education*. Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.
- Oliveira, I. B. (2017b). Itinerant curriculum theory against epistemicides: A dialogue between the thinking of Santos and Paraskeva. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-22.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2016a). *Curriculum epistemicide*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2016b). *The curriculum: Whose internationalization?* New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2017). Author's response – Itinerant curriculum theory revisited: On a non-theoricide towards the canonicide: Addressing the curriculum involution. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-42.
- Paraskeva, J. M. & Steinberg, S. R. (2016) (Eds.). *Curriculum: Decanonizing the field*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.) (1988). *Contemporary curriculum discourses*. Scottsdale, AZ: GSP.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.) (2003). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Pinar, W. F. (2006). Internationalism in curriculum studies. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 1, 35-42.
- Pinar, W. F. (2007). The canon project proposal: Passed April 7th 2007. <https://tw-curricuwiki.wikispaces.com/The+Canon+Project+Proposal>

- Pinar, W. F. (2008). Curriculum studies since 1950: Crisis, reconceptualization, and internationalization. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, and J. Phillion (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 491-513). London, England: SAGE.
- Pinar, W. F. (2013). *Curriculum studies in the United States: Present circumstances, intellectual histories*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, W. F.; Reynolds, W.; Slattery, P. & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Price, T. A. (2017). Welcome to the new Taylorism! Teacher education meets itinerant curriculum theory. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-12.
- Price, T.; Moreira, M. A.; Süsskind, M. L.; Barbosa de Oliveira, I.; Parakeva, J. M.; & Jupp, J. C. (Chair) (2016). Curriculum history: An engaged discussion and critique of João Parakeva's recent books. Symposium at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in Washington, DC.
- Puigrrós, A. (2004). Ensayo sobre alternativas para la integración de nuestra cultura. (Retrieved August, 2016)
<https://docs.google.com/file/d/0B51i86Lkj5dyVWpJMm5tVDFKeDQ/view>
- Quijano, A. (1992). Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad. *Peru Indígena*, 13, 11-20.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina. In E. Lander (Ed.), *La colonialidad del saber: Eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales* (pp. 201–246). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Razfar, A. (2011). The linguistic re-turn: The moral and practical imperative of “language” in curriculum studies. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 7(2), 1-37.
- Razfar, A. (2012). Language ideologies and curriculum studies: An empirical approach to “worthwhile” questions. *Journal of curriculum theorizing*, 28, 127-140.
- Rivera, T. (1987). *And the earth did not swallow him/No se lo tragó la tierra*. Houston, TX: Arte Público Press. (Original work published 1971)
- Santos, B. S. (2006). *Conocer desde el Sur: Para una cultura política emancipatoria*. Caracas, Venezuela: Fondo Editorial de la Facultad de Ciencias Sociales.
- Santos, B. S. (2009). A non-occidental West? Learned ignorance and ecology of knowledge. *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 26, 103–125.

- Santos, B. S.; Nunes, J. A.; & Meneses, M. P. (2007). Opening up the canon of knowledge and the recognition of difference. In B. de Sousa Santos (Ed.), *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond Northern epistemologies* (pp. xix-lxii). New York, NY: Verso.
- Schubert, W. (2008). Curriculum inquiry. In F.M. Connelly, M.F. He, and J. Phillion *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 399-420). London: Sage.
- Schubert, W. H. (2009). Possibilities, recommendations, and suggestions for the AAACS canon project to advance curriculum studies through disciplinarity. <https://tw-curricuwiki.wikispaces.com/Disciplinarity2009wikified>
- Schubert, W. H. (2010). Journeys of expansion and synopsis: Tensions in books that shaped curriculum inquiry, 1968–Present: *Curriculum Inquiry*, 40, 17-93.
- Schubert, W. H. (2017). Discussion response – Growing curriculum studies: Contributions of João Paraskeva. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-21.
- Schubert, W. H.; Lopez Schubert, A. L.; Thomas, T. P.; & Carol, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Slattery, P. (2006). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the Subaltern Speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (2012). *An aesthetic education in the era of globalization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Spring, J. (2016). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality* (8th ed.). New York, NY: MacMillan. (Original work published 2000).
- Süssekind, M. L. (2014). Why a deterritorialized curriculum? *Transnational curriculum inquiry*, 2, 67-75.
- Süssekind, M. L. (2017). Against epistemological fascism: The (self) critique of the criticals – A reading of Paraskeva’s itinerant curriculum theory. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-18.
- Thiong’o, N. W. (2009). *Something torn and new: An African renaissance*. New York, NY: Perseus Book Group.
- Watkins, W. H. (1993). Black curriculum orientations: A preliminary inquiry. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63, 321-338.
- Watkins, W. H. (2016). A Marxian and radical reconstructionist critique of American education: Searching out Black voices. In J. M. Paraskeva & S. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Curriculum: Decanonizing the field*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

- Walsh, C. (2008). Interculturalidad, plurinacionalidad, y decolonialidad: Las insurgencias político-epistémicas de refundar el estado. *Tabla Rasa*, 9, 133-152.
- Winfield, A. (2010). Eugenic ideology and historical osmosis. In E. Malewski's *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 142-158). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Winfield, A. (2011). Bringing history back: Curriculum theory's lost memory. Paper presentation at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies in New Orleans, LA.
- Yúdice, G. (1991). Testimonio and postmodernism. *Latin American Perspectives*, 18(3), 15–31.
- Yúdice, G. (1992). Testimonio y conscientización. *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana*, 18(36), 207–227.
- Yúdice, G. (2003). De la guerra civil a la guerra cultural: Testimonio, postmodernidad, y el debate sobre la autenticidad. In S. Castro-Klaren (Ed.), *Latin American women's narratives: Practices and theoretical perspectives*. Madrid, Spain: Iberoamericana.
- Zinn, H. (2000). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-Present*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial Classics. (Original work published 1980)

Notes

¹ I thank my Co-Editors at *JAAACS*, Susan Mayer and Patrick Roberts, who supported this special section and dedicated numerous meetings to its production. To begin with, the special section was Susan's idea in the first place as she invited us to put together a proposal on the AAACS symposium (Price, Moreira, Süssekind, Barbosa de Oliveira, Parakeva, & Jupp 2016) from which the special section emerged. In continuation, Susan spent countless hours commenting on, studying, editing, and proofing the articles that are in this special section. In the same direction, Patrick listened to discussions and commented thoughtfully about the limits of collaborative strategies in the special section's production. Overall, I am grateful for the support of Susan and Patrick. So, I will say directly to them both: *Many, many thanks.*

² A second more refined version of this symposium (Jupp, Price, Moreira, Süssekind, Barbosa de Oliveira, Janson, Motta Silva, Parakeva, & Schubert) was presented at American Educational Research Association (AERA) 2017 in San Antonio, Texas with the additional listings of Elizabeth Janson and Carmelia Motta Silva as presenters and William Schubert as discussant. The addition of Janson and Motta Silva, public school teachers and Parakeva's doctoral students, made an important contribution to the this special section here by articulating the potentials of Paraskeva's critical multicultural education in public schools. The addition of senior scholar William Schubert as discussant provided historical perspective. The lineup of the second symposium is what comprises this special issue.

³ As an organization, AAACS has taken an active role in understanding intellectual and curriculum history. Intellectual and curriculum history was important for those who advanced the Canon Project Proposal including William F. Pinar (2007, 2013), William H. Schubert (2009, 2010), and others. The Canon Project, important for what Janet Miller (2010) has called "communities without consensus" (p. 95), originally included Janet Miller, Craig Kridel, Denise Taliaferro Baszile, Ming Fang He, Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández, William Watkins, Carl Grant, Kathleen Kesson, James Henderson, and Patrick Roberts. Brown and Au (2014) advanced an important multicultural critique on the directions taken in the canon project that helps advance our work here but in many ways re-instates a US-centric multicultural horizon of intelligibility. Ostensibly a "failed project," nonetheless, the Canon Project created a space for new interest and different directions in historicizing transnational curriculum from which this special section emerges. Following *not* the Canon project but rather genealogical directions, our special section purposefully references the Canon Project using the phrase *Decolonizing and De-canonizing Curriculum Studies* as title of the special section. Importantly, rather than pursuing a uniform curriculum studies Canon Project, scholars in this special section take an historicized and genealogical approach to curriculum history that recognizes multiple intellectual traditions (e.g., Hendry, 2011, 2012; Jupp, 2013a, 2013b, Paraskeva, 2016b; Paraskeva & Steinberg, 2016; Puigrrós, 2004; Süssekind, 2014, 2017; Watkins, 1993, 2016; Winfield, 2010, 2011).

⁴ Several members of the AAACS Internationalization Task Force including Jupp (2013a, 2013b), Paraskeva (2011, 2016a 2016b), and Süssekind (2017) have questioned and distanced themselves from the term *internationalization* as curriculum studies' third paradigm (e.g. Pinar, 2003, 2008, 2013). Internationalization, when understood as third paradigm (2000-present) that followed curriculum development (1918-1975) and then reconceptualist curriculum (1976-2000), reifies a US-centric and Anglophone curriculum field that occults multiple geo-regional traditions of cultural and educational criticism (Paraskeva, 2011, 2016a; Jupp, 2013a, 2013b). In pursuit of historicized genealogies within and across traditions of cultural and educational criticism, I advance here the term *transnational* curriculum studies with the understanding that further discussion, dialogue, and debate on this topic is important to dislodge US-centric and Anglophone coloniality in curriculum studies' and other education research.

⁵ The AAACS Internationalization Task Force presently includes the following members: Andrea Baldwin, Washington Adventist University; João M. Paraskeva, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth; Todd Alan Price, National Louis University; Maria Alfredo Moreira, University of Minho; Seungho Moon, Loyola University; Dinny Risri Aletheiani, Yale University & Arizona State University; James C. Jupp, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley; Kaoru Miyazawa, Gettysburg College; Lori Imasiku, Andrews University; Mei Wu Hoyt, University of North Texas; Jung Hoon Jung, University of British Columbia. Follow this link for more information on the Task Force: <http://www.aaacs.org/task-forces.html>

⁶ I emphasize the importance of the tenets of critical race theory as an important development on the US-centered and Anglophone landscape (e.g., Bell, 1992; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) that helps drive at decolonial and southern theory's historical arc. The tenets of critical race theory emphasize, among other insights, that (a) historical racism is endemic to US history and society, (b) changes from "liberal" civil rights movements were in the interest of Whites, (c) structural racism's inequality are permanent features of US globalizing capitalism, and (d) that whiteness and legal rights are intimately bound together in Europe and the US. This relates to my present discussion of 1970s revisionist histories of which curriculum studies is one university-located revisionist narrative. Revisionist narratives, those of curriculum studies but also other 1960s-ingrained revisions (e.g., Acuña, 1972; Zinn, 1980/2000; Spring, 2000/2016), need *not* dismissal but rather engagement, re-evaluation, critique, and extension in the present moment, and these re-engaged revisionist narratives need to break free from their authors' intentions in a self-critique of critical theory (see Süssekind, 2017) and a transmodern re-evaluation of center and periphery (Dussel, 2005). In short, critical race theory complements a reading of Paraskeva's efforts to decolonize and decanonize curriculum studies from a longer historical purview rather than one that relies on 1960s-ingrained liberal-progressive intellectual habits.

⁷The discussion of the word “American” referenced in the *American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* (AAACS) and the *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* (JAAACS) is most likely a decision that needs to be revisited as the organization moves forward. The use of “American” as simplistically “US” is problematic and offensive for a group purporting to do international or transnational intellectual work, especially given Bolivarian understandings of *Las Américas*, clearly a contradictory invention of European coloniality (Maldonado-Torres, 2007; Mignolo, 2005) along with categories like Indian or indigenous.

⁸ Lesser known or understood is how this same hermeneutic tradition engaged in a vast revision of Greek and Roman intellectual content into a single body of thought in re-articulating a whitened, eugenic, and unified reading of this historical construct of “Europe” (Dussell, 2000). These sorts of revisions, the removing of Greek and Roman resources from, for example, Egyptian and Middle Eastern ones, became the common sense of White supremacy that most scholars take for granted. More historical investigation into the construction of “European” in the Continental sense and “White” on US-centered North America is important for deconstructive elements of social justice projects.

⁹ For a field that advanced a uniformly Anglophone Canon Project, I suppose I should not be surprised. Nonetheless, the coloniality of academic work in English is well-known and debated topic in the fields of English Education, language teaching, Chicano Studies, bilingual education, English as a second language, language policy, African American studies, and others. Chicano literature provides a particularly interesting example of negotiating the politics of language within US-centered and Anglophone universities in which initial Chicano literature was produced in Spanish or Spanish with English translations (e.g., Gonzales, 1967; Hinojosa, 1973/1994; Rivera, 1971/1987) only later to become a predominantly English area out of pragmatics and survival. Paradoxically, the best novel produced in the translation was Anaya’s (1972/1995) *Bless Me, Ultima* translated into Spanish as *Bendíceme, Ultima*. Curriculum studies slowness to take on this topic is at best problematic and at worst an indicator and manifestation of US-centered and Anglophone interests. The work here, emphasizing the question *whose languages* and by extension, *whose intellectual traditions and practices are of most worth* hastens and advances a discussion on the coloniality of English.

¹⁰ The translation of distinct geo-regions’ traditions of educational and cultural criticism was a key motive for original formation of the AAACS International Task force in New Orleans in 2011. The discussion after the AAACS Business Meeting (Appelbaum, 2011) immediately revolved around both sharing existing translations and creating new translations of educational and cultural criticism as part of transnational curriculum studies. This discussion was important because it quickly demonstrated that translations of Henry Giroux into Spanish, John Dewey into Chinese, José Vasconcelos into English, or Tsunesboro Makiguchi into English already existed, among others. This quick discussion provided two immediate

insights: (a) a more historicized and broader “internationalization” of intellectual traditions of educational and cultural criticism already existed prior to curriculum studies’ internationalization and (b) the positionalities of (i) who is translated for whom and (ii) what traditions are made available to whom are required analyses in approaching the critical question *whose internationalization is it?* Overall, reading works in different intellectual traditions requires a different set of sensibilities I discuss through Spivak (2012) later in this section. See Jupp (2013a, 2013b) for my grappings with these problems in working across traditions of educational and cultural criticism.

¹¹ As explanatory note, Anglophone academic forums, though even believing their work to be experimental, arts-based, cutting edge, or theoretical, privilege specific sets of discursive features and syntactical structures as invisible “rules” of US-centered and Anglophone intellectuals. Of course, the internationalization of curriculum studies often selects for a certain type of US-trained or influenced curriculum scholar as “worthy contributors” who can manage these features and structures. Contrastingly, a “good” Hispanophone conceptual essay allows for less frontloading or mapping of argument, greater latitude of digression, more dialectical mobility or dynamic “switch,” and at times, thematic paradox as interpretive insight over discussion of Anglophone “implications.” Importantly, this is not to say that Hispanophone academic conceptual essays that use these features are “permissive.” Regarding the required cosmopolitan sensibilities to do this work, I have one phrase: *It’s hard.*

¹² By 2017, poststructuralist blackmail regarding discursive mediation of subalterns as a critique of critical theory and pedagogy seems a small concern as neoliberal globalizing capitalism becomes increasingly fascist. Threatening on the US scene with an alliance of White elites and disenfranchised White laboring middle and working classes, the emergence of a new politics of fascist resentment became an open force in the election of President Donald Trump and his White privilege final solutions. Within new fascist politics, is it a surprise, after all, that subaltern voices are mediated, and if not, then what does the exercise of critical politics look like in the present that includes Marxian, Black, and indigenous interlocution? See George Yúdice’s (1991, 1992, 2003) transnational essays on voice and Latin American testimonio for a discussion on the complexity of voice and deliberation in the politics of political conscientization. Yúdice gets the problematics of mediation but moves beyond the hand-wringing of who is really speaking towards an ethics of solidarity in political practice that is missing from poststructuralist discourses’ endless fetish with *there* not being *there*, truly, part of the new presence of the fascist perspective of fake news and alternative facts. I agree with Dominick LaCapra’s (2001) negotiated, politicized empiricism rather than poststructuralist thinly veiled transcendence before the traumas of reading and writing material histories.

¹³ Here, in my work as curriculum director of two progressive- and critically-oriented public school programs and two M.Ed programs with critical components, I believe the abandonment of “development,” which later became assessment, is an

unfortunate selling of the farm. As Dr. Lucero Argott from the UNAM Facultad de Estudios Superiores Aragón emphasized, we all still do curriculum development and practice. Here, Ien Ang's (2016) discussion of the institutionalization and leadership of Stuart Hall's cultural studies legacy is instructive to reconceptualists' unnecessary argument with curriculum development.