

AGAINST EPISTEMOLOGICAL FASCISM:
THE (SELF) CRITIQUE OF THE CRITICALS –
A READING OF PARASKEVA'S ITINERANT CURRICULUM THEORY

MARIA LUIZA SÜSSEKIND

Federal University of Rio de Janeiro State, Brazil

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

What is the relevance of the curriculum field in the struggle for social transformation? What is the continued role of critical theory in curriculum? These and other questions haunt Paraskeva's (2011) 'non-abysal' rationale in his *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. More recently, Paraskeva (2016a, 2016b) further complexifies his analyses in volumes on curriculum epistemicide and curriculum internationalization, forming a compelling potential new division of labor for the curriculum field. In raising and examining such questions, Paraskeva opens the veins of traditional and critical curriculum discourses, which have created and promulgated concepts, symbolisms, meanings, understandings, memes, and knowledges that have become so widely accepted—in some cases, almost as dogmas—in Western Eurocentric Modern(ity) culture's understanding of how education and, specifically, curriculum must produce and legitimize the word and the world.

In complexifying Paraskeva's concerns on curriculum, maybe one could ask: Why it is crucial, as Paraskeva advances, for teachers, students, and communities to understand curriculum's relevance and impact in creating everyday life possibilities for social transformation in a post- or decolonial world? As I have argued elsewhere (2014b), this is a towering issue in Paraskeva's approach as he proposes a post-abysal, a non-abysal and non-territorial—fully itinerant—curriculum theory (hereafter abbreviated as ICT). ICT, it follows, drives at denouncing and defeating

the epistemicide produced and legitimized by the Global North and the northern intellectuals within the Global South. Such a conceptual framework raises crucial issues of whether the field of curriculum studies is a machinery for epistemicide and how radical critical theories can be both ‘epistemicidal’ and progressive simultaneously. Respecting the past, Paraskeva opens the oppressed veins of our field, by challenging not only hegemonic, but also specific counterhegemonic curriculum traditions as functionalist.

In challenging curriculum studies’ historically hegemonic and counterhegemonic traditions, Paraskeva connects both with what he coins ‘curriculum epistemicide’, drawing on the approach of Santos (2007, 2014). In this context, Paraskeva challenges the predominantly US field to come to grips with Eurocentric Anglo Saxon epistemological eugenic cleansing and, within this coming to grips, begin to recognize and respect diversity in epistemological and intellectual traditions, with an emphasis on Global South traditions. Paraskeva is attempting to shepherd the field in a different direction, one that challenges both the field’s traditional “scientificity,” long in crisis, and also mono-logical histories of the field’s discursive expansionism (e.g., Pinar, 2008; Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995; Schubert, 1986, 2010; Schubert et al., 2002) and expansionist refinements (Malewski, 2010). Importantly, in developing these challenges, Paraskeva (2011) brings to the fore the historical roles played by social movements such as civil rights activism and the Romantic critics – such as Kozol, and others - often left out of US curriculum studies’ past, as well as including intellectual and historical contributions from African, Latin American, and Asian-Arab-Middle Eastern epistemological matrices. In challenging prior and established curriculum discourses and refinements, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) argues that the best way to address epistemicide, perpetrated by a full-bore epistemological fascism, is to work with ICT toward engaged and sustainable praxis.

In this essay, which I have organized around the arc in Paraskeva’s (2011) *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*, I (a) characterize the complex ICT approach, (b) dissect the crisis of the Western and Eurocentric scientific hegemonic paradigm, (c) unpack the nexus of the struggles led by a radical critical progressive river, and (d) suggest that Paraskeva’s intellectual engagement in Southern epistemological traditions provides a key new division of labor for the curriculum field. Overall, in aiming this essay to introduce Paraskeva’s work to (predominantly) curriculum scholars from the Global North, I emphasize Paraskeva’s (2011, 2016a) contribution of a rich conceptual vocabulary aimed at amplifying curriculum studies’ on-going inter- and

transnational interlocution. This rich vocabulary, drawing on Santos (2007, 2014) and other intellectuals aligned with the Global South, includes ICT, epistemicide, epistemological fascism, Global North/Global South, ecology of knowledges, cognitive justice, the abyssal line and abyssality, insurgent cosmopolitanism, coloniality of knowledge, and the critical-progressive curriculum river. Writ large, my purposes in advancing this essay all aim at more authentic South-North intellectual exchanges, interlocution, translation, and dialogue.

Towards an Itinerant Curriculum Theory

First, let us now turn our attention to Paraskeva's (2011, 2016a) claims of curriculum epistemicide and the need for an ICT. Paraskeva's is a clarion call against epistemological fascism perpetrated by the field of curriculum studies, controlled both in its form and content by belligerent battles between and within traditional and non-traditional epistemological forms within the Western Modern Eurocentric platform. Needless to say, those Western Modern Eurocentric pundits within what Sousa Santos (2010) calls the Global North are not so happy and very concerned with such powerful statements and critiques. Yet Paraskeva's (2011, 2016a) concerns are justifiable, and irreversibly push the debate into a different terrain, a terrain in which Western Modern Eurocentric dominant and counter dominant rationales have lost their hegemonic totalitarian position.

Over the last few decades, the curriculum field has changed radically, not only experiencing a huge theoretical expansion and thematic development (e.g., Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995; Malewski, 2010; Schubert, 1986, 2010; Schubert et al., 2002) but also walking towards its internationalization (e.g., Pinar, 2008, 2012)—yet not so detached from colonial impulses and in many ways continuing to weave the reconceptualist paradigm.¹ As a Brazilian scholar, I can say that the worldwide success of Freire's work seems to have opened up and founded an ongoing dialogue, beginning in the 1970s, that suggests different and predating inter- and transnational intellectual currents. While the influences of Freire's approach in the U.S. are deeply multidimensional and despite the efforts made by Pinar (2008, 2011, 2012) to proliferate the US field's concepts through internationalization, Paraskeva (2016a; 2016b) problematizes the very nature of the reconceptualist field's internationalization. As Paraskeva (2011, 2016a; 2016b) demonstrates and argues, such an internationalization has been enacted in a new form of colonialism and thus, in many cases inadvertently, runs the risk of continuing epistemicide globally.

Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) has made the greatest contribution in recent years to the work of those critical curriculum theorists who are questioning the theoretical mold that generates both hegemonic curriculum and counterhegemonic perspectives. In questioning the received mold, Paraskeva maps a “curriculum river, and in so doing lays bare the major arguments at the core of the political struggle for a democratic curriculum” (2011, p. 2). Following the notion of curriculum river as extended metaphor, Paraskeva challenges the very historicity of the field and advances “a possible path for future critical curriculum theorists, analyzing the general tensions that emerged in the curriculum field at the end of the nineteenth century exposing how different groups were able to edify a hegemonic position in the curriculum field throughout the last 100 years” (ibid, p. 3). In examining such struggles, “the conflicts within the counterdominant tradition, the dead ends, and the challenges faced by a critical curriculum river begin to be unveiled” (ibid). Drawing heavily on the approaches of Santos and other leading Latin American, African, and Middle East decolonial intellectuals, Paraskeva “proposes a promising future path for critical theory and challenges critical curriculum theorists to deterritorialize their approaches and assume a critical itinerant position”. Such a position, Paraskeva states,

would allow these theorists to complexify the struggle for curriculum relevance, thus fully engaging them in the struggle against epistemicides. To put it simply, epistemology can be defined as the study of knowledge, its justification(s), and its vast theories. It seeks to address issues related to the fundamental conditions of knowledge, its sources, structures, and borders, as well as the mechanisms related to the creation, dissemination, and legitimization of knowledge. ... As I claim in this book, the future course of the critical curriculum river will depend on the struggle against the epistemicides—that is, the way hegemonic epistemologies, predominantly that of the Western male, have been able to violently impose, both secularly and religiously, a coloniality of knowledge. (ibid, p. 3)

In working through the notion of epistemicides, Paraskeva thus explains that hegemonic and counter-hegemonic curriculum studies have in fact carried out the epistemicide in the discursive expansion of the field. These discursive expansions considered endemic to reconceptualist counter-hegemonic discourses produce and cultivate a eugenic abyss between the Global North and Global South.

Importantly, Paraskeva posits the notion of ICT as countervailing potential for the cultural and educational “Critic” who, within a transnational and international division of labor in the curriculum field, must take a permanently itinerant posture. The future of curriculum studies, Paraskeva claims is “to overcome its tensions, twists, and contradictions and engage in the creation of ICT that must be committed to the struggle against epistemicides” (ibid). ICT, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) argues, is the most southern political and epistemological approach to doing curriculum studies work in the present moment. He asserts the importance of paying attention to decolonial intellectuals such as Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Walter Dignolo, Enrique Dussel, Aníbal Quijano and many others as well as to a huge armada of intellectuals from the Middle East and Africa, the vast majority of whom are totally unknown and ‘produced as non-existent’ by the Western Eurocentric Anglo Saxon hegemonic epistemology.

The Scientific Hegemonic Paradigm, Social Uses of Sciences, and The Paradigmatic Crisis

Building on Paraskeva’s (2011, 2016) insightful advancement of ICT, I argue that the international and transnational Global North and Global South dialogue in the field of curriculum must begin with the examination of the curriculum field as emblematic of Western Modern Eurocentric societies and of the culture and discourse associated with the Global North. Such culture and discourse imposes a way of thinking and existence that conquers, invades, explores, destroys, and to be more precise, produces epistemicides. It is the expression of epistemicides that has been at the heart of Western Modern Eurocentric thinking from the beginning. Paraskeva emphasizes:

The struggle against epistemicides (those that have been edified by Western male hegemonic epistemologies) is a Herculean task, but one that we cannot deny if we are truly committed to a real and just society. The struggle against the Western eugenic coloniality of knowledges is the best way to transform the school and its social agents into real leaders in their struggle to democratize democracy. (2011, p. 169)

Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) denounces the reality that such a ‘contentious agora’ has been determined and colonized by a very specific Western Modern Eurocentric Epistemological platform. In a way, then, Paraskeva’s ICT alerts us to an

epistemicide within the epistemicide. That is, Paraskeva examines how specific counterhegemonic groups—despite their laudable accomplishments, deeply rooted in the struggle led by the oppressed, unions, and social movements—fell prey to the “same functionalism that they criticized” (Paraskeva, 2011, p. 150). In following functionalist gambits for power, counterhegemonic groups ended up creating differently-oriented epistemicides. Some demiurges of what Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) calls the radical critical river – i.e. Apple, Giroux, Pinar, Grumet, Miller, among others - were very sentient of this issue, yet they addressed it only in very partial ways.

Unpacking Santos’ (2010) rationale, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) challenges the field to embrace Southern epistemologies (Santos, 2010), arguing that itinerant curriculum theorists understand that social justice is cognitive justice. It is in this sense that Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) laudably articulates the need for an ecology of knowledges (Santos, 2007). According to Paraskeva’s rationale, if the struggle for social justice is amputated from a conscious commitment to cognitive justice, it is part of the epistemicide. In this sense, the field of curriculum studies represents a field of public citizenship committed to the notion that relations among people should be based on solidarity (Oliveira, 2012). Social emancipation is therefore understood as a set of endless battles around global-and-local or *glocal* negotiations. Thus, social knowledges should represent a permanent ecological and nonhierarchical negotiation. In this reading of the word and the world, there is no space and time for fixed or a priori hierarchies.

Key, is an understanding that the scientific hegemonic Northern tradition makes sense of the world through general ideas and universal concepts that are becoming less and less convincing as adequate, politically reasonable, or—simply stated—good ways of understanding. Social phenomena have not just always been haunted by science, as pointed out by curriculum studies’ critical theorists, but the current state of affairs is marked by a sense of stagnation and on-going crisis. Nowadays, science has been severely targeted and denied by Southern innovations, transformations, and practices of insurgent cosmopolitanism. In this context, Paraskeva argues:

the point is to move beyond questions such as “what/whose knowledge is of most worth” despite not having figured out a correct answer, and to fight for (an)other knowledge outside the Western epistemological harbor. Therefore, we need to engage in the struggle

against epistemicides. One needs first to assume consciously that (an)other knowledge is possible and then to go beyond the Western epistemological platform, paying attention to other forms of knowledge and respecting indigenous knowledge within and beyond the Western space. Needless to say, this fight is only possible precisely because of the advancements, developments, gains, and frustrations experienced by the particular critical approaches edified by Apple, Giroux, and many others both within and outside the critical progressive curriculum river, yet within the complex progressive tradition. In fact, the struggle for (an)other knowledge needs to be contextualized in the struggle for curriculum relevance. The next big struggle is the struggle for cognitive justice, which in reality is a struggle for social justice. (2011, p. 152)

Acknowledging critical and reconceptualist curriculum scholars' work in formulating critiques of the scientific hegemonic Northern tradition, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) ups the ante in linking social justice in glocal contexts to cognitive justice.

The criticisms of the scientific hegemonic Northern tradition and its consequences—criticisms that it is tied to epistemicide, ignorance, and destruction of local creativities—is just one of the contributions made by Santos (1987, 2001, 2007), Mignolo (2011), Dussel (1985), Latour (2011), and Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) and myself (2014b), among others. None of these scholars reduces the idea of paradigm to a ball tossed around among theorists; nor do they claim the social uses of science as the only form of abyssality in Western culture, society, and history. Latour (2011), with much irony, maintains that we never got to modernity and argues that science is the prime example of how the pursuit of valid knowledge in society is little more than a game. Bourdieu (2003), following a similar line, maintains that in order to understand how science works, it becomes necessary not to follow notions of truth or progress, but rather to attend to economic, military, and political relationships, as well as specific governmental lobbies and, above all, the practices of the scientists. Considering that each “science” has its own political ways of producing, financing and publishing research for “validity,” and promoting a discipline-specific, so-called ‘scientific knowledge’ speaks volumes in regards to how the scientific hegemonic Northern tradition imposes, not truth for dissemination, but rather socially and historically embedded political paradigmatic regimes of validity (Kuhn, 1971). These might be more aptly termed ‘the social uses of science.’ Understood within

these contexts, the term 'social uses of knowledge' readily accounts for the social-historical-political matrix assumed in notions of "science" as imbued within the coloniality of knowledge.

In driving at the social uses of science, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) not only brings the work of Sousa Santos (1987, 2001, 2007) and other critical decolonial thinkers mentioned above, but also, in doing so, pushes the debate on the social uses of science to a new and different level. That is, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) insightfully challenges the very historicity and scientificity of the scientific hegemonic Northern tradition. Paraskeva (2011; 2016a) overtly denounces such historicity and scientificity as a eugenic knowledge project with countless and dense evidentiary claims. In his exegesis, he thoughtfully articulates both the hegemonic social uses of science and specific counterhegemonic and critical paradigms for such "eugenicism." That is, both hegemonic social uses of science and particular counter hegemonic traditions were trapped in a dangerous functionalist approach, ignoring the importance of understanding the existence of epistemological diversity with particular regard to the Global South and southern intellectual traditions and epistemologies. Drawing on Sousa Santos (2007, 2014), Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) argues that in a world of epistemological diversity, both hegemonic uses of science and counter-hegemonic traditions (despite some major gains) functioned as part of the curriculum epistemicides. While the hegemonic uses of science were overtly prejudiced and intentional in epistemicides, the fact that counter hegemonic traditions did not pay much attention in their arguments to epistemological respect and diversity makes these traditions complicit as well.

One emblematic historical example that Paraskeva uses to articulate the epistemicide of social uses of scientific knowledge focuses on Dewey's attack on vocational education. Situating the social uses of sciences historically, Paraskeva's ICT (2011) also demonstrates how the educational policies under industrialism enable curricular claims for just educational equality, as advanced by Dewey, Counts, Rugg, and other social frontier curricularists. And this, in fact undercut the possibility of an epistemological and pedagogical diverse educational system and naturalizes epistemicides through adhering to the dangerous tendencies of individualism and science. Historically situating us within the uses of science in curriculum, Paraskeva demonstrates how behaviorists like Bobbitt, Snedden, and Charters emphasized major investments in vocational curriculum and workplace skills in an industrial society. Such faith in vocational education and workplace skills was severely countered by John Dewey, a complex figure swimming within

the critical progressive river as outlined by Paraskeva (2011). Dewey argued that a curriculum directed towards only behavioral workplace efficiency makes education “an instrument of perpetuating unchanged the existing order of society instead of operating as a means of its transformation” (Paraskeva, 2011, p. 48, 122). Nonetheless, and ironically at the same time, Dewey also contributed to epistemicides by advancing differently oriented practical and experiential social use of science that also contributed to curriculum epistemicide by maintaining the common sense primacy of school subjects. In this example, Paraskeva (2011) argues, the demiurges of “social efficiency, when confronted by a social and cultural instrument, such as the curriculum, opt for simplistic solutions and ignore the fact that they had in hand dangerous tools, which cut off so many presents and futures of thousands and thousands of generations” (p. 60).

Presently, the contemporary quasi-totalitarian creed, as represented in technical devices such as high stakes testing (Süssekind, M. L., Pinar, 2014, p. 94), is grounded not just in the hegemonic social uses of science (Santos, 2001, 2007), but also as Paraskeva (2011, 2016a, 2016b) demonstrates, within the social uses of science as epistemicide. These knowledge platforms promoted and developed by hegemonic curriculum traditions created the fallacy of one’s full ability to diagnose and resolve social problems as long as ‘science,’ that is, Western modern Eurocentric science, was the river bed of one’s research (Paraskeva, 2011; 2016a; Vilaça, 2015; Santos, 2001; Bourdieu, 1998, 2003; Süssekind, M. L., 2014a; 2016). What Paraskeva (2011; 2016a) denounces and announces, based on Santos (2007, 2014) and others, is that this cult of the scientific hegemonic Northern tradition is *not* the only way to legitimize knowledge and that singular reliance on social uses of science represents, in fact, an overt form of epistemological fascism and eugenic knowledge cleansing. Dewey (1910/1997), in his *How We Think*, tried to address yet re-inscribed a practical science of experience that, historically, advanced the epistemicides of “science.”

In describing this notion of epistemicide, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) brings in and advances Santos’ (2007) notion of abyssal lines to the curriculum fore—which creates discomfort as I have witnessed first hand in Northern academic curriculum meetings. However, in criticizing the field as one of the greater legitimizers of an abyssal line and thinking, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) non-euphemistically criticizes both hegemonic and specific counter hegemonic curriculum traditions that ended up contributing to such abyssality. The abyssal line pervades curriculum commonsense, prescribes acceptable and non-acceptable ways of existing and thinking in the “to-do curriculum” of results, and devises an eugenic panopticon

that helps to establish the hegemonic logic of capital (Paraskeva, 2011; 2016a). Curriculum, in Paraskeva's (2011; 2016a) rationale, is the social constructor of the abyssal line, a movable and imaginary line that determines existences and 'non-existences' regarding form and content of what counts as valid knowledge. Curriculum is at the very core of modernity's epistemicide. Such 'abyssality' shows how the Global North is obsessed with the normal and sameness. The Global North's culture, narcissistically, produces its own mirrors. And, for Santos "societies are the image they have of themselves seen in the mirrors that they build to play the dominant identifications in a given historical moment" (2001, p. 47).

Floating on a Critical-Progressive Curriculum River Towards Southern Epistemology

It would be erroneous, in my perspective, to place Paraskeva, simply in a post-critical plateau: the fact is that his ICT pushes the debate on curriculum's role in knowledge legitimization toward a different path and division of labor. In driving toward this different path, critical paradigms have to come to grips with their own role in epistemicides and the functionalist vacuum into which they often fall. Respecting these counter-hegemonic traditions' past, Paraskeva cautiously alerts the reader to the crucial role of critical theorists and theories in the struggle for curriculum relevance, and for a just society. Moreover, Paraskeva's clarion call for a radical co-presence sweeps away the drowsiness and mold that eroded certain gains accomplished by critical curriculum theorists. Paraskeva's (2011, 2016a) ICT propels a theoretical movement "towards the undeniably infinite epistemological diversity of the world" (p. 152). A just curriculum implies a just field, one that is engaged in not just in theory, but rather a field that fights unconditionally for "cognitive diversity" (Paraskeva, 2011, p. 152) as "the best way for schools to experience a just and equal society—especially when facing the impact of neo-radical centrist policies and strategies" (Paraskeva, 2011, p. 153).

Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) introduces in the already complicated—yet in too many ways rusted conversation—the river matrix, a critical curriculum river as an interdisciplinary river bed that, since the end of the nineteenth century, championed from different Western Eurocentric Modern perspectives the struggle for a more equal society. Paraskeva's (2011) critical curriculum river also forces us to re-think the very way we mapped out the emergence and development of the field and, in so doing, inserts a very insightful perspective that helps us to better understand, for example, how hegemony works within and beyond counter-hegemonic traditions.

In this context, Paraskeva nuances the curriculum conversation by unpacking theoretical proximities, distances, cascades, dams, aqueducts, and whirlpools exhibited by those swimming within such radical critical river. This counter-hegemonic critical-progressive curriculum river always challenged hegemonic paradigms, yet on too many occasions, this river pushed such paradigms to a state of perpetual crisis. For Paraskeva, the field must fully take advantage of the crisis in the validity of knowledge constructs. It must go deep into the crisis of the scientific hegemonic Northern tradition and challenge the laziness of its reasoning which wastes experience, creates blindness, and destroys knowledges. In this way, through Santos' (2007, 2014) ecology of knowledges, Paraskeva's (2011 2016a) ICT presents an anthem against epistemicides and mounts a key decolonial struggle.

Following George S. Counts (1932a, 1932b)—one of the great figures of the radical critical river—Paraskeva (2011, 2016) asks curriculum studies to answer a crucial question raised decades ago: *Dare the schools build a new social order?* In recapturing this question, Paraskeva not only respects the past but also clearly wants the field to take a non-abysal political direction opening many possibilities in the present as we assume that a lot of curriculum practices are being made invisible and contributing to epistemicides. And Paraskeva complements and complicates this conversation by saying, “[t]he struggle against epistemicides will allow us to highlight and learn how science was powerful in what is considered pre-colonial.” Curriculum, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) argues, is the praxis of the epistemicide.

Influenced by Deleuze, Paraskeva (2011, p. 173) argues that critical theories need to challenge the representationism that “does not capture the global scale of difference” (Süssekind, M. L., 2014b). My argument here is that Paraskeva's (2011, 2016a) ICT arrives at crucial moment in the curriculum studies field and gains traction by offering ICT as the “best answer” for the profound paradigmatic crisis. Paraskeva argues that past critical-progressive curriculum scholars committed themselves to approaches that unmasked the nexus ideology, hegemony, power, reproduction, resistance and commonsense with categories such as hidden curriculum, transformation, emancipation, class, gender, and race, among other discourses (Malewski, 2010; Pinar et al., 1995; Schubert, 2010, Schubert et al., 2002). In the end, this critical-progressive river sanitized the struggle for social justice by ignoring that there is no social justice without cognitive and intergenerational justice (Santos, 2014; Innerarity, 2012). In this sense, Paraskeva argues that specific counter-hegemonic traditions were unable to produce a sufficiently historicized self-understanding of epistemological and traditional knowledges' diversities. Instead,

curriculum studies' reconceptualist field long ignored its own history and instead played a game of paradigm one-upmanship (Jupp, 2013a, 2013b), through the introduction of newer and trendier curriculum discourses, too often imported in facile, sycophantic, and ahistorical ways from the area of US-based cultural studies. Such curriculum discourses reshaped the field in the 1980s and 1990s; however, to do significant decolonizing praxis in the present moment it becomes especially necessary to deterritorialize the field from its laudably queer speech acts and interlocutors (Huebner, Greene, Giroux, Apple, Pinar, Grumet, and Miller). However, in this decolonizing move, I follow Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) in insisting that the deterritorialization resizes and retextures curriculum praxis to attend to the blunt epistemicide and eugenic cognitive cleansing within a truly international and transnational field cemented by radical co-presence. By taking advantage of the present paradigmatic crisis (Süssekind, 2014a), it is Paraskeva's (2011, p. 176) contention that "we need a curriculum theory and practice that re-escalate their very own territorialities, which reflects an awareness that the new order and counter-order must be seen within the framework of power relations" (p. 176). Repositioning scientific knowledge and Northern thinking the presence of the other, the South, can be placed as a co-presence (Süssekind, 2014a), and not a dispute for hegemony. Paraskeva's sharp irony and sarcasm is a beautiful strategy to escape from the drowsiness of a metatheoretical discourse (Süssekind, 2014b), so common in our critical approaches. Shaking us awake, fully awake from curriculum discourses, Paraskeva (2011) calls "for the democratization of knowledges that is a commitment to an emancipatory, non-relativistic, cosmopolitan ecology of knowledges" (p. 154). Echoing literary critical theorist Terry Eagleton's hope without optimism, Paraskeva (2011, 2016a) unwraps the future path through ICT that moves us beyond a shattered theoretical field by putting forth ICT as the move toward curriculum praxis. He does that, though, without championing a shrewd new discourse to throw on top of the bone pile, as he recognizes that these counter hegemonic traditions and their discursive strategies were also part of the epistemicide. Instead, Paraskeva (2011) identifies the main goals for critical progressive educators at the present time as being social and cognitive justice and another 'real' democracy, which, again, are not possible without cognitive justice.

Importantly with ICT, Paraskeva (2011, 2016) moves us towards the Global South—which he argues, endorsing Santos' (2007, 2014) approach, is not a geographic distinction. Arriscado Nunes (2010) highlights the political commitment to the cause of the oppressed as being what characterizes "a" critical thinking that goes farther than its possible structuralist extension. For Nunes, the paradigm of the oppressed is

a transitional paradigm that opens towards a Southern paradigm theoretically and epistemologically, a paradigm that is concerned with the causes, the experiences, and the knowledges of the colonized, the feminine, the child, the native, the trans, and *the other* and conceiving of the world as an ecology of differences. This argument recognizes that, in recent decades, there has been criticism of the Global North's historical colonialism and present coloniality of knowledge in relation to the Global South.

Undeniably, Paraskeva is championing a new powerful theoretical approach using ICT, which floats South on the critical-progressive curriculum river. However, and against discourse one-upmanship of the past, Paraskeva (2011, 2016) shows a great deal of respect for the curriculum field's past. Instead of trashing the past in a manner typical of 1960s intellectual habits, dyed in the wool of the present ever newer and more refined discourses, Paraskeva suggests, inclusively, new ways of understanding the historicity of history in curriculum that jibe well with the approaches of our queer speech acts and interlocutors like Huebner, Greene, Giroux, Apple, Pinar, Grumet, and Miller, and others. In so doing, Paraskeva (2011) opens the veins of the field, but he does so in order to advance a generous face-to-face conversation with the critical beacons of our field. Rather than being dismissive of those that came before, Paraskeva seeks to establish a dialogue between Western-African-Asian-Arab-Latin American epistemological platforms based on cognitive justice. This is priceless and even more challenging than the challenge the cultural studies' frameworks and paradigmatic forces waged in the field in the 1970s-1990s. *Take note:* Paraskeva's (2011; 2016a) ICT introduced a new historicized momentum in the curriculum studies field with potential for other areas of education research and praxis, a momentum not just framed by a new language, but one that drastically moves the theoretical debate into a new and powerful level.

References

- Apple, M. (1990) *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: Routledge
- Aoki, T. (2005). *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted Aoki*. W. Pinar & R. Irwin (Eds.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Arelaro, L. R. G., Jacomini, M. A., & Klein, S. B. (2011). O ensino fundamental de nove anos e o direito à educação [Nine-year fundamental education and the right to education.] *Educação e Pesquisa*, 37(1), 35–51. Retrieved from http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1517-97022011000100003&lng=pt&tlng=pt. 10.1590/S1517-97022011000100003.
- Arendt, H. (1966/2003). Reflections on Little Rock. In: Arendt, H., *Responsibility and judgment*, pp. 193–213. New York: Schocken Books.
- Arriscado Nunes, J. (2010). O resgate da epistemologia [The rescue of epistemology]. In B. S. Santos, & M. P. Meneses (Eds.), *Epistemologias do Sul* [Southern epistemologies], p. 28. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Ball, S. (2012). *Global Education: New Policy Networks and the Neoliberal Imaginary*. New York: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization. The Human Consequences*. London: Blackwell Publishers
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Contrafogos: táticas para resistir à invasão neoliberal* [Counterfire]. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Zahar.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003). *Os usos sociais da ciência: por uma sociologia clínica do campo científico* [The social uses of science]. São Paulo: Ed. Unesp.
- de Certeau, M. (1994). *A invenção do cotidiano. Artes de fazer*. [The practice of everyday life.] Rio de Janeiro: Vozes.
- Counts, G. S. (1932a). Dare progressive education be progressive? *Progressive Education*, 4, 257–63.
- Counts, G. S. (1932b). *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: John Day.
- Dewey, J. (2012). *Democracy and education*. New York: Start Publishing LLC.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *How we think*. New York, NY: Dover Publications, Inc. (Original work published 1910)
- Dussel, E. (1985). *Philosophy of Liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling*. New Orleans, LA: Temple University Press.
- Grumet, M. (1981) "Autobiography and Reconceptualization," in H. Giroux, A. Penna and W. Pinar (eds) *Curriculum and Instruction*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, pp., 139–44.

- Hobsbawm, E. (1994). *A era dos extremos: o breve século XX*. [The age of extremes: A history of the world, 1914–1991]. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Innerarity, D. (2012) *The Future and Its Enemies*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Jupp, J. (2013a). Undoing Double Binds in Curriculum: On cosmopolitan sensibilities in US curriculum studies. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*. 9 (1), Available here: <http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/jaaacs/article/view/187721>
- Jupp, J. (2013b). Toward Cosmopolitan Sensibilities in US Curriculum Studies: A Synoptic Rendering of the Franciscan Tradition in Mexico. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 29, 48-71.
- Kliebard, H. (1995) *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*. New York: Routledge;
- Kuhn, T. (1971). *A estrutura das revoluções científicas* [The structure of scientific revolutions]. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Latour, B. (2011). *Reassembling the social. An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malewski, E. (Ed.) (2010). *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Macedo, E. (2006). Currículo: Política, cultura e poder [Curriculum, culture and power]. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 6(2), 98–113. Retrieved from <http://www.curriculosemfronteiras.org/vol6iss2articles/macedo.pdf>
- Miller, J. L. (2006). Curriculum studies and transnational flows and mobilities: Feminist autobiographical perspectives. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 3(2), 31–50.
- Mignolo W (2011) *The Darker Side of Modernity. Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham, NC:Duke University Press.
- Paraskeva, J. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. New York: Palgrave/MacMillan.
- Paraskeva, J. (2016a). *Curriculum epistemicides*. New York: Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J. (2016b) *Curriculum: Whose Internationalization?* New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. (1975) *Curriculum Theorizing. The Reconceptualists*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (2011). *Curriculum studies in Brazil: Intellectual histories, present circumstances*. New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Pinar, W. (2004) *What is Curriculum Theory*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers

- Pinar, W. F. (2008a). A equivocada educação do público nos Estados Unidos [The misguided education of the public in United States]. In R. L. Garcia & A. F. B. Moreiras (Eds.), *Currículo na contemporaneidade: Incertezas e desafios*. São Paulo: Cortez, 139–157.
- Pinar, W. F. (2008b). Curriculum theory 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 Publications.
- Pinar, W. F. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P. & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- de Oliveira, I. B. (2012). *O currículo como criação cotidiana* [The curriculum as an Everyday Life creation]. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A.
- Saltman, K. (2010) *The Gift of Education*. New York: Palgrave.
- Santos, B. S. (1987). *Um discurso sobre as ciências* [A discourse about the sciences]. Porto, PT: Afrontamento.
- Santos, B. S. (2001). *Crítica da razão indolente: Contra o desperdício da experiência* [A critique of lazy reason: Counter to the waste of experience]. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Santos, B. S. (Ed.) (2004). *Conhecimento prudente para uma vida decente: Um discurso sobre as ciências revisitado* [Prudent knowledges for a decent life: A discourse about sciences revisited]. São Paulo: Cortez.
- Santos, B. S. (2007). *Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges*. Retrieved from <http://www.ces.uc.pt/bss/documentos/AbysalThinking.pdf>
- Santos, B. S. (2010). Pr' além do pensamento abissal. [Beyond abyssal thinking.] In B. S. Santos & M. P. Meneses (Eds.), *Epistemologias do Sul* [Epistemologies of the South]. São Paulo: Cortez, 31–83.
- Santos, B. S. (2013). *Se Deus fosse um activista dos direitos humanos* [If God were a Human Rights Activist]. Coimbra, PT: Ed. Almedina.
- Santos, B. S. (2014) *Southern Epistemologies*. Boulder: Paradigm.
- Schubert, W. (1986) *Curriculum. Perspective, Paradigm and Possibility*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Schubert, W. (2010). Journeys of expansion and synopsis: Tensions in books that shaped curriculum inquiry, 1968 – Present. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 40, 17-94.
- 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..

- Süssekind, M. L. (2014a). Taking advantage of the paradigmatic crisis: Brazilian Everyday Life Studies as a new epistemological approach to the understanding of teacher's work. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*, 13(3), 199–210.
- Süssekind, M. L. (2014b). Why deterritorialized curriculum? *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 2. Retrieved from <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci>
- Süssekind, M. L. & Pinar, W. F. (2014). *Quem é William F. Pinar?* [Who is William F. Pinar?]. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. DP & Alii.
- Süssekind, M. L., Lontra, V., & Pellegrini, R. (2016). Pátria Educadora: uma receita de fé na educação, falta de confiança nos professores e homogeneização dos estudantes. [Pátria Educadora: a recipe of faith in education, lack of trust in teachers and homogenization of students] In C. L. de Mattos, L. C. Borges, & P. A. de Castro, (Eds.), *Didática e avaliação: Educação, cidadania e exclusão na contemporaneidade* [Didacticism and evaluation: education, Citizenship and exclusion in contemporaneity], p. 246. Campina Grande, PB: Realize Editora.
- Vilaça, M. (2015). Más condutas científicas uma abordagem crítico-comparativa para in-formar uma reflexão sobre o tema. [Bad scientific conduct a critical-comparative approach to inform a reflection on the theme]. *Revista Brasileira de Educação*, 20(60), p. 245–269.

Notes

¹ Thomas Kuhn (1971) conceptualizes “paradigm” as the realizations universally recognized as temporary solutions to standardized problems by the community of practitioners of science (p. 13). Santos clearly expands this idea to the mindset.