

Author's Response

ITINERANT CURRICULUM THEORY REVISITED ON A  
NON-THEORICIDE TOWARDS THE CANONICIDE:  
ADDRESSING THE 'CURRICULUM INVOLUTION'

---

JOÃO M. PARASKEVA

*University of Massachusetts – Dartmouth*

---

*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

**Beginning from a Beginning**

It was in Brazil, though, more specifically in Caxambu, in 2006, at ANPEd, “Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Educação” (National Association of Research and Graduate Educational Studies), that I first introduced the rudiments of what would be established as an Itinerant Curriculum Theory (hereafter ICT). Although I had written and debated the idea previously in a few annual meetings in Europe and in Central Africa, it was in Caxambu that such platform was presented and examined in a more systematized form.

I was quite honored to be the keynote speaker of the “GT-Curriculo - Grupo de Trabalho do Curriculo” (Curriculum Working Group); I was invited to respond to multiple research projects from a multiplicity of curriculum research groups based at graduate programs at both public and private Brazilian Universities.

All those phenomenal projects were swimming beautifully and non-uniformly and transgressively within and beyond the so-called critical and post-critical ‘curriculum’ veins, squeezing the very best of such intricate and important platforms. I noticed some clear commonalities between them and with some of my deep concerns, as well as the work that I was developing. For example, among other issues, I actually

was able to identify the same laudable ideological frustrations that I was facing, related with the same theoretical distress and agonies within specific counter-dominant positions and battles. I was disturbed, not only with their incapability of—at least—interrupting a eugenic epistemological platform, but also with the so-called ‘sepoys of coloniality’.

In *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory* (2011; 2014) and in *Curriculum Epistemicides* (2016), I was able to argue in detail how particular radical and critical curriculum approaches have been under fire from some critical scholars frustrated with puzzling and unacceptable silences within the critical progressive curriculum river. In my view, critical pedagogical theories, despite their unquestionable merits, not only exhibited an explicit functionalist approach, ignoring vital empirical research (see Liston, 1988; Paraskeva, 2011); they also showed a reactionary impulse—that is, particular concepts of critical pedagogy, such as empowerment, student voice, dialogue, and even the term “critical,” are representative myths that perpetuate relations of domination (see Ellsworth, 1989; Paraskeva, 2011; 2014; 2016a; 2016b). Paradoxically, even though particular radical, critical, neo-Marxist approaches were criticizing functionalist dominant and counter-dominant traditions, the reality is that they relied precisely on a functionalist approach as well (Paraskeva, 2011; 2014; 2016a; 2016b).

‘We’ were clearly all in pain. We were all looking into a path that would sustain an educational and curriculum platform that could destroy the virus of a despotic epistemology. I was trying to understand how to terminate the virus of Western Modern Eurocentric epistemological identity, “a pathology in which the ‘Western Modern Eurocentric’ self is the despotic virus” (Gil, 2009, p. 10). Such a despotic virus, whose millenarianism infected the field unashamedly, brutalized millions and millions, crushing them through an institutionalized epistemicide; influenced by Sousa Santos’ (2014) work, I defined such ‘brutalization’ as ‘curriculum epistemicide.’ One of my concerns and tough challenges was the fact that unfortunately both curriculum terrains—hegemonic and counterhegemonic—did not recognize themselves as producers and determinants of such an epistemicide. While the former’s position showed no surprises, the latter’s advocacies represented a complex and puzzled paradox, a paradox that scholars such as Pinar, Miller, Grumet, as well as Giroux, Macedo, Darder, and others, in a way, flagged and were trying to address.

Here I was, digging in such research projects, sipping letter by letter, tasting word by word, absorbing idea after idea, rejecting and swallowing a multitude of new language(s) and thirsty for an alternative vocabulary; here I was sometimes battling, sometimes jazzing ‘with a spell of open veins’, with a whirlwind of notions that drove me to countless theoretical equations, (non)possibilities and (non)hypotheses, all of them constituting a healthy disorganized, organized, non-stable front of silences and non-silences, not only against the dehumanized Byzantine forces that have colonized the field, but also—and this is crucial—against some specific counterhegemonic platforms that despite so many accomplishments, in the end were inadequate to interrupting ‘the epistemicide’—a concern well identified by contributors of this volume. I will argue that this battle created a vacuum, a curriculum vacuity, an issue that I will address later in this piece.

ICT owes a great deal to this ‘first encounter’ as Latour would put it; an encounter that showed me that we were all battling to develop the best comprehensible matrix possible to grasp an endless epistemologically diverse reality. It was clear to me that, to address the crux of such a battle, one should consciously understand that in a world epistemologically diverse, as Sousa Santos (2014) argues, it was almost delusional to imagine that one single and lone theoretical perspective would grasp such rich endless diversity.

At this time, also, I was willingly gobbling a multitude of rich readings far beyond the so-called Western Modern Eurocentric epistemological platform, completely outside of ‘our’ field, as well as an impressive armada of epistemological perspectives within the West(ern), alarmingly and non-euphemistically calling out the Western Modern Eurocentric epistemicide. Within and before such a horde of readings, I was absorbing new vocabulary, questioning the historicity of history and its philosophy, following spellbinding new semantic avenues that, while driving me to interesting paths and exposing simultaneously some laudable silences in our field, helped me slowly to address some of ‘our’ frustrations, opening the veins of Modern Western Eurocentrism. I was in a middle of a healthy and wealthy turmoil, with an endless fleet of disparate epistemological veins way out of our educational field that dialogued with each other. As Martin Bernal (1987) argues, “fundamental challenges to disciplines tend to come from outside” (p. 3). This multitude of perspectives spoke deeply to me. I majored in Ancient Greek, Latin language, Western philosophy and literatures. Six years studying, dissecting, and translating all the major scholars in the Western Eurocentric classic world. Such training forced me into bizarre courses in which we had to translate from Latin written plaques from thumb

stones in the cemeteries—some of them with incomplete texts, since they were broken. Don't get me wrong, as I am not trashing 'my major(ism).' However, for example, my incursions and interactions with such a magnitude of perspectives and their extraordinary matrix(es) radically turned 'my major inside out.' It allowed me to understand in deep the need to work below, above and beyond Modern Western Eurocentric theory towards the killing of the canon. Curriculum, in my view of its future as a field, needed to lead such a 'dead or alive' battle. In such a process, another anti-despotic theory, and an anti-non-theory that unpacks the canon is crucial.

At the *American Association For The Advancement Of Curriculum Studies* annual meeting in 2011, in New Orleans, I was invited by Peter Appelbaum to be the Program chair of the next AAACS annual meeting to be held in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada in 2012. Peter and I had a serious and deep conversation about several issues related with the field. At the conference, together with Peter and other colleagues we put together a group discussion around the internationalization of the field. Out of that discussion a *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force* was formed charged with the responsibility of translating the work of major non-Western intellectuals and to relate such work to the field. On the way back to Massachusetts, I decided to accept Peter's invitation and suggested that Maria Alfredo Moreira a professor at the University of Minho and a Visiting Professor at the University of Washington - Seattle to co-chair the program. A draft for the call for papers was written and after several rounds of inputs a final piece for the call for papers was sent to the members of the Association.

The *American Association For The Advancement Of Curriculum Studies* annual meeting in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, Tuesday, April 10 - Friday, April 13, 2012 with the theme *Curriculum Studies in Times of Globalization: Whose Internationalization?*, had the following call for papers:

The beginning of the new millennium may well be the moment in history that demonstrates how internationalization has conquered the epicenter of the curriculum field. Internationalization, conceptualized and developed within various epistemological perspectives has become an inevitable and legitimate 'macro project' for the present and future of the field of curriculum studies. Internationalization reinforces the tensions over the direction of curriculum studies through the attempt to develop a broader 'conversation'. This annual meeting proposes a debate over the 'internationalization' of

curriculum studies, in another sense; just as we have advanced in prior years, challenges to the emancipatory potential of a “pedagogical stance” to curriculum studies has demanded that we examine how the field works with, through, and around these critiques. In addition, we need to be aware of its ability to address critical issues and current crises that have marked this cultural and historic moment. In view of this, our 2012 AAACS conference call for papers asks curriculum scholars and educators to rethink and consider the very meaning of the internationalization endeavor. As an association affiliated with the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies [IAACS] we seek to answer the following questions: How can this [new] scholarship within the American Association help address issues related to the problematic of internationalization and globalization? What kind or kinds of internationalization(s) and globalization(s) are we talking about? Who directs the internationalization and globalization? Who has been globalized? Who has been localized? Who is globalizing whom? Whose internationalization we are talking about? Are there any symmetrical power relations in such processes? What kinds of circuits and mechanisms of economic and cultural production and reproduction does internationalization promote and/or silence? What is the effect of such conversations, or lack thereof, in the day-to-day lives of teachers and students? What are the real impacts of internationalization on advancement of curriculum theory and its development? Finally, the question remains whether or not curriculum studies, as a field, is on a collision course with internationalization and globalization? While we are part of a field that has always lived in crisis and by crisis, it is important to understand the fluidity of such movements. Are we facing an act of internationalization, or are we internationalizing the crises or internationalizing a way to further the crises? (Paraskeva & Moreira, 2011)

Needless to say that the call for papers signaled a drastic change. *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies Task Force* presented the first set of papers, and I presented a paper entitled *Theories after theory. Towards an itinerant curriculum theory*. In this paper, I was able to deepen my analysis and claimed how the field was engaged in a blunt epistemicide and how both dominant and specific counter dominant movements were responsible for such epistemicide. I challenged what I called ‘curriculum epistemicide’ and how the future of our field needed to pay attention to other epistemological platforms beyond the Western Modern Eurocentric terrain. I argued, among too many other issues, that ICT was a deliberate disrespect for any canon. I maintained, drawing on Sousa Santos rationale, that ICT was a clarion call for a general epistemology against the

impossibility of general epistemology, and that ICT was an epistemology of liberation that demanded the liberation of the very notion of epistemology.

The following conference, that was held in S. Francisco, April 24 – 27, 2013, with the theme *Counter-western curriculum theory: Displacement, Transference, or Action?*, produced the following call for papers:

That the world is global, cosmopolitan and complex would naturally be fluid music for the ears of curriculum scholars. That such dynamics drive local societies to shocking and Caspian social, economic and cultural paradoxes is a truism of any respectful academic document in general, and curriculum studies in particular. That such conditions are irreversible is, however, a divisive question for some scholars. The unsustainability of the inhuman, local consequences of globalization naturally reinforces its persistence, and pushes the (ethical) struggle for social justice into extreme levels of complexity. The history of our field is rich with narratives of individuals struggling for a more just curriculum and more equitable schools. Many scholars have directly addressed such powerful struggles, routinely denounced hidden and explicit eugenic policies and practices, and constructed new discourses that strive to circumvent problematic practices. The curriculum field has, at the same time, played key roles in the struggle for more relevant curriculum and pedagogies, and curriculum scholars have been responsible for some of the most important intellectual battles that have been fought both diachronically and synchronically within the educational field more broadly. With the advent of globalization and its cosmopolitan costs, the struggle for social justice needs to take into serious consideration, among other issues, the epistemological genocides perpetrated by ambassadors of Western modernity. We need new theories. We need, in particular, a just theory that attempts to resolve the contradictions of the present historical, cultural, and economic moment. Much critique of globalization now circulating in curriculum studies both nationally, in the United States, and internationally, helps us understand some of the lethal effects of globalization. Nevertheless, little of such critique is grounded in a strong commitment to work beyond the Western epistemological perimeter. Yet, to call for responses to such a situation is no more than another reproduction of center-periphery discourse! At the same time, the formerly silenced discourses struggle to complexify an already intricate conversation beyond this epistemological crisis. The debris of such confusion is the reinforcement of a particular Western position. But this is nothing new! Were you lulled to sleep by the previous paragraph? Why have we grown so

complacent? Why do we repeat and repeat (and repeat ...) these critiques of our own work? The psychoanalytic interpretation is clear: because, by doing so, we find pleasure in our work. Or so it seems. Explanation number one, following Said: those in power in curriculum studies maintain a perceived gap between Western and "other" in order to perpetuate an orientalism of the other, and therefore to hold off the completion of a fantasy of merging with those erotic, oriental theories. Explanation number two: We unconsciously believe that the other theories are "bad" for us; then, seeking them out and never actually interacting with them is a perseveration neurosis of our field, something like walking dark streets where prostitutes are known to be found, only to never actually pay for a prostitute; if we were to truly experience what the "other" indigenous epistememes had to offer, the thrill of the desire would be gone, so we need to never carry out the dream in order to maintain the fantasy of exquisite ecstasy. It is only good to truly want to undermine the Western dominance of the field, and only feels good, ironically, when we desire it; to fulfill the desire would mean the end of the fantasy and thus the end of the dream. Ending the dream would lead to an end of searches for ways to learn about alternative, culture-shocking curriculum theorizing that we seem to need to know about. Explanation three: the avoidance of cross-cultural and inter-cultural literacy in the field of education meets a fundamental psychoanalytic need of most curriculum scholars. What is this need? It might be the seemingly satisfying promises more than the fulfillment of the dream, for this devalues the dream, which is doubly embarrassing in undermining two dreams at once. The need is so powerful, it means ignoring research, not paying attention to recommendations by colleagues who have tried it. AAACS XII proposes that we highlight work in our program that is moving toward a new field. Each proposal will be expected to meet several of the following criteria for this new mode of theorizing:

(a) A read of your proposal and a reviewer's imagination about what will happen at the conference based on what you wrote, includes most of the following as symptoms of a sick world in need of a prescribed cure: internationalization, nation- and local-based curriculum theories and practices, generation of parallel or independent lines of itinerant flights, challenging in the process powerful legacies of colonialism and neocolonialism at the very core of globalization. Such curriculum routes need to be sentient of convoluted social issues such as urbanization, development, rural education, apprenticeship, place, space, time and migration.

(b) In view of this, our 2013 AAACS conference call for papers asks curriculum scholars and educators to re-examine and consider curriculum theory beyond the Western, Anglo-Saxon epistemological terrain. This means

making substantial if not central use of a curriculum research publication from at least one different curriculum scholar from those whom would never be considered a scholar within your own extended family of citations, i.e., of influences and influencers of influences in your work. Of course, as is our AAACS tradition, proposals for current research projects not directly tied to the yearly theme are also welcome.

(c) Symposia proposed should make a greater than average effort meet to these criteria. At the same time, other issues and concerns of interest to our members are welcome on this year's program.

(d) Proposals should include a plan for making the controversial work of the session explicit and to make sure that the audience understands what is controversial and how that is transformative.

(e) When possible, invite a well-known school or policy-maker who would be embarrassed or professionally damaged by your work, if it were to be taken seriously, to participate in the AAACS conference, either as part of your session or as an independent rebuttal session to be feature on a future AAACS YouTube channel.

As an association affiliated with the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies [IAACS] we seek to address the following issues: How can we fight for a just society and just school, and just curriculum with a just theory? How can we engage and create a just theory? A question we are tempted to ask, "Who determines the *we*?" can only be asked in a discourses that already has those included and those excluded by criteria. Who defines a just theory? Who sets the limits? When we ask these questions, we construct an ideological neutral teacher, student, and policy designer who would not experience their own understanding of their social and cultural reality as having common elements; meaning the limits would be experienced differently as would the justice of a particular theory. If to interpret society is to change it, how can we produce any change with blemished theoretical tools? Can we head on a global theory? What do we really want? Do we want to change the field? Do we want to change curriculum theory? Do we want to change society? Do we want to challenge the Western modern discrepancy between social experience and social expectations? What are we doing now? What now is helping us to participate in the great conversation that is curriculum theory, and what are you doing to help AAACS make these kind of thin How can we engage in a theory that is aware of different historical patterns within the West and beyond the West and between West and non-West platforms? How can we produce a theory that doesn't seek a predominant pattern? In what ways does the lack of such

a theory make the pleasure of wanting such a theory even more pleasureable than any seemingly perfect theory could be? (AAACS 2013 Call; Paraskeva & Moreira, 2012)

At this conference, I continued to debate with my colleagues about the major arguments around the 'curriculum epistemicide', the need to deterritorialize the field and to engage in an itinerant curriculum theory (ICT). Undeniably, the last two themes of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> annual meetings of the *American Association For The Advancement Of Curriculum Studies* (namely *Curriculum Studies in Times of Globalization: Whose Internationalization?* and *Counter-western curriculum theory: Displacement, Transference, or Action?* respectively) showed an interesting challenge and change both to the meeting and to the field.

Peter Applebaum (and many other colleagues as well), always so much supportive of our efforts, on his *Report on the Fourth World Curriculum Studies Conference*, organized by IAACS (*International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2-5, July, 2012, registered such a harsh turn while acknowledging the discomfort, anxiety, and challenges faced by colleagues that were championing new avenues such as 'the cannon'. Appelbaum (2013) recognizes how ICT embodied and championed a critique against the 'hegemonic epistemicide'. Drawing on Paraskeva (2012), he (2013) alerts that "there have been numerous critiques of the [canon] project itself as complicit in various forms of intellectual imperialism, cultural reproduction, and hegemonic epistemicide of contrasting traditions around the world". Appelbaum (2013) highlights how ICT rationale was moving the field into a different territory. He (2013) states:

In Paraskeva's (2012) editorial introduction, he takes us into such territory, committing AAACS through its journal to challenging the sociology of absences, that is, challenging how certain non- western epistemologies have been rendered as non-existent. While he calls for us to take on these challenges without fostering what he terms 'indigenistude' (Paraskeva 2011), or a kind of romantic exoticism of indigenous knowledges that would further colonialize non-Western epistemologies and practices by assuming an itinerant posture of a deterritorialized thinking, he insists that our work through our Internationalization Task Force has successfully denied any mystification of indigenous cultures and knowledges. The key strategy will be to extend this work in consort with our task force, calling in the scholarship of each of our members for a democratization of knowledges grounded in emancipatory, non-relativistic, cosmopolitan ecologies, a

“bringing together and staging [of] dialogues and alliances between diverse forms of knowledge, cultures, and cosmologies in response to different forms of oppression that enact the coloniality of knowledge and power.” As we learn from cosmologies and knowledges other than our own, in particular from “the South” (since the aim to reinvent social emancipation goes beyond the critical theory produced in the North and the social and political praxis to which it has subscribed), we would be transforming our field against the kind of “Western thinking” one might label “abysmal thinking” (with Paraskeva), rooting out among other things systems of visible and invisible distinctions. (p. 9)

While respecting the past, a past that is coined with laudable accomplishments and puzzling collapses within and beyond the radical critical river, ICT is openly and unromantically signaling a possible future path for the field, one that is ‘non-theoricidal’ and against any canon. ICT unleashed a set of multifarious reactions both nationally and internationally within and well beyond the Western dominant and counter dominant platforms – in which this issue is just one example. I was invited by James Jupp at the time at Georgia Southern University now at University of Texas Rio Grand Valley to respond to a set of pieces that were dialoguing with ICT. I thank him, the contributors of this issue, and so many others colleagues for such an honor.

### **On a Non-Theoricide Towards the Canonicide**

The authors who reexamine ICT and its contribution to the field in this issue grasp ICT’s volcanic nature. As I have examined elsewhere (Paraskeva, 2011; 2014; 2016a; 2016b), ICT did try to say something to the field, positing new terrains and theoretical situations. ICT denounces and challenges the epistemicide, the curriculum epistemicide that is not only scientific, but also social, as Oliveira (2017) examines; an epistemicide in which both dominant and specific counter-dominant movements are overtly implicated. ICT, Sússekind (2017) argues, “pushes the struggle over the curriculum into another level denouncing the field as the leading ideological locomotive of epistemicide” (p. 1-2). Identifying my take as ‘a full blast comprehensive “self-critique of curriculum studies’ critical theorists” (p. 2), Sússekind’s (2017) claims that ICT “denounces how both hegemonic and counterhegemonic movements were players in such curriculum epistemicide” (p. 2). Curriculum, Janson and Silva (2017) documented, exposed “the silent colors of the epistemicide” (p. 1), legitimized by what Sousa Santos (2014) defines as abyssal

thinking. Modern Western thinking, Sousa Santos claims (2007), “is an abyssal thinking” (p.45). It consists,

of a system of visible and invisible distinctions, the invisible ones being the foundation of the visible ones. The invisible distinctions are established through radical lines that divide social reality into two realms, the realm of “this side of the line” and the realm of “the other side of the line”. The division is such that “the other side of the line” vanishes as reality, becomes nonexistent, and is indeed produced as nonexistent. (p. 45)

Challenging such “abyssality,” ICT, Moreira (2017) examines,

travels extensively through the ‘other side of the epistemic abyss’, unveiling it, and construing a compelling argument for inclusion of a wider diversity of knowledges in curriculum theory and practice, schooling, teacher education, and education research. (p. 2)

Such processes, Moreira (2017) adds, will humbly recognize and validate the Oriental, African, Indigenous, “‘Southern’ epistemologies that have been *just there* on the invisible side of this epistemic abyss but have been systematically obliterated in Western, male dominated curriculum theory and practice discourses” (pp. 2-3).

ICT participates in the complicated conversations (see Trueit, 2000; Pinar, 2000) that cannot bend under the yoke of Western academicism but must challenge Western curriculum epistemicides and alert us of the need to respect and incorporate non-Western epistemes. Such contributions are noted. As Price (2017) argues, ICT helps “us as curricularists to take the road less traveled, a clarion call that we dare not ignore” (p. 2). Such a road opens the veins of the Modern Western Eurocentric canon, introducing a new vocabulary. For example, the approaches of Oliveira (2017), Moreira (2017), and Süssekind (2017) clearly highlight how ICT introduces a new curriculum language to address social phenomena. Süssekind (2017) states that vocabulary such as ICT, epistemicide, epistemological fascism, Global North/Global South, ecology of knowledges, cognitive justice, abyssal line and abyssality, insurgent cosmopolitanism, coloniality of knowledge, critical-progressive curriculum river, and epistemological euthanasia aimed at amplifying curriculum studies into an alternative inter-and transnational platform. ICT forces a new historicity of history, a just historicity of the field’s history. William Pinar (2012; 2013) acknowledges the influential synopticality of ICT in his recent *Curriculum Studies in the United States*. He (2013) states:

There are other discourses influential now, sustainability perhaps primary among them. Arts-based research is hardly peripheral ... One sign is the synoptic text composed by João M. Paraskeva. Hybridity is the order of the day. Pertinent to the discussion is that even Paraskeva's determination to contain in one "critical river" multiple currents of understanding curriculum politically floods its banks; he endorses an "itinerant curriculum theory" that asserts a "deliberate disrespect of the canon" (2011, 184). In Paraskeva's proclamation, this "river" has gone "south" (2011, 186). That South is Latin America, where we can avoid "any kind of Eurocentrism" (2011, 186) while not "romanticizing indigenous knowledge" (2011, 187). Addressing issues [such as hegemony, ideology, power, social emancipation, class, race, and gender] implies a new thinking, a new theory ... an itinerant curriculum theory. (p. 64)

Although Pinar's reading of ICT is crucial, I would clarify (maybe complexify) that 'the' South is not just Latin America. Again, Sousa Santos is vital here:

The South is metaphorically conceived as a field of epistemic challenges, which try to address and repair the damages and negative impacts historically created by capitalism in its colonial relation with the world. Such a conception of South overlaps the geographical South, the group of nations and regions in the world that were subjugated to European colonialism and that, with the exception of Australia and New Zealand, never achieved levels of economic development similar to the Global North (i.e. Europe and the United States of America). (2009, pp. 12 -13)

Thus, we "designate the epistemological diversity of the world by South epistemologies" (Sousa Santos, 2009, p. 12). In this way, ICT addresses Sousa Santos's claim about the need for a new critical theory, a new emancipatory praxis (2006, p. xi). As he states,

contrary to their predecessors, [such] theory and practices must start from the premise that the epistemological diversity of the world is immense, as its cultural diversity and that the recognition of such diversity must be at the core of global resistance against capitalism and of alternative forms of sociability. (ibid)

Oliveira (2017) dissects the risks of a field conceptually and historically framed and thus understood only through global north discourses. The yoke of the 'North' obliterates any epistemological validity beyond it. She states that ICT denounces 'Global North's hegemonic, as well as specific counterhegemonic, knowledge forms that have historically been and continue to contribute to the epistemicides. As I argue, such a wrangle, in a way, produced a vacuum, a void—an issue that I will address later.

ICT attempts to create an itinerant path to address a problem. In so doing, it faces undesirable yet unavoidable, and needed, black holes (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). ICT sees the confrontation with such holes as a reassembled set of processes towards a creative and desirable plan of (in)consistency only possible by respecting a perpetual itinerancy. Such a theory(ist) understands the structure and flows of a given social formation. Its itinerancy allows the theory(ist) to grasp why the imposition, certification and legitimization of particular un/re/coding metamorphoses, as well as the eclipse of so many others. That is, ICT reads and challenges such codes that frame each social formation and fueled the wrangle of oppressor–oppressed. This is crucial because it allows one to master the complex processes of axiomatization of specific codes within the capitalist society from slavery in the 1400s to the current slavery constructions as de-/re-/coded flows of an economy and culture pumped by an epidemic of overproduction (Marx & Engels, 2012).

ICT is an unblemished claim against dominant multiculturalist forms that are “Eurocentric, a prime expression of the cultural logic of national or global capitalism, descriptive, apolitical, suppressing power relations, exploitation, inequality and exclusion” (Sousa Santos, 2007, pp. xxiii – xxiv), which have been legitimizing a monoculture of scientific knowledge that needs to be defeated and replaced by an ecology of knowledges (Sousa Santos, 2003). Jupp and Espinosa-Dulanto (2017) do not speak euphemistically when they denounce ‘the erroneous tendencies’ feeding and ‘eugenicizing’ multicultural foundations. They denounce multiculturalism as “a UnitedStatesian and Anglophone project that is often universalized in unspoken ways” (p. 24).

First, we argue that assigning fixed before/after identities is an erroneous tendency. This assigning of fixed before/after identities (very often) delineates oppressed person of color and White privilege identities prior to the multicultural intervention. After the

intervention, these identities are to be followed by emancipated person of color and White-ally/race-evasive identities. Second, we argue that multicultural foundations' UnitedStatesian and Anglophone (additionally, Puritanical and Manichean) opposition to Eurocentric "traditional curriculum" (Grant, 2006, p. 20) is also an erroneous essentializing tendency. (Jupp & Espinosa-Dulanto, 2017, p. 25)

In Jupp and Espinosa Dulanto's view, the struggle for social justice is severely compromised by such a Western Modern Eurocentric approach. They accurately claim that "fixed before/after interventions lack sufficient subtlety, nuance, or attention to process for actually advancing identity conscientization" (p. 25), or 'consciencism as ICT advocates, following Nkrumah's (1964) rationale. Moreover, Jupp & Espinosa Dulanto reiterated that their critique "rather than dismissing UnitedStatesian-based revisionist history, drives at greater historicized understandings within and among collectivities within cross-cultural, cosmopolitan, and global-local contexts" (p. 26). In this context, Jupp and Espinosa Dulanto claim the need to re-think the very own Western Modern Eurocentric historicity of history, arguing that:

[m]ulticulturalisms, like the ones sometimes found in multicultural foundations, release us from careful thinking about historical relationships both inside and beyond Europe that suggest we might need both European traditions and multicultural, cross-cultural, and cosmopolitan understandings of other cosmologies and traditions.  
(p. 29)

Undeniably there is a 'racialized critieria' (Jupp and Espionsa Dulanto, 2017) underpinning, not only the Western Modern Eurocentric hegemonic eugenic platform, but also, and this is quite important, some of the 'devices' put in place to 'supposedly' interrupt and destroy such 'eugenicism,' such as dominant multicultural forms. These need to be situated within the complex framework of 'coloniality'. ICT challenges the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being (cf. Quijano, 2000; Mignolo, 2008; Grosfoguel, 2007; 2010; 2011); in this issue, Janson and Silva's (2017) teacher narrative unveils the US education system within the matrix of coloniality:

U.S. education is a structural masterpiece of Eurocentric, Anglophone, white, patriarchal imperialism. As female critical transformative

leaders, we are constantly trying to push against this domination within ourselves, our communities, and our classrooms. However, the very composite of our school speaks to the way in which knowledge reflects gendered norms in the U.S. Here is the breakdown: in English language arts, 5 out of 6 teachers are female; in world languages, 3 out of 4 are female; in art and music, 3 out of 3 are female; whereas in science, 1 out of 6 is female; in math, 2 out of 7 are female; in history, 0 out of 6 are female; and in the industrial and technological sciences, 0 out of 5 are female. This is a sophisticated network of power that reflects the colonialities of knowledge and being. (pp. 4-5)

Epistemological fascism – so well merged in an eugenic historicity of history (Galeano, 1997) – is protected every day with an overt, well-established, commonsensical attack of diversity, even within ‘this side of the abyssal line.’ “Coloniality” argue Janson and Silva (2017), “is the aftermath that remains in the reproduction of textbooks, hidden school agendas, cultural normative patterns; it is seen in self-image and is morphed into commonsense” (p. 7).

ICT is sentient that the “politics of cultural diversity and mutual intelligibility calls for a complex procedure of reciprocal and horizontal translation rather than a general theory” (Sousa Santos, 2007, p. xxvi). Oliveira’s (2017) argument identifies ICT commitments with the ecology of knowledges. She states,

Paraskeva in proposing a new ecology of knowledge as a way to overcome both epistemicides and curriculum theories and perspectives that are sustained by the belief in the aprioristic superiority of some knowledge. Finally, I argue that Paraskeva’s itinerant curriculum theory (hereafter ICT) provides a way to think about curriculum from the perspective of the ecology of knowledge and South-North dialogue, and considering ICT to be a daily knowledge practice, I reflect on ICT’s contribution to curriculum and everyday school life studies. (p. 3)

ICT shows, Oliveira (2017) argues, how the struggle for an ecology of knowledges cannot be detached from the yoke of the coloniality of knowledge, denouncing how previous multicultural curriculum projects were necessarily nonemancipatory and undeniably and profoundly regulatory.

Süssekind (2014) has reinforced how ICT helps one to re-think one's own arrogant ignorance within the curriculum, when this curriculum is framed as lived experience toward social and cognitive justice. Formalizing ICT in my mind, through my writing, through dialogues with others and the wor(l)d has meant, and still does, considering the intricacies of its conceptions and assertions. Yet, its conceptualization and creation is a natural complex interaction with the wor(l)d, as Michelangelo and Picasso each suggested was the case with their art.

When one day Michelangelo was asked how a certain frame was painted, i.e. where his idea came from, he answered, "I had no idea. The figure just stood there, looking at me. I just gave it life/birth." Picasso had a similar dialogue with a Gestapo officer. In occupied Paris during World War II, a Gestapo officer who had barged into Picasso's apartment pointed at a photo of the mural, *Guernica*, asking: "Did you do that?" "No," Picasso replied, "you did." Writing is, Gilles Deleuze (1995) argues, "bringing something to life, to free life from where it's trapped, to trace lines of flight" (p. 141).

These words of Michelangelo and Picasso also highlight the *theory of translation* that works through art. Such 'translation' is overtly absent, for example, from the massive majority of the teacher education programs. ICT, as the contributors of this volume have highlighted, moves the field beyond a kind of 'theoretical absolutism' that is so crucial if our field intends to have a say in the complex field of teacher education and its impact in teachers and students' daily lives. ICT refuses to abdicate the classroom, the so-called pedagogical ditch which faces, Price (2017) argues, "strange times" (p. 5). In Price's (2017) words, "teacher education phenomena have been determined by a dangerous new managerialism dogma that forces the cult of momentism', a dangerous state of curriculum existence that places theory and practice as antagonist entities" (p. 5). This observation can also be seen in Janson's and Silva's (2017) approaches. Price minces no words, arguing that the new managerialism geometry pushed curriculum and teacher education to an insulting quasi 'non-existent' position. Price (2017) argues that the field is:

largely ignored, hardly recognized for being even part of the educational furniture; thus has positivism and education reform so effectively marginalized our work and importance. This is clearly evident in, on display with, what I call the "tyranny of method" which has so thoroughly won over the imagination of teacher preparation institutions across the land. (p. 3)

Meanwhile, within the so-called 'black box,' Janson and Silva (2017) argue that

educators stand before an abyssal river throwing students into a race without ever getting them to dive into the depths of knowledge in order to reveal the seafloor that holds the remnants of knowledges, spiritualities, languages, and cultures destroyed as colonization and imperialism transformed the world as well as colonized minds, leaving colonialities as the waters of Lethe and Nepenthe—Drink the waters, choke on the waters, it doesn't matter you will forget. (p. 1)

That is, Janson and Silva (2017) add,

the students who manage to swim across are legitimized in the dominant knowledge. But, what of those that sink; the ones who were never taught to swim, who didn't come with that knowledge? As these students sink and educators grab them, what stays and sinks into the waters as these students struggle to breathe? Identities, beings, and knowledges sink and become new adornments for the seafloor. (pp. 1-2)

To address the field's implication in the 'Epistuhmawho' (as verbalized by a student in Janson's classroom), that is, the 'Epistemicide: the killing of knowledge' implies also to challenge both the way the field's history has been produced, reproduced and legitimized, as well as the language through which such legitimization occurs.

ICT is a theory of translation that attempts to prevent the "reconstruction of emancipatory discourse and practices from falling into the trap of reproducing, in a wider form, Eurocentric concepts and contents" (Sousa Santos, 2007, xxvi). Translation is crucial to the processes of coding and decoding,

between the diverse and specific intellectual and cognitive resources that are expressed through the various modes of producing knowledge about counter-hegemonic initiatives and experiences aimed at the redistribution and recognition and the construction of new configurations of knowledge anchored in local, situated forms of experience and struggle. (ibid)

In such context, examples such as Acouba Sawadogo, an African farmer of Burkina Faso, who has been restoring the soil damaged by centuries of drought (and desertification) through traditional farming techniques, cannot be arrogantly minimized or eugenically produced as non-existent or non-science, just because this work cannot be translated and framed within Western scientificity. Western intellectuals need to consciously acknowledge that the Western epistemological platform—both in its most sophisticated dominant and/or radical critical counter-dominant perspectives—is insufficient and inadequate to explain and change its own effects (Seth, 2011). A new system cannot emerge from the ashes of the old. It is pointless to think about the future just with(in) the Cartesian modernity model. It is hopeless to frame the present within such a dated model.

Western counter-dominant perspectives are crucial in the struggle for social and cognitive justice, yet not enough. As Sandra Corazza courageously argues, “we need to start taking seriously the task of a real theory of curriculum thought” (2002, p. 131), one that opens the Western canon of knowledge and responds to the need for a new epistemological configuration. Such a journey of belligerent struggles—against dominant and within the counter-dominant Western epistemological platform—aims to replace the so-called monoculture of scientific knowledge for an ecology of knowledges. Such ecology of knowledges is:

an invitation to the promotion of non-relativistic dialogues among knowledges, grating equality of opportunities to the different kinds of knowledge engaged in ever broader epistemological disputes aimed both at maximizing their perspective contributions to build a more democratic and just society and at decolonizing knowledge and power.  
(Sousa Santos, 2007, p. xx)

As with any other theoretical exercise to understand the educational world in order to transform it (see Pinar, 2004), ICT provides a borderless space within which to deepen certain claims. For example, among many issues, ICT highlights the linguistic imperialism framed by the English language and culture as one part of the genocide. Conscious of this linguistic imperialism as a crucial part of the genocide, ICT allows one to respectfully understand, for example, how ‘Camfrenghish’— “a language used in Cameron cities, invented created daily by the Cameron’s urban youth” —a language that deliberately violates the linguistic rules of French and English and in so doing desacralizes these imperial languages (Marc Ella, 2013, p. 24). Camfrenghish, in cities such as Yaonde, is the people’s language.

Antonia Darder (2012), in her superb exegesis of the political economy of cultural theory and politics, brings language to the core of the battle against eugenics. As Darder claims, “the complexity of language and how the students produce knowledge and how language shapes their world represent a major pedagogical concern for all educational settings” (2012, p. 105). Language, Darder argues, is more than a tool that epitomizes a specific learning theory or the cult of a flamboyant method. The language question intersects other social non-epiphenomena such as the question of authority, reframing equality as well as social and cognitive justice. Any critical theory that aims for cultural democracy cannot ignore the power of biculturalism as a *poesis* that determines culture and power relations in the classrooms (Darder, 2012). This is not a minor issue in ICT’s approach, as examined by Moreira (2017). The reality is not that different in Portugal and in too many nations in Southern Europe and within the broader E.U. Moreira’s (2017) approach speaks volumes about how ICT addresses some of the major issues in teacher education in Portugal. Anchoring her claims in empirical evidence, Moreira (2017) argues how the ‘epistemicide’ in teacher education struts arrogantly through the ‘linguisticides’. That is, as Moreira (2017) argues, “in Portugal, as in many other countries, native language speakers perform higher in literacy studies than students with an immigrant background, especially those from ethnolinguistic minorities” (p. 4). That is the epistemicide: the curriculum epistemicide, Moreira (2017) claims, goes on

when we look at the way second language education mirrors schooling and education in general; it’s not just public schools in the USA that use a combination of meritocracy, high-stakes testing, ability-grouping, low teacher expectations, and an oppressive curriculum to perpetuate inequality among bilingual/bicultural students. (p. 5)

Moreira (2017) unpacks the nexus between the epistemicide and techno rationale that runs curriculum and teacher education affairs, arguing that “teacher education in Portugal needs to be deterritorialized as well, as it still is held hostage to a techno-rational way of thinking” (p. 4). ICT, in Oliveira’s (2017) take, points out the responsibility of educators and curriculum theorists in understanding the task of curriculum studies in its relationship with daily school practices. In Moreira’s (2017) hands-on approach, “And the linguistic minorities suffer what they must?” ICT addresses such an antagonist milieu. Relying on Vieira’s (2014) study, Moreira (2017) argues ICT is the just theory that will promote “the decolonization of university practices and teacher education programs” (p. 9), a counter theory that places

bilingualism as the trump card towards emancipatory praxis. ICT, Moreira (2017) claims, “does make sense and serves a more inclusive and more democratic education by helping to deterritorialize prevailing epistemologies” (p. 9).

To understand ICT, Janson (2017) argues, “we need to see it as a form of praxis that I think is easier to analyze through the narrative of experience in which people as they read are enacting ICT in their analysis in dialogue” (p. 9). That is,

as teachers who enact ICT, we also must be rearguard intellectuals who are ‘trained in academic knowledges but solidarily involved with the social actors, their task is to retrain themselves in such a way as to be able constantly to translate academic knowledge in non-academic knowledge, and vice versa, and to do with *con passionalità*’. (Sousa Santos, 2014, pp. 231-232)

ICT, in Silva’s (2017) approach helps her, as a foreign language teacher, not just to fight the eugenic English only society, but also to situate her bilinguism and specifically her Azoreanism in the web of coloniality. She states:

In my own bilingual experience, I continue to feel embarrassment in my speaking of Portuguese, not because I am not proud to be bilingual, but because of the negative conditioning that was engrained in my being. My Portuguese is not native Continental Portuguese; rather, it is Azorean American Portuguese, seen locally as a subpar dialect of the language. This view of my tongue affected the formation of my own identity, but far from my process of becoming is the process of becoming that began way before me. (p. 7)

Epistemological cleansing is the core business of coloniality and totalitarizes life in classrooms. Silva’s (2017) also unfolds a graphic x-ray of such eugenic framework.

As educators confronted with a common curriculum what is needed is the reflection on “how we can deal with these struggles in our own positions in ways that do not help reproduce privilege and essentialized binarism” (Lin, 2008, p.80). The struggle within my own position has been at times swarming with hypocrisy as the status of being able to morph between two cultures undetected by physical characteristics or by striking markers. In my teaching of Spanish, I have at times continued the coloniality of being as I have

corrected students' native expression and made it the version that "should" be taught in schools. As a "foreign" language teacher, I have in the past continued the cycle of inferiority, suppressing their cultural identities to appreciate the language and culture the way the Academia Real sees fit, not the way their *antepasados* passed down as they struggled to keep the semblances of what was the only thing the colonizers could not take away, their discourse with each other. The idea of what is valued and what is not is hidden in the foreign language curriculum with "issues about what language knowledge counts as legitimate, whose language is important enough to be included in the curriculum, why, and in what terms have usually not been reviewed in terms of the linguaracism that choices of foreign language and foreign language pedagogy entail" (Macedo, et al., 2003, p. 101). Spanish, the language of the colonizer, is never approached from that angle but rather from a superficial position unsynthesized from its historical progression.

(pp. 7-8)

ICT also warns about the need to challenge any form of indigenitude or the romanticization of indigenous cultures and knowledges, and it is not framed in any dichotic skeleton of West/Rest. In fact, it challenges such functionalist forms. Its itinerant dynamic pushes the theorist to a pluri(non-necessary) directional path. Acknowledging the pervasive effects of *curriculum epistemicides* and *epistemic colonization* within an ICT framework, Moreira (2017) argues that this work does not automatically turn the discourses of linguistic minorities and of given socioprofessional groups into something intrinsically good.

A deterritorialized curriculum theory implies a commitment to fight for a different research platform, one that pushes research to a "level of instability, not stability, generating concepts also, in itself, unstable" (O'Brien & Penna, 1999, p. 106). In doing so, a deterritorialized curriculum theory increasingly becomes an itinerant theory, a theory of nonspaces (Auge, 2003). In essence, as Gough (2000) claims, one needs to assume a rhizomatous approach that sees reality beyond dichotomies, beyond beginnings and endings; an approach that breeds from the multiplicity of immanent platforms and, from its centerless and peripheryless position, defies clean knowledge territories (DeLeuze & Guattari, 1987; Eco, 1984).

Said's (2005) arguments are quite significant in this regard. He claims that when human experience is recorded for the first time and is then given a theoretical formulation, its strength comes from the fact that it is directly linked to actual historical circumstances and is an organic result of these circumstances. The

subsequent versions of such a theory cannot reproduce its original power, because the situation has calmed down and changed. Through this, the theory has been degraded and deteriorated, has been domesticated, and has been transformed into a substitute for the same thing. Its initial purpose (political change) has been subverted. In essence, Said (2005) challenges the way that theories travel to distinct situations, losing in this process part of their original power and rebellion. We need a myriad of ways to build a deterritorialized curriculum theoretical posture that will force curriculum research to deal with multiple, not fixed, frameworks within ample and intricate epistemological waves.

Although it is true that we are in the presence of an itinerant theoretical edification that tries to overcome previous theoretical formulations, it is also a fact that this itinerant position should be seen as transgressive. Along with Said (2005), one might say that “the purpose of curriculum theory[ists], is to travel, to go beyond the limits, to move, and stay in a kind of permanent exile” (p. 41). A theory of non-places and non-times is, in essence, a theory of all places and all times. The curriculum theorist is, as Jin (2008) put it, a constant migrant who experiences a series of [epistemological] events (Khalifa, 1999). I am claiming an atypical epistemological approach that will be able to deconstruct the images of thought. Such an approach will unfold naturally, as Merleau-Ponty (1973) put it, into voluntary and involuntary creations. Furthermore, the curriculum worker and creator needs to be seen as “an *auctor*, which is *qui auget*, or the person who augments, increases, or perfects the act (in fact), since every creation is always a co-creation, just as every author is a co-author” (Agamben, 2005, p. 76). The educational and curriculum theorist needs to be seen as an epistemological pariah who is challenging and challenged by a theoretical path that is inexact yet rigorous (Deleuze, 1990b). Such an itinerant theory(ist) provokes (and exists amid) a set of crises and produces laudable silences.

The theory(ist) is a volcanic chain, showing a constant lack of equilibrium, and thus is always a stranger in his/her own language. He or she is an itinerant theory(ist) profoundly sentient of the multiplicities of lines, spaces, and dynamic becomings (Deleuze, 1990b). Such a theoretical course is defined by a cutting edge, a *Malangatania* and *Pollockian* set of processes, not because it is abstract but because it is oppressive in its freedom. It is not a sole act, however; it is a populated solitude. This itinerant theoretical path, claims a multifaceted curriculum compromise, and “runs away” from any unfortunate ‘canonology.’ Such an itinerant curriculum theory is an anthem against the indignity of speaking for the other (Deleuze, 1990a; 1990b). Following the critique of Bogues and Gordon, Walsh (2012) challenges the

lack of attention of the intellectual production of people of color. She uses no euphemism targeting the left hemisphere as well:

For the Left, “experience” in and of itself is not the problem. In fact, “experience” is important in that it both reveals the lived realities of oppression and of resistance and helps to think social change and revolution. Yet it is not the voices or intellectual production of those who have lived “this” oppression and resistance that has generally been of interest to leftist thinkers, but rather the interpretation and utility of this “experience.” That is to say, it is the intellectual practice of “speaking for” the subalternized and oppressed that has generally characterized leftist politics and leftist thought particularly in Latin America; a practice that tends to reproduce and maintain subalternization. The problem, then, and with regard to the discussion here, is with the ways leftist critical thinking continues to disparage, obscure or negate the intellectual production that derives not from modernity itself but from its other face, that is, from coloniality and from the subjects who have lived the colonial wound. (Walsh, 2012, p. 14)

Such epistemic suppression is also quite visible in the ‘invasion’ of dominant and counter-dominant Western epistemological forms in non-Western spaces and places. Ibarra Colado (2007) unveils such epistemic colonization through the translations processes:

This process of epistemic colonization has been assisted by the increased translation of textbooks distributed by large publishing houses from the United States and other dominant Anglo countries, which guarantee the reproduction of their ideology. The analysis of syllabi from any Latin American university reveals the widespread presence of well-known American authors. Similarly, there are falsifications under the signature of ‘Latin American’ authors that have acquired the ability to think like Americans to the point of ignoring their native reality by abdicating their own identity. Furthermore, we must not forget the international bestsellers of the management gurus whose books occupy the largest spaces in the study programs and classrooms of Latin American universities.

The itinerant theory(ist) is much more than an eclectic approach; it is actually a profoundly theoretical discipline. After all, as Popkewitz (2001) claims, “the challenges about knowledge are not only about academic knowledge, but about cultural norms of progress and social change that are part of the politics of contemporary life” (p. 241).

More importantly, ICT 'confronts and throws' the subject to a permanently unstable question of 'what is it to think?' Moreover, ICT pushes one to think in the light of the future as well as to question how can 'we' actually claim to really know the things that 'we' claim to know, if 'we' are not ready specifically to think the unthinkable—to go beyond the unthinkable and master its infinitude. ICT is to be (or not to be) radically unthinkable. ICT is a metamorphosis between what is thought and non-thought and un-thought, but fundamentally about the temerity of the colonization of the non/un/thought within the thought. ICT attempts to understand, to domesticate the question of how big is infinite, the infinite of thought and action. If one challenges infinity, 'then it is chaos because one is in chaos'; that means that the question or questions (whatever they are) are inaccurately deterritorialized and fundamentally sedentary. The focus is to grasp that ICT implies an understanding of chaos as domestic, as public, as a *punctum* within the pure luxury of immanence. In such multitude of turfs, ICT needs to be understood as *poesis*. It plays in the plane of immanence. Being immanence is 'a life'; ICT is 'a life.' A life paced by a *poesis* or a revolution? 'Yes please,' in a full Žižekian way. ICT is a *poesis* that itinerantly throws the subject against the infinite of representation to grasp the omnitude of the real(ity) and the rational(ity), thus mastering the transcendent. Being more *poesis* than just theory (and not because it is less theory), its itinerant position *epitomizes* a transcendent nomadography, which is not transcendental.

ICT challenges book worship (Tse Tung, 2007, p. 45). In fact, ICT also encourages us to pay attention to the multiplicity of forms to read the wor(l)d. The verbalization of pain and oppression is quite visible in Africa, for example, in art forms, such as dance and painting. Dance, Marc Ella (2013) argues, in a country financially and economically moribund, is not just a way to face inequality and oppression. It is, he states, "the very best way to face discouragement" (2013, p. 26). ICT is an attempt to help us to think in another form of being. Corazza's (2002) insightful framework is crucial here as well. As she claims, and I honestly think ICT addresses her claim, the challenge is to fight against what she coins as *assentado curriculum* towards a *vagamundo curriculum*; that is "to create [or co-create] a *vagamundo curriculum* one needs to question how can one think about the inaddressable, the unthinkable, the non-thinkable of the curriculum thought, the exteriorities, the self different, the self other, the other self" (Corazza, 2002, p. 140). Corazza adds, that:

such curriculum thought is meaningless, a real vacuum, without the effective forces acting upon such thought, as well as without the effective indeterminations that forces such thought [or forms of thought] to think

otherwise, differently, through the creation of new concepts required by the real experience and not just by the possible experience, thus allowing new life experiences. [In fact] the strength of (an)other knowledge, as well as a new philosophy, will be measured by the concepts that it is capable of creating, or its capacity to renew meanings which impose a new framework on things and to *assentados* actions, shuffle their syntax, and organizing its thought in a clumsy logic. (ibid)

Corazza's (2002) sharp take equips intellectuals with the necessary extraordinary tools to understand why some African scholars, such as Axelle Kabou (2013), Jean Marc Ella (2013), and others justifiably counterargue the Western and non-Western hegemonic apparatuses with the following question: What if Africa refuses development?

The definition of development must be seen through other lenses beyond its Western monocultural conceptualization of the needed development for the Global South. *Whose* purpose does this development serve? What is the cost to those beneath its grinding wheel of so-called progress? In such a context, ICT is really a matter of human rights as well, due to its commitment to social and cognitive justice. This is a commitment that challenges dominant multicultural forms, creating the conditions for an intercultural reconstruction of human rights, towards an intercultural post-imperial human rights that respects, among other issues: (a) the right to knowledge, (b) the right to bring historical capitalism to trial in a world tribunal, (c) the right to democratic self-determination, and (d) the right to grant rights to entities incapable of bearing duties, namely nature and future generations (Sousa Santos, 2007).

ICT is a clarion call to challenge curriculum epistemicides by engaging fully in the complex struggle for social and cognitive justice. It is also a call to decolonize the 'decolonized.' This is an intergenerational matter of justice as well. However, ICT also calls out what I term as the 'sepoys of coloniality,' that is, those in the Global South who are the instruments of the Global North, repressing Southern and or non-Western Eurocentric ways of perceiving the word and the world. Süsskind (2017) states:

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. (pp. 1-2)

ICT is *seeing*, to rely on Saramago's metaphor. In one of his best novels, *Seeing*, Noble Prize-winning Portuguese intellectual Saramago describes pictorially how, with the vote, the citizens of one non-identified country (most probably Portugal) blocked the normal daily life. That is, on a typical gray, wet winter day in Portugal the huge majority of the population decides to not show up to vote until late afternoon. The narrative explains the gradual panic of politicians who do not know what to do before such democratic scandal. Suddenly, almost at the end of the day, the population shows up and votes. Shockingly, after counting the votes, officials announce that the majority of the votes were blank. Such political embarrassment is examined, and a lot of reasons come to the table, including the unpleasant weather conditions. The government schedules another election on the following week on a very pleasant sunny day. To national consternation, the results are worst: more than 80% of the votes are blank. The government reacts immediately against such outcome as if a crime has been perpetrated. A state of emergency is put in place; such a state paved the way for a state of siege, with the intelligentsia spying on citizens, taking them for interrogation and lie-detector tests. The story goes on with surreal examples narrated by Saramago.

Saramago's *Seeing* is crystal clear for all of us really committed to the struggle against epistemicides. *Seeing* goes well beyond the understanding of how to use democracy to save democracy. It is a call for a blank vote from all of us really committed with social and cognitive justice not just against the modern Western dominant and specific counter-dominant forms that colonize the very way we can think, but also against the complex matrix of circuits of cultural production so well unmasked by Ahmad (2008) as well as our own very existence in our academic settings. In claiming a *seeing* position, ICT allows us to move on toward a world that we wish to see, a world that was proposed in the Bamako Appeal:

(1) a world based on solidarity among human beings and peoples, a world based on the full and complete affirmation of citizenship and equality between the sexes, (3) a universal civilization that offers the greatest possibility for the creative development of the diversity in all area, (4) a world that constructs civilization thorough real democracy, (5) a world based on the recognition of the non-commodity status of nature, the planet's

resources and agricultural lands, (6) a world based on the recognition of the non-commodity status of cultural products, scientific knowledge, education and health, (7) a world that promotes policies that closely combine unlimited democracy, social progress, and the affirmation of the autonomy of all the nations and peoples, (8) a world that affirms the solidarity of the people of the north and the south in the construction of internationalism on an anti-imperialist foundation. (Amin, 2008, pp. 108–111).

More to the point, and as I have mentioned in *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*, ICT should please everybody; nevertheless, it will certainly not, as I was able to see in certain academic events in our field (to be honest, more in the United States). While appeals for a co-presence conversation to rub Sousa Santos's (2009) and Pinar's (2004) approaches against each other, it is not a cross-cultural conversation. We actually need to challenge the cult of cross-cultural conversations. Al-Azmeh (2009) helps a great deal here. One needs to radically question the notion of cross-cultural conversation

[n]ot because [one] wishes there to be an eternal incomprehensibility between peoples, or because I wish to promote xenophobia, and encourage ethnic cleansing and correlative acts of barbarism. It is rather because I believe that the notion of cross cultural conversations rests upon an unreflected assumption of the fixity and finality of the interlocutors in this conversation which even at the ends of serious philosophical authors tends to cause reason to denigrate to the tritest statements on common maximums of etiquette. It is the very same assumption of fixity and irreducibility underlying the etiquette of interculturalism and multiculturalism as a form of conservatism etiquette, that [one] sees so apparently paradoxical correlative of the sorts of assumptions about others—other *ethnoi*, other religious groups—that prepare the grounds, in the realms of conceptions and imagination for the entire range of possibilities extending from the rapturous fascination with the exotic at one extremity, to bellicose dehumanization of the Other and genocidal dehumanization of the Other.

By championing the commitment to a non-abyssal thinking and defying the eugenic cult of cross-culturalism, ICT put forward, along with Mignolo (2012, 2013) and Escobar (2013), among others, *un paradigma otro* that “does not fit into a linear history of paradigms or epistemes [that] runs counter to the greatest modernist narratives [and] reaches towards the possibility of non-European modes of thinking” (Escobar, 2013, p. 34). Such *paradigma otro* frames and fuels the debate about Western

modernity within the so-called modernity/coloniality research program (Escobar, 2013, p. 33) that challenges dominant perspectives in the study of modernity that could well be framed as “intra modern perspectives” (Escobar, 2013, p. 34). Euro-centered Western modernity, Escobar (2010) states, cannot be dissociated from the global–local quarrel (p. 37). That is, Euro-centered Western modernity is a particular local history that was able to “produce particular global designs in such a way that it has subalternized other local histories and their corresponding designs” (Escobar, 2013, p. 38; Mignolo, 2013).

The modernity/coloniality research project (hereafter MC) conceptualizes such colonial–coloniality momentum “grounded in a series of events [social constructions] that distinguished it from established theories of modernity” (Escobar, 2013, p. 38). That is

(1) an emphasis on locating the origins of modernity with the Conquest of America and the control of the Atlantic after 1492, rather than in the most commonly accepted landmarks such as the Enlightenment of the end of the eighteenth century; (2) a persistent attention to colonialism and the making of the capitalism world system as constitutive of modernity; (3) the adoption of a world perspective in the explanation of modernity, in lieu of a view of modernity as an intra-European phenomenon; (4) the identification of the domination of others outside the European core as a necessary dimension of modernity with the concomitant subalternization of knowledge and cultures of these other groups; (5) a conception of Eurocentrism as the knowledge form of modernity/ coloniality—a hegemonic representation and mode of knowing that claims universality for itself. (Escobar, 2013, p. 38)

Such MC frames its research agenda by emphasizing notions such as

(a) modern colonial world system—as an assemble of processes and social formations that encompass modern colonialism and colonial modernities; (b) Coloniality of power—a global hegemonic model of power in place since the conquest that articulates race and labor and peoples according to the needs of capital and to the benefit of white peoples; (c) colonial difference and global coloniality—which refer to the knowledge and cultural dimensions of the subalternization processes effected by the coloniality of power; the colonial difference brings to the fore persistent cultural differences within global power structures; (d) coloniality of being—as an ontological dimension of coloniality on both sides of the encounter; (e) Eurocentrism—as the

knowledge model that represents the local European historical experience and which became globally hegemonic since the seventeenth century. (Escobar, 2013, p. 39)

ICT needs to be seen in such framework as well. It is sentient of MC, yet it is not exhausted by it. Its itinerant perpetual dynamic creates that incapacity of surrender to a concrete framework. However, ICT attempts to complexify MC. For instance, it does not necessarily “run counter the greatest modernist narratives” (Escobar, 2013, p. 34). It definitely runs against dominant modernist great narratives and through some counterdominant modernist great narratives, such as Marxism, for example, and, in so doing, decolonizes it. However, even in the attempt to smash certain dominant Western modernist great narratives, ICT pays cautious attention between the wrangle of religion, that is, Christianity, and spirituality and how such yarn was/is crucial in the construction of the (non)existence of the ‘other’ (see Marc Ela, 2013). In such sense, ICT is a theory of liberation, liberation from certain constrains of critical pedagogy as well without denying it. Critical pedagogy exhibits particular pedagogical forms as part of an ongoing individual and collective struggle over knowledge, desire, values, social relations, and modes of political agency [that is] critical pedagogy is central in drawing the attention to questions regarding who has control over the conditions for the production of knowledge, values and classroom practices; [critical pedagogy] is a form of provocation and challenge [attempting] to take people beyond the world they are familiar with and makes clear how classroom knowledge is always implicated in power (Giroux, 2011, pp. 5–6).

More to the point, ICT sees such ‘collective struggle over knowledge’ as a struggle that today needs to go well beyond the Western epistemological platform. We all stand respectfully on the shoulders of others, and Giroux’ (2011) helps a great deal. That is, by insightfully framing critical theory and pedagogy as a language of critique and of hope and possibility, that is, a critical pedagogy “that addresses the democratic potential of engaging how experience, knowledge and power are shaped in the classroom in different and often unequal contexts” (Giroux, 2011, p. 5), he built a foundational field that one can explore in the struggle against epistemicides. ICT is a clear call against the precariousness of any fixed ossified theoretical position.

Needless to say, this implies severe conflict, a conflict that was always part of our daily lives. To metaphorically adapt Dussel’s (1995) approach,

from Heraclitus to Henry Kissinger if by everything one understands the order or system that world dominators control, their power and armies, we are at war—a cold war for those who wage it, a hot war for those who suffer it, a peaceful coexistence for those who manufacture arms, a bloody existence for those obliged to clash and use them. (p. 1)

ICT is the people's theory, an epistemology of liberation quite sentient that there is no theoretical and/or political incompatibility between Marxist critical impulses and non-Western epistemes. For instance, if one pays close attention to Giroux's language of hope and possibility and the way that he frames critical theory and pedagogy, one does not see any incompatibility for an itinerant curriculum theorist to rub against other critical Marxist impulses and non-Western epistemes. This clearly implies decolonizing processes within the very core of critical and Marxist matrix. Is this not what Marx actually alerted us to when he claimed the need for a ruthless critique of everything that exists?

The struggle against epistemicides and curriculum epistemicides is difficult, but it needs to be engaged. That it is impossible is a fabricated fallacy. Braganca's 'walk and beyng' is a wake-up call to all of us really committed in the struggle against curriculum epistemicides. It allows one to grasp ICT as a political yarn that works within and beyond the capitalist system, or better to say, against the 'world system theory.' ICT is also a human rights issue, a challenge to the dichotomy between ethics and chaos, since it is the ethic of the [needed] chaos. ICT praises the consistency of inconsistencies and fosters a reckless philosophy of praxis above and beyond the wrangle of 'being-non-being'; it is a eulogy of 'beyng.' ICT is *a la Marti*, 'an infinite labor of love', one that perceives that the act of thinking is not just theoretical. ICT works in a never-ending matrix that was determined and continues to be determined by sensations, forces, fluxes, 'happenings' all of which are linked and reacting against the modes and conditions of production of the capitalist system.

ICT is a curriculum turn. A 'pluri-versal' 'not uni-versal'. A decolonial turn. ICT needs to be seen within the cartography of a decolonial being. Mignolo is of great help here as well, arguing that the genealogy of decolonial thinking,

is pluri-versal (not uni-versal). As such, each knot on the web of this genealogy is a point of de-linking and opening that re-introduces languages, memories, economies, social organizations, and at least double subjectivities: the splendor and the miseries of the imperial

legacy, and the indelible footprint of what existed that has been converted into the colonial wound; in the degradation of humanity, in the inferiority of the pagans, the primitives, the under-developed, the non-democratic. (2011b, p. 63)

Such inquiry implies, as Deleuze and Guattari felicitously unveil, that while an itinerant theorist is not just a war machine that judiciously collides with ossified truths and fossilized realities, its itinerant existence is only possible in a permanent theater of war. Needless to say, ICT is not a cavalier way to approach history. Nor it is just a pale reaction against the way such history has been *quasi* suffocated by hegemonic and particular counterhegemonic traditions. While a concept—arguably a geophilosophical one—it goes well beyond an aesthetic wrangle between sedentary theoretical hegemonic and particular counterhegemonic platforms, and nomad(ic) approaches free from walls, dams, institutionally backward bourgeois turfs. ICT implies a nomadic inquiry, but one in which the foci occupies the truly total itinerant capacity of space(less)ness, a permanent smooth itinerant position, a perpetual search that whole heartedly aims at saturation. The nomadography of such a theory is framed in the nonstop itinerant posture in which creators of *poesis* seem to be part of the history of thought, but escape from it either in a specific aspect or altogether. ICT attempts to turn curriculum theory against itself as well. It is a philosophy of liberation, which is sentient of the pitfalls of the internationalization dynamics within the curriculum field. ICT helps understand how to situate curriculum theory into the project of modernity/colonialism/decolonization.

It is no longer possible to carry on with and in the same epistemological framework. ICT champions such a posture. Relying on Habermas, Mignolo argues that:

[i]t is no longer possible, or at least it is not unproblematic, to ‘think’ from the canon of Western philosophy, even when part of the canon is critical of modernity. To do so means to reproduce the blind epistemic ethnocentrism that makes difficult, if not impossible any political philosophy of inclusion. The limit of Western philosophy is the border where the colonial difference emerges, making visible the variety of local histories that Western thought, from Right and Left, hid and suppressed. (2008, p. 234)

(An)other science is not just really possible— It is real. ICT is a claim for a just theory, a claim for a just science. It is possible for an itinerant curriculum theory—

which we argue is the best path for critical progressive curriculum scholars—not only to grasp precious concepts and dynamics, such as hegemony, ideology, power, social emancipation, class, race, and gender in the complex age of globalization (Sousa Santos, 2008) or globalisms, but also to better (re)address the towering questions of curriculum, starting with the one asked by Counts in the last century: *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* While poverty and inequality keep multiplying, the question remains central. However, it is crucial to ‘re-work’, to ‘re-tune’, to ‘re-think’, to ‘re-contextualize’ and to ‘re-centralize’ in a decolonial way such question. That is, the centrality of such question needs to reflect the world’s epistemological diversity. There is no such thing as ‘new social order’ by ignoring other epistemological formations beyond the Western Modern path.

The devastating impact of neoliberal policies forces the intemporality of certain challenges. As such, ICT challenges the critical curriculum river to go beyond its counter-dominant and dominant within the counter-dominant positions, thus tu(r)ning the struggle for curriculum relevance into a struggle for social and cognitive justice. In examining Chomsky’s (1971) approach, while transforming society is crucial, it is no less important to accurately understand it.

The core of ICT is the fact that it ferociously challenges any attempt of a bunker theory-practice, or a bunker praxis. In examining the complex conundrum of the Portuguese identity, the great Mozambican born philosopher José Gil argues that identity matters are not detached from the cruelty of a “one and only one-dimensional way” (2009, p. 38). That is, the cult of ‘the one best theory-practice’ “is intimately connected with all the commonsensical commonsense lack of evidence of so-called credible alternatives, that ‘cocoonizes’ the subject in invisible and visible bunkers” (ibid). In a way, to upgrade Gil’s (2009) arguments, a palpable ‘selficide’ is systematically produced by blocking ‘truth’ from itself and from the very own self, a self that can only exist ‘in inner violence.’ The new managerial teacher education, so well examined in the approaches of Price (2017), Moreira (2017), and Janson and Silva (2017), implies entrepreneurial teachers opening the door for a kind of intellectual anti-intellectualism (Paraskeva, 2013), the very core of neoliberal pedagogies (Paraskeva & Macrine, 2015). Within such a new managerial mood, teaching has been stripped of being perceived as a class phenomenon. Price (2017) argues how ICT alerts and challenges a critical point: *especially ignored are class relations*. In Price’s (2017) words,

this is a powerful, and to my estimation largely undertheorized or unacknowledged blemish on our work, that we eclipse the inherent

contradiction(s) of professionalism whereby teachers in accepting the grand bargain, go on to lose their autonomy. This ignore(ance) of the grand bargain (feigned, I believe) accounts for the rise of a decidedly atheoretical, professional class of educationalists, not social meliorists per se.' (p. 4)

ICT is an 'anti-bunker approach' (cf. Gil, 2009), one that promises a better perception and respect for epistemological diversity. ICT breaks the 'Self Unum,' unified and omnipresent, that blocks the possibility of perpetually creating an 'exterior' (ibid). Price (2017) states that ICT,

provides insight into the affairs of teacher education, providing the tools to unpack the meanings behind the official, white paper reports regarding the imagined new teacher, or neoliberal teacher. To consider another teacher is to engage in this type of deterritorialized inquiry, and this work represents an exercise that is well past due and entirely consequential to the relationship between curriculum theorizing and teacher education. (p. 10)

I am certainly not claiming that ICT is a perfect theory as I claim that there is no such thing as a perfect theory (see Quantz, 2011). Obviously, there is room for critique, for instance the clashes within the post-structural positions could be expanded. The ecological domain should not be so silent. ICT questions linguistic imperialism as portrayed by English and other Western imperial languages. It also challenges the way science has been defined and legitimized based on the cultural politics of academic writing, which are not only social formulas but also legitimize 'the modern epistemicidium' and are thus real obstacles to social and cognitive justice. ICT also challenges the internationalization momentum, as well as in whose language this epoch is occurring. ICT is alert to the fact that the very struggle to internationalize the field of curriculum studies is a relatively recent phenomenon for the United States' academic milieu.

ICT aims precisely to be 'a general epistemology of the impossibility of a general epistemology.' That is an itinerant posture that is profoundly engaged in the commitment of a radical co-presence, which, as Sússekind (2017), argues, "refines the drowsiness and mold that eroded certain gains accomplished by critical curriculum theorists" (p. 18). It is non-abyssal since it not only challenges the Modern Western cult of abyssal thinking, but also attempts to dilute such fictional

vacuums between lines. In such a context, ICT is also an act of resistance at the metaphysical level. That is, the struggle against Modern Western abyssal thinking is not a policy matter. It is also above and beyond that. It is an existential and spiritual question. That is, the struggle against the Western Cartesian model cannot signify the replacement of the Cartesian model with another one. Also, the task is not to dominate such a model or to wrap it within a more humanistic impulse. The task is to pronounce its last words, to prepare its remains for a respectful funeral. Nor is the task to change the language and concepts, although that is crucial. The task is to terminate a particular hegemonic geography of knowledge that promotes an epistemological euthanasia.

ICT denounces how the internationalization has been, in so many ways, the new apparatus through which Modern Western epistemologies have been expanding the very process and significance of 'what it is to think.' It has exposed even more the open wounds created by "the archives of Western knowledge and the question of cultural domination exercised by countries of advanced capital over imperialized countries" (Ahmad, 2008, p. 2). ICT is undeniably a call for a new never stable gathering epistemological point. While it is so evident that the struggle against the epistemicide is a human rights issue, it also clear that such a struggle cannot be fought with old weapons (Latour, 2005). ICT is about 'curriculum from the South in the Global South and curriculum from the South in the Global North' and its connections with the different metamorphoses of coloniality, thus unpacking the Western, Eurocentric, Anglo-Saxon epistemological fascism subsumed on the real colors of policy and reform matters, as well as daily life within classrooms. It intends to help establish a multifarious corpus of scholarship that will open the curriculum canon to foster social and cognitive justice, moving within an itinerant theory toward a non-abyssal curriculum, quite crucial in our collective commitment in the struggle against the epistemicide. The need to understand that the battle for social justice is also a cognitive justice matter is not minimized in Oliveira's (2017) approach. As she states, "in modern society cognitive injustice constitutes one of the powerful arguments in the production of social injustice" (p. 9). This implies a collective struggle, and

it becomes necessary to move back to the modern construction of cognitive injustice by promoting the ecology of knowledges, building one prudent knowledge, standing up politically and epistemologically in the struggle for a decent life, since we assume that cognitive justice is crucial to the construction of social justice. Only through the notion

of cognitive justice does it become possible to question the epistemicidal exclusions promulgated in the Global North's hegemonic scientific traditions, and through this questioning, epistemological discrimination and prejudices underlying social injustices become intelligible as eugenic, genocidal, and annihilating forms. (Ibid)

ICT helps us to better rethink our collective responsibilities in the struggles against epistemicides, against social and cognitive justice. In this, concomitantly, an itinerant posture is against any anti-non-theory cult and against any canon. ICT understands that the yoke of the Western canon has been wrapped within an anti-theory dangerous commonsense that pervades the field. Such a collective struggle cannot be romanticized though.

ICT attempts to address overt frustrations that erupted in the clashes between the dehumanized byzantine forces that have colonized the field, but also – and this is crucial – against some specific counterhegemonic platforms, that despite so many accomplishments, ended up being inadequate to interrupt 'the epistemicide.' This battle as I stated before created a vacuum, a vacuum that some of us – Pinar, Grumet, Miller, Ellsworth – ferociously and tenaciously have been fighting. While such battle and its outcomes are crucial for us to move towards an Itinerant Theory, it is also true that the challenges are Herculean as it created an involution.

### **Addressing the 'Curriculum Involution'**

One of the critical issues addressed and challenged by ICT and examined by the contributors of this volume is how the epistemicide, the curriculum epistemicide, has been produced and, in a way, legitimized by both hegemonic and specific counter-hegemonic traditions. Oliveira's (2017) approach grabs and grasps this wrangle. She states:

Both hegemonic and counterhegemonic curriculum theory and work are historically ingrained in epistemicides. Through a lethal cult of the uniqueness and infallibility of a positivist scientificity promulgated by functionalistic, hegemonic pedagogical movements, as well as the incapability of specific counterhegemonic traditions to wipe out hegemonic perspectives and avoid falling into a sort of functionalist nightmare, curriculum has historically advanced epistemicides. These epistemicides are visible not only in the kind of knowledge that has been taught, the way it has been taught, and the way it has been evaluated, but epistemicides are also

intimately connected with the metamorphoses involving educational and curriculum policy and reform, teacher education, and accreditation. Contrastingly, in advancing an epistemologically diverse cosmovision, Santos and Paraskeva—from different terrains—challenged the eugenic nature of social apparatuses—such as schools, curriculum, teacher education, and reform—that legitimized the epistemicides. (pp. 6-7)

Not just despite such pugnacious disputes, but precisely because of the act of denouncing and challenging such curriculum epistemicide and its sources, Oliveira (2017) advances how ICT praises certain previous critical and counterhegemonic arguments and pushes critical and post-critical paths into a different and important new level.

I argue here that such ‘trans-millenary’ clashes between dominant and specific counter-dominant traditions and within each of these traditions constitute what I would call, drawing from Gil (2009), ‘curriculum involution.’ Let me be more precise.

The eugenic struggles for the U.S. curriculum always were the battles between, on one side, the so-called non-monolithic dominant groups that throughout the centuries (end of the 19<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup>, and beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century) fought for a curriculum archeology (Kliebard, 1995; Doll, 1993; Schubert, 1980; Watkins, 2001) that perpetuated and legitimized a specific Modern Western Eurocentric eugenic epistemology based on a racial scientificity of science and society (the yoke of the white, blond, blue eyed, heterosexual male and Christian if needed) and, on the other side, the so-called non-monolithic counter-dominant groups that also throughout the centuries fought tenaciously to smash the dominant tradition and establish a more progressive non-eugenic, non-racial educational and curriculum culture (the very seed of the preparation on the new human being). Needless to say that the lines of such wrangles are often a blur and not so dichotomic. However, while the former openly championed the epistemicide, the latter ended up being incapable of interrupting such epistemicide and, in many ways, ended up helping the scientific and social perpetuation of such anathema. Moreover, in many ways, specific counter dominant traditions were actually crucial enzymes of the epistemicide as well. As I stated in other contexts (Paraskeva, 2011; 2014; 2016a; 2016b) in criticizing the functionalism of the dominant traditions, counter-dominant traditions became as functionalist as the functionalism they criticized. For example, advocates of the counter-dominant traditions saw the production of the ‘new man’

(i.e. 'new human being') within an alternative path, yet within the Western Modern Eurocentric platform, not beyond.

In such sometimes ruthless struggles, neither the dominant nor the counter-dominant traditions were able to claim full victory; thus we keep experiencing an increasing void between, on one hand, the absence of the consolidation of the a fully racialized curriculum—we do have countless examples of counter-dominant victories—and, on the other hand, the full absence of the emergence of the new human being. In Gil's (2009) terms, transformation did not happen out of such battles. Paradoxically, or maybe not, there was no tragedy, Gil (2009) would argue. And the epistemicide keeps being perpetuated. Such a void basically creates a paradox between 'the old man' that did not die completely and the promise of a 'new human being' that never emerged. Neither the old social order remained safe, nor the new social order emerged. To be more precise, neither the 'old human being' died, nor the 'creation' of the new human being was fully accomplished. Both dominant and counter-dominant traditions were working within the coloniality frameworks of being, power, knowledge, and labor. Süssekind (2017) alerts us to how ICT challenges "both hegemonic and specific counterhegemonic curriculum traditions that ended up contributing to an abyssality" (p. 9), an abyssal line that "pervades curriculum commonsense, prescribes acceptable and non-acceptable ways of existing and thinking in the 'to-do curriculum' of results, and devises a eugenic panopticon that helps to establish the hegemonic logic of capital" (ibid). All the promises 'on both' sides were aborted. Needless to say, I am not marginalizing here so many crucial gains that were achieved by the counterhegemonic struggles. The battles led and won by the feminist movement, the Civil Rights movement, the LGBTQ movements, and African Americans, to mention a few, cannot be minimized and should be praised and protected. However, in many ways counter-dominant movements were unable to fully destroy the dominant tradition and impose not just an alternative curriculum platform, but a non-abyssal curriculum that respect non-Western Eurocentric epistemological frameworks. Again, according to Gil (2009), these battles represented no 'real' tragedy as they were stripped of their tragic dimension. Instead a curriculum involution occurred (Gil, 2009), a kind of no(all) - human beings space and time that, in too many ways, points into a 'regression.' That is, these great accomplishments of the past and present are not just at risk of stagnation but of nullification. And, in such eugenic regression process, shockingly, one witnesses our time as a time of alarming decays and social sagas that we had thought have been completely eliminated (The Trumphemonon is just one example – there are many others – of an epoch, an epoch paced by the reinforce of an

eugenic praxis that paves the way to 'say the unsayable'). ICT denounces and challenges such a 'curriculum involution,' arguing that any attempt to claim the wor(l)d from a privileged and fixed territorialized position will sink us and legitimize such involution momentum.

Our task as curriculum scholars is to engage in an Itinerant Curriculum theoretical approach, which is "post-abyssal, thus non-abyssal, non-territorial, fully itinerant" (Süssekind, 2017, p. 1) and that can therefore help us to decolonize.

To be continued.

## References

- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ahmad, A. (2008). *In theory*. London: Verso.
- Al-Azmeh, A. (2009). *Islams and modernities*. New York: Verso.
- Amin, S. (2008). The Bamako appeal. In S. Amin, *The world we wish to see: Revolutionary objectives in twenty first century* (pp. 107–112). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Appelbaum, P. (2013). Report on the fourth world curriculum studies conference, organized by IAACS (International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 2-5, July, 2012. IAAACS. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 9(1), 1-12.
- Auge, M. (2003). *Não-lugares: Introdução a uma antropologia da supermodernidade*. Campinas: Papirus Editora.
- Bernal, M. (1987). *Black Athena: The afroasiatic roots of classical civilization. Volume 1. The fabrication of ancient Greece 17785 – 1985*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1971). *Problems of knowledge and freedom*. New York: The New Press.
- Corazza, S. M. (2002). Noologia do currículo: Vagamundo, o problemático, e assentado, o resolvido. *Educação e Realidade*, 27 (2), 131 – 142.
- Darder, A. (2012). *Culture and power in the classrooms. Educational foundations for the schooling of bicultural studies*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Deleuze, G. (1990a). *The logic of sense*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1990b). *Pourparlers*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit
- DeLeuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations 1972 – 1990*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus. Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Doll, W. (1993). *A postmodern perspective on curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dussel, E. (1995). *Philosophy of liberation*. Oregon: Wipf & Stock.
- Eco, U. (1984). *Proscript to the name of the rose*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Ela, J. M. (2013). *Restituir a historia as sociedades africanas*. Lisboa: Edicoes Pedago.
- Ellsworth. E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy, *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297–324.

- Escobar, A. (2013). Worlds and knowledges otherwise. In W. Mignolo and A. Escobar (eds) *Globalization and the decolonial turn* (pp. 33-64). New York: Routledge.
- Galeano, E. (1997). *Open veins of Latin America. Five centuries of pillage of a continent*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Gil, J. (2009). *Identidade*. Lisboa: Relógio D'Água.
- Giroux, H. (2011). *Zombie politics in the age of casino capitalism*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Gough, N. (2000). Locating curriculum studies in the global village. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32(2), 329–42.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2010). Epistemic Islamophobia: Colonial social sciences. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, 8(2), 29 -39.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2007). The epistemic decolonial turn: Beyond political economy paradigms. *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3), 211–223.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing post-colonial studies and paradigms of political economy: Transmodernity, decolonial thinking, and global coloniality. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(1), 1-38.
- Ibarra-Colado, E. (2007). Organization studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America: Thinking otherness from the margins. *Worlds and Knowledges Otherwise*, Fall, 1–24.
- 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.
- Jin, H. (2008). *The writer as migrant*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jupp, J. C. & Espinosa-Dulanto, M. (2017). Beyond US-centered multicultural foundations on race. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 19(2), 20-43.
- Khalifa, J. (1999). Introduction. In J. Khalifa (ed) *An introduction to the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze*. (pp. 1-6) London: Continuum.
- Kabou, A. (2013). *E se a Africa se recusar ao desenvolvimento?* Lisboa: Edicoes Pedagogo.
- Kliebard, H. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893–1958*. New York: Routledge.
- Liston, D. (1988). *Capitalist schools. Explanation and ethics in radical studies of schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (2012). *The communist manifesto*. New York: Verso.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1973). *The prose of the world*. Evanston: Northwestern.
- Mignolo, W. (2008). The geopolitics of knowledge and colonial difference. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101(1), 57 – 96.

- Mignolo, W. (2012). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges and border thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2013). Introduction. Coloniality of power and decolonial thinking. In W. Mignolo and A. Escobar (eds) *Globalization and the decolonial turn* (pp. 1-21) New York: Routledge.
- 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.
- Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- O'Brien, M. and Penna, S. (1999) *Theorizing welfare*. London: Sage.
- Oliveira, I. B. (2017). 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: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. New York: Palgrave.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2013). School rituals as a counterhegemonic performance. *Policy futures in education*. 11(4), 484 – 493.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2014). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies* (2<sup>nd</sup>). New York: Palgrave.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2016a). *Curriculum epistemicides*. New York: Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2016b). The curriculum: Whose internationalization? In J. Paraskeva (ed) *Curriculum: Whose internationalization*. (pp. 1-11) New York: Peter Lang.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2016c). *The curriculum: Whose internationalization?* New York: 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. & Moreira, M. (2011). *Curriculum studies in times of globalization: Whose internationalization?* (Call for Papers) American Association For The Advancement Of Curriculum Studies annual meeting in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, Tuesday, April 10 - Friday, April 13, 2012
- Paraskeva, J. & Moreira, M. (2012). *Counter-western curriculum theory: Displacement, transference, or action?* (Call for Papers) American Association For The Advancement Of Curriculum Studies Annual Meeting, S. Francisco, April 24 – 27, 2013.

- Paraskeva, J. M. & Macrine, S. (2015). Neoliberal pedagogy of debt. In M. Peters, J. M. Paraskeva & T. Besley (Eds.), *Global financial crisis and education restructuring* (pp. 209-234). New York: Peter Lang.
- Paraskeva, J. (2016c). *The curriculum: Whose internationalization?* New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2000). Introduction: Toward the internationalization of curriculum studies. In D. Trueitt, W. Doll Jr, H. Wang and W. Pinar (Eds.), *The internationalization of curriculum studies* (pp. 1-13). New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2012, April). Closing key note address. *American Association For The Advancement Of Curriculum Studies*. Annual Meeting in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
- Pinar, W. F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* New Jersey: Lawrence and Earlbaum Associates.
- Pinar, W. F. (2013). *Curriculum studies in the United States*. New York: Palgrave.
- Pinar, W. F.; Reynolds, W.; Slattery, P.; & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Popkewitz, T. (2001). A changing terrain of knowledge and power: A social epistemology of educational research. In R. G. McNinnis (Ed.), *Discourse synthesis. Studies in historical and contemporary social epistemology* (pp. 241-266) Westport: Praeger.
- 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.
- Quantz, R. (2011). *Rituals and student identity in education: Ritual critique for a new pedagogy*. New York: Palgrave.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, eurocentrism and Latin America. *Neplanta, Views from the South*, 1(3), pp. 533 – 580.
- Reynolds, W. (2003). *Curriculum. The river runs through it*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Said, E. (2005). Reconsiderando a teoria itinerante. In M. Sanches (orga) *Deslocalizar a Europa. Antropologia, arte, literatura e história na pós-colonialidade* (pp. 25-42). Lisboa: Cotovia.
- Schubert, W. (1980). *Curriculum books: The first eighty years*. Landham: University Press of America.
- Seth, S. (2011). Travelling theory: Western knowledge and its Indian object. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 21(4), 263–82.
- Sousa Santos, B. (2003). Prefácio. In Boaventura de Sousa Santos (org.) *De- mocratizar a democracia – Os caminhos da democracia participativa* (pp. 25-33). Porto: Edições Afrontamento.

- Sousa Santos, B. (2006). *The rise of the left the world social forum and beyond*. London: Verso.
- Sousa Santos, B. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking. From global lines to ecologies of knowledges, *Review*, 30(1), 45 – 89.
- Sousa Santos, B. (2009). *Epistemologias do Sul*. Coimbra: Almedina.
- Sousa Santos, B. (2014). *Epistemologies from the South*. Boulder: Paradigm.
- Süssekind, M. L. (2014). Why a deterritorialized curriculum theory? *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.
- Trueit, D. (2000). Democracy and conversation. In D. Trueit, W. Doll Jr, H. Wang and W.Pinar (eds) *The internationalization of curriculum studies*. (pp. xi-xvii) New York: Peter Lang.
- Tse Tung, M. (2007). Oppose book worship. In S. Žižek. *Slavoj Žižek presents Mao on practice and contradiction* (pp. 43-51). London: Verso.
- Walsh, C. (2012). ‘Other’ knowledges, ‘other’ critiques: Reflections on the politics and practices of philosophy and decoloniality in the other America. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(3), 11–27.
- Watkins, W. (2001). *The white architects of black education*. New York: Teachers College Press.