

Can an Itinerant Curriculum Theory Travel?

Sardar M. Anwaruddin¹
University of Toronto, Canada

Introduction

Initiatives to internationalize the field of curriculum studies are relatively recent. Before proceeding to a discussion of curriculum studies as an international field, I should clarify that “there has long been a well established field of international and comparative education, but curriculum studies is customarily contained within national and local boundaries in the form of educational practices that are embedded in local and national histories and cultures” (Carson, 2009, p. 145). Curriculum inquiry has traditionally occurred within national borders and has been shaped by the national policies and priorities. Moreover, efforts to understand curriculum inquiry from an international perspective have been influenced by the curricular methods and concepts available in economically and technologically dominant nations.

Only the previous decade has witnessed a growing movement toward a true internationalization of curriculum studies. Among the earliest attempts to internationalize the field was the Oslo meeting under the leadership of Professor Bjorg Gudem. This meeting called for a conversation between European and North American traditions of curriculum inquiry. William Pinar (2003) believes that “if there develops someday a worldwide field of curriculum studies, it can be said to have been conceived in Oslo in August 1995” (p. 3). The next breakthrough meeting to internationalize the field took place in 2000 at the Louisiana State University (LSU). In his presidential address to the attendees of this meeting, Pinar (2003) emphasized that the internationalization project “need[ed] to be constructed from the ground up” and the participants of the LSU Conference were “on the ground floor” (p. 3). In this conference of scholars from all continents and twenty seven countries, Pinar proposed a worldwide field of curriculum studies, which was not supposed to simply mirror the North American traditions of curriculum inquiry.

Pinar also made clear that the goal of this project was not to look “for new ‘markets’ for American conceptual products” (p. 5). Rather, he warned everybody of the “unbelievable narcissism of American curriculum studies” (p. 4). While defining the character of this internationalization project, Noel Gough (2003) succinctly describes what it means to contest this narcissism:

Internationalizing curriculum inquiry might best be understood as a process of creating transnational ‘spaces’ in which scholars from different localities collaborate in reframing and decentering their own knowledge traditions and negotiate trust in each other’s contributions to their collective work. For those of us who work in Western knowledge traditions, a first step must be to represent and perform our distinctive approaches to curriculum inquiry in ways that authentically demonstrate their localness. This may include drawing attention to the



TO CITE THIS ARTICLE PLEASE INCLUDE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING DETAILS:

Anwaruddin, Sardar. (2013). Can an Itinerant Curriculum Theory Travel? *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* 10 (1). <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci> <access date>

characteristic ways in which Western genres of academic textual production invite readers to interpret local knowledge as universal discourse. (p. 68)

Thus, at the heart of this project is to build *transnational* and *transcultural* solidarities which “requires a rethinking of the ways in which we perform and represent curriculum inquiry, so that curriculum work within a global knowledge economy does not merely assimilate national (local) curriculum discourses-practices into an imperial (global) archive” (Gough, 2004, p. 1).

Since the LSU Conference and the establishment of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (IAACS) in 2000, many scholars (see, for example, Huber, 2010) have taken up the idea of internationalizing curriculum inquiry. In his recent book, Paraskeva (2011) looks at the field of curriculum studies from a historical perspective. He uses the metaphor of a river to offer an understanding of how the field has evolved and how different theorists fought to control the flow of this river. Referring to the current tensions in the field, Paraskeva proposes an itinerant curriculum theory to fight against epistemicide. He emphasizes that curriculum theorists shift their focus and “deterritorialize their approaches and assume a critical itinerant position” (p. 3). This is necessary because he believes that the knowledges of Western male scholars have dominated the field and that any other knowledges have been silenced or marginalized.

Paraskeva’s argument is grounded to a large extent in Boaventura de Sousa Santos’s (2008) claim that there will be no global social justice without global cognitive justice. Santos (2008) brings together social scientists from Latin America, Africa, and Asia to show how another world of knowledge exists beyond the Northern epistemic boundaries. One of Santos’s key purposes is to respond to different forms of oppression stemming from the coloniality of knowledge and power. He focuses attention on how colonial epistemic monoculture affects our understanding of such concepts as modernity and development. Santos, Nunes, and Meneses (2008) present nine theses in order to contribute to the opening of a different cannon of knowledge. Among them, the following thesis is particularly relevant to this article as well as to Paraskeva’s notion of an itinerant curriculum theory: “The decolonization of science is based on the idea that *there is no global social justice without global cognitive justice*. The logic of the monoculture of scientific knowledge and rigor must be confronted with the identification of other knowledges and criteria of rigor that operate credibly in other social practices regarded as subaltern” (p. xlix, emphasis added).

History is filled with accounts of how hegemonic forms of knowledge are produced, distributed, and consumed. The domination of Northern epistemologies has remained ascendant with the rapid spread of the notion of “modernization” and the recent technological and economic globalization. A question that critical scholars, e.g., Apple (1990) and Giroux (1991) often ask is: Whose knowledge is being globalized? They argue that forms of knowledge that do not fit in the Western traditions are generally suppressed and ignored. Scholars such as Bennett (2007) call it epistemicide, in which “other” knowledges are skillfully rendered invisible or swallowed up. Santos (2004) argues that the knowledges that do not exist are also produced, but they are produced as *non-existent*. In order to resist the hegemony of the Northern epistemologies, these scholars demand for *epistemological diversity* and *cognitive pluralism*. Along this line, Paraskeva (2011) makes a strong argument for such diversity and pluralism and recommends that we “assume consciously that (an)other knowledge is possible,” and that we “go beyond the Western



epistemological platform, paying attention to other forms of knowledge and respecting indigenous knowledge within and beyond the Western space” (p. 152).

An Itinerant Curriculum Theory

Paraskeva (2011) argues for democratization of knowledges as a way of achieving social justice and cultural relevance in the curriculum. He proposes an itinerant curriculum theory to describe the struggle for this democratic and socially just curriculum. In the first 172 pages of his book *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*, Paraskeva presents an extensive review of the history and development of curriculum studies as a field. It is only the final 16 pages of the book where he describes his proposed itinerant theory. Although it is not my primary purpose in this article to thoroughly critique Paraskeva’s itinerant curriculum theory, I briefly focus on some issues that arise from his proposal.

In this paragraph, I deliberately use many quotations from Paraskeva to capture the essence of his argument. Borrowing from Deleuze and Guattari’s (1988) conception of deterritorialization, he emphasizes that “in essence, curriculum theory should give voice to an engineering of differences by deterritorializing itself and looking for new ways of thinking and feeling about education” (p. 174). He presents his theory as “a commitment to fight for a different research platform” (p. 176). Quoting Edward Said, he says that the purpose of his curriculum theory “is to travel, to go beyond the limits, to move, and stay in a kind of permanent exile” (p. 177). Then he moves on to a discussion of epistemology and argues that “Western epistemological views need to pay attention and learn from other non-Western epistemological views in and beyond the West” (p. 179). Then he brings in Linda Smith (1999) and talks about decolonization of methodological frameworks. Without digging much deeper into Smith’s arguments, he presents Boaventura de Sousa Santos and contends that his itinerant curriculum theory “challenges modern/post modern western thinking, which is abyssal thinking in which the knowledge of the Other is produced as non-existent” (p. 185). Paraskeva also believes that as “deliberate disrespect of the canon” (p. 184), his itinerant curriculum theory should celebrate differences by deterritorializing itself. In the final paragraph of his book, he claims that his itinerant curriculum theory “is the best path for critical progressive curriculum scholars” (p. 188).

This snapshot view of Paraskeva’s itinerant curriculum theory raises a number of concerns, some of which I briefly describe below. First, Deleuze and Guattari’s inspiration is obvious from Paraskeva’s reference to the concept of deterritorialization. Deleuze and Guattari (1988) use the metaphor of a rhizome as a theoretical lens to describe concepts such as deterritorialization and multiplicity. A rhizome is a plant stem, often underground, that is capable of producing new plants. It “allows the parent plant to propagate vegetatively (asexually) and also enables a plant to perennate (survive an annual unfavorable season) underground” (Rhizome, 2012, para. 1). If a rhizome is broken into pieces, each piece may produce a new plant. The metaphor of a rhizome becomes meaningful for us because it “spreads from horizontal, bulbous underground shoots and flourishes in *unforeseen* and *unpredictable* directions” (Hagood, 2009, p. 39, emphasis added).

For Deleuze and Guattari (1988), each rhizome contains lines of territorialisation as well as lines of deterritorialization. However, “there is a rupture in the rhizome whenever segmentary lines explode into a line of flight, but the line of flight is part of the rhizome” (p. 9). The rhizome is characteristically different from trees and their roots because it



“connects any point to any other point,” and therefore, it “is reducible neither to the One nor the multiple” (p. 21). It is not possible to understand the rhizome in terms of units or specific points or positions. It does not have binary relations between any two points. It “is made only of lines: lines of segmentarity and stratification as its dimensions, and the line of flight or deterritorialization as the maximum dimension after which the multiplicity undergoes metamorphosis, changes in nature” (p. 21). Because the rhizome is only *directions in motion*, which are irreducible, and its lines are always tied to one another, Deleuze and Guattari do not want to “posit a dualism or a dichotomy, even in the rudimentary form of the good and the bad” (p. 9). Though Paraskeva acknowledges his inspiration from Deleuze and Guattari, he takes binary logic to present his itinerant curriculum theory, which portrays West as the oppressor and non-West as the oppressed. His unwarranted and dichotomous claims—such as modern Western thinking is abyssal and Western knowledge system makes non-Western knowledge invisible—are incongruent with Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of deterritorialization and multiplicity.

This dichotomy leads to the second concern, i.e., an essentialist position that the proposed itinerant theory suggests. For Deleuze and Guattari, multiplicities are rhizomatic. Unlike a tree or a root, a rhizome does not have any points or positions; it only has lines. These lines are not reducible to any One or many. In this sense, Deleuze and Guattari are resolutely anti-essentialist, but Paraskeva’s emphasis on binary logic runs counter to their thought. In fact, the concept of rhizome has been used in post-colonial studies “to contest the binary, centre/margin view of reality that is maintained by colonial discourse. The key value of the term is to demonstrate that the repressive structures of imperial power themselves operate rhizomically rather than monolithically” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2000, p. 207). Since power does not always operate in a simple vertical way, it is problematic to create essentialist political and cultural categories. Colonial discourse theorists such as Said (1979) and Bhabha (1994) argue that these categories are fundamentally flawed because they constantly diffuse and intersect within the rhizomic networks of imperialism. Additionally, in the concluding paragraph of his book, Paraskeva claims that his itinerant curriculum theory “is the best path for critical progressive curriculum scholars” not only to understand concepts such as hegemony, power and ideology but also to address broader questions about schooling, curriculum, and social order (p. 188). By self-claiming the “best” position for his proposed theory, Paraskeva follows a binary logic of dichotomy which is far away from Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of multiplicity.

The third concern that arises from Paraskeva’s proposal is his choice of the term “itinerant.” He does not provide an explanation of why he chose to call his theory “itinerant.” Nonetheless, the use of this term implies that the journey of his curriculum theory is predictable and unidirectional—from West to non-West. This unidirectional journey/movement contradicts with Deleuze and Guattari’s (1988) theory of deterritorialization. The concept of nomad is of particular importance here, and it occupies an important place in Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophy. It is a powerful tool for understanding concepts such as state apparatus, smooth space, war machine, art, and religion. However, for our purpose here, i.e., to understand the notion of deterritorialization, let’s contrast the nomad with the migrant. Although migrants go from one place to another and their destinations may be uncertain, their trajectory is different from that of nomads. The nomadic trajectory “does not fulfill the function of the sedentary road,” rather, “*it distributes people (or animals) in an open space, one that is indefinite and*



non communicating” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988, p. 380, original emphasis). Both the nomad and the migrant move, but Deleuze and Guattari believe that there are qualitative differences between their movements. The migrant reterritorializes after moving to a new place. For this, Deleuze and Guattari believe that only “the nomad can be called the Deterritorialized par excellence...because there is no reterritorialization *afterward* as with the migrant” (p. 381, original emphasis). In this sense, when Paraskeva recommends that curriculum theory travel and “stay in a kind of permanent exile” (p. 177), he reinforces the unidirectional movement of the migrant. Therefore, from the perspectives of Deleuze and Guattari, the term “nomadic” seems to be a better choice than “itinerant” to signify the multiplicity of a curriculum theory inspired by the concept of deterritorialization.

In summary, the three concerns—a binary logic of domination, an essentialist categorization of West and non-West, and a unidirectional movement of his theory—obscure our understanding of an itinerant curriculum theory which, according to Paraskeva, is supposed to facilitate global cognitive justice and the internationalization of curriculum studies. Although “Deleuze and Guattari’s geophilosophy is particularly helpful in thinking about the unavoidable concept of difference (within and between nations/regions/cultures) and the opportunities and dilemmas for curriculum scholars that difference produces” (Gough, 2007, p. 284), Paraskeva’s interpretation and application of Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of deterritorialization does not enable us to sufficiently understand how his proposed theory will be helpful for curriculum scholars.

In spite of Paraskeva’s references to many scholars, including Deleuze and Guattari, I believe that his arguments are based primarily on the works of Santos (2004; 2008), who argues strongly for global cognitive justice. Paraskeva urges that the curriculum workers fight against the coloniality of knowledge and thus prevent epistemicide by embracing the cognitive pluralism and epistemological diversity of the world. Building on Santos’s arguments, he believes that an itinerant theory “will challenge one of the fundamental characteristic[s] of abyssal thinking: the impossibility of co-presence of the two sides of the line; it will challenge the cultural politics of denial, that produces a radical absence, the absence of humanity, the modern sub-humanity” (p. 188). Again, in light of a rhizomic understanding of (neo)colonialism, hegemony—cultural, economic, or epistemic—operates through blurry, sometimes invisible, networks in which each line has many sides and intersecting points, not just two.

Though I find Paraskeva’s binary logic problematic, I accept his call for freeing the curriculum from the Western epistemological boundary. I also add that curriculum needs to be free from all epistemological boundaries, not just from the Western boundary. We need to be mindful “of the dangers of simply reversing the categories of oppressed and oppressor” and “of the dangers of creating a new indigenous elite who would act merely as neo-colonial puppets” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2000, p. 78). Therefore, we need to abolish all boundaries and resist any forms of epistemological domination if we want to create transnational spaces in which scholars from different geographic locations may collaboratively engage in curriculum inquiry (Gough, 2004). These transnational spaces may play an important role “to initiate a vigorous debate/dialogue among scholars of all races” and thus to fight against epistemological racism (Scheurich & Young, 1997, p. 11).

I believe that the concept of deterritorialization—which is not adequately fleshed out in Paraskeva’s proposal for an itinerant curriculum theory—is crucial to global cognitive justice and the internationalization of curriculum studies. However, I argue that we need to ask: what are the challenges that an itinerant curriculum theory based on the



concept of deterritorialization is likely to face? Paraskeva does not tell us the challenges and obstacles that his theory will have to overcome. While I accept Paraskeva's call for deterritorializing curriculum theory, I am afraid that his proposal for an itinerant curriculum theory may remain an unattainable goal if it fails to overcome the challenges of English linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992, 2009), geopolitics of academic writing (Canagarajah, 2002), and academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Simply put, my argument is that an itinerant curriculum theory—or any similar proposal for internationalizing the field—has to challenge and overcome these three obstacles; otherwise, the vision of a worldwide field of curriculum studies may remain unfulfilled.

Linguistic Imperialism

I argue that the first obstacle for an itinerant curriculum theory is English linguistic imperialism. Since the early days of British colonialism, the English language has played crucial roles in creating a class of natives who collaborate with the colonizers. For example, English education in British India was intended “to form a class who may be interpreters between us [colonizers] and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect” (Macaulay, 1995, p. 430). In the present neo-colonial time, the English language is being used as a tool of colonizing the minds of those who do not speak English as a mother tongue. Phillipson's (1992) thesis of linguistic imperialism helps us understand how “the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages” (p. 47). In this argument, “structural” refers to material properties such as institutions and financial allocations, and “cultural” means immaterial and ideological properties, e.g., pedagogic principles and beliefs. For Phillipson (1992), linguistic imperialism is “a distinct type of imperialism,” and it “permeates all the types of imperialism” for two main reasons: the first is concerned with form and the second with content (p. 53).

An interesting example of how English is used as an imperial language is Robinson Crusoe's teaching of it to Man Friday. In most colonized territories, English was considered a language for success, and “was regarded as a force for the ‘modernizing’ of the country” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 110). Nowadays, many countries place heavy emphasis on teaching and learning of English as a means to “modernization” and “development.” Neo-imperial organizations such as the British Council seize this opportunity to teach English and make huge economic profits. We see such exploitive attitudes in the British Council's commonly used slogans, e.g., English for Success and Bridge to Success (British Council, 2012).

In this age of economic globalization, English is being used as a hegemonic language that serves the interests of most Western corporations and the U.S.-led neo-empire. Although many people around the world switch between two or more languages, this multilingualism is rarely observed in this neo-empire and its international affairs—political, business, or academic. Thus, “where multilingualism characterizes the bottom of the world's societies, monolingualism seems to be the rule at the top” (van Dijk, 1997, p. 292). States around the world are imposing the English language not only on international business and politics, but also on internal affairs. This elimination of linguistic diversity and imposition of monolingualism have been described as *linguicide* which, for instance, was evident in “the internal colonization of the British Isles, with the attempted extermination of Welsh and Gaelic, and in North America and Hawai' at the expense of First Nations languages” (Phillipson, 2009, p. 149).



Some scholars take a rather naïve approach to English as a *lingua franca*, which generally refers to a common language used as a tool of communication between groups who do not share a common mother tongue. However, Phillipson (2009) argues that *lingua franca*, as a culturally neutral term, is misleading and false. In many societies, English is used as a language of social inclusion and exclusion, and for formation of elite status. Thus, the linguistic imperialism of English entails unequal rights of communication between diverse groups who speak different languages. The hegemonic status of English tries to legitimize such exploitation and social injustice. Even more crucial than the fact that English is being used as a hegemonic language is the question of why people choose to use English (Pennycook, 2001). What are the factors that affect people's choice? In this sense, linguistic diversity is not an isolated matter; it is an integral part of fundamental human rights. According to UNESCO (2013), "it is estimated that, if nothing is done, half of 6000 plus languages spoken today will disappear by the end of this century. With the disappearance of unwritten and undocumented languages, humanity would lose not only a cultural wealth but also important ancestral knowledge embedded, in particular, in indigenous languages" (para. 1). If this estimate is correct, then we are losing one language in every 11 days. This is alarming!

In the countries where English is the language of the dominant group, other languages are constantly under pressure. In places where English is not the language of the dominant group, the neo-imperial countries and corporations are pushing for more use of English. Inter-governmental organizations, e.g., the World Bank, also prioritize teaching and learning of English in the countries where it is not widely used. Today, English is being used for different purposes in different contexts. Phillipson (2009) discusses various purposes of using English. Some examples include English as a *lingua economica*, as a *lingua academica*, as a *lingua emotive*, as a *lingua cultura*, as a *lingua bellica*, and as a *lingua divina*. English as a *lingua academica* is of particular relevance to the purpose of this article. It refers to the use of English in scholarly publications, at international academic conferences, and as a medium of teaching and learning at educational institutions. This transnational use of English as a *lingua academica* feeds into what Altbach (1995) describes as educational neocolonialism.

Thus, Phillipson's (1992; 2009) thesis of linguistic imperialism is a major barrier to Paraskeva's itinerant curriculum theory. Drawing on Macedo (2000), Paraskeva touches briefly on the hegemony of the English language and how it devalues the knowledges of those who speak other languages. For this, he stresses the need to initiate conversations of curriculum in languages other than English. However, I believe that conversations have been occurring in other languages, but they are not being adequately heard by the English-speaking curriculum scholars in the global North. The ability to speak does not guarantee equality; the act of speaking becomes meaningful only when the speaker is seriously listened to. As Spivak (1990) succinctly puts:

For me, the question 'Who should speak?' is less crucial than 'Who will listen?' 'I will speak for myself as a Third World person' is an important position for political mobilization today. But the real demand is that, when I speak from that position, I should be listened to seriously; not with that kind of benevolent imperialism, really, which simply says that because I happen to be an Indian or whatever...A hundred years ago it was impossible for me to speak, for the precise



reason that makes it only too possible for me to speak in certain circles now. (pp. 59-60)

Therefore, it is important that the English-speaking scholars listen to the curriculum conversations taking place in other languages. We need to keep in mind that ability to use the English language is not only a matter of international communication, but it is also related to the colonial legacy of cultural and racial discriminations. For many people around the world, an inability to speak and write in English has become a scholarly burden (van Dijk, 1997). Because of English linguistic imperialism and its role as an inclusion/exclusion mechanism, I am afraid that the deterritorialization of curriculum theory proposed by Paraskeva will be very difficult, especially if the curriculum scholars writing in languages other than English are excluded from the curriculum conversations.

Geopolitics of Academic Writing

I argue that the second obstacle for Paraskeva's itinerant curriculum theory is what Canagarajah (2002) calls geopolitics of academic writing. The written medium has tremendous power to transmit information to the global audience. Those who have resources and ability to control the written medium get the advantages of generating and disseminating knowledge. The abilities of the dominant groups in this respect include not only printing presses but also cost-effective technologies and global networks of marketing and distribution. Canagarajah (2002) contends that these advantages have enabled most Western communities to disseminate their knowledge and information and, at the same time, to appropriate the knowledges of other communities. Canagarajah's (2002) central argument consists of the following components:

Academic writing holds a central place in the process of constructing, disseminating, and legitimizing knowledge; however, for discursive and material reasons, Third World scholars experience exclusion from academic publishing and communication; therefore the knowledge of Third World communities is marginalized or appropriated by the West, while the knowledge of Western communities is legitimated and reproduced; and as part of this process, academic writing/publishing plays a role in the material and ideological hegemony of the West. (p. 6)

Due to this geopolitics of academic writing, it will be very difficult for the critical curriculum river (Paraskeva, 2011) to travel beyond the Western epistemic harbor.

In addition to the linguistic barrier for scholars who speak languages other than English, a lack of resources in the global south make it harder for them to undertake research projects and publish their academic writings. For example, if we analyze the global expenditures in research, we see that the United States has invested more than any other country in research. As Lillis and Curry (2010) report, "in 2005 the US share of global research expenditures was approximately 35%" (p. 11). Thus, geographic locations of scholars and the language they speak greatly influence their ability to publish research findings and to contribute to the theorization in the field. Unfortunately, scholars from all communities do not get equal rights to participate in this theorization. For many years, "research publications remain highly concentrated in a few countries, with more than 80%



of world scientific articles coming from the OECD area, nearly two-thirds of them G8 countries” (Lillis & Curry, 2010, p. 11).

Let’s take the field of curriculum studies as an example. As Paraskeva (2011) has discussed, scholars from the United States have heavily dominated the field. Recently, we have noticed some efforts to internationalize the field, for example, in the initiatives of organizations such as the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. However, despite some gains in the internationalization project, “there is also strong evidence that the field remains steadily ensconced in the work of scholars located primarily in academic institutions in the United States, Canada, Britain, and, to a lesser extent, Australia. This is perhaps most evident in the work being published in leading curriculum journals” (Gaztambide-Fernández & Thiessen, 2012, p. 1). In this way, many Western English-speaking scholars are controlling the projects of knowledge creation and distribution by publishing their academic writings and also by grounding their inquiries in the works of other Western scholars.

This politics of academic text production is central to Santos’s (2008) notion of global cognitive justice. Leaving out the vast majority of scholars who use languages other than English makes it impossible to achieve global cognitive justice. English linguistic imperialism discussed above has close connections with this politics of academic text production. For example, drawing on the data available on Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory in 2009, Lillis and Curry (2010) show that 67% of the academic periodicals were published using some or all English. Furthermore, there is an issue of prestige and academic rigor attached to the journals published in English. Even though ISI indexes claim to be international, they are extremely biased toward journals published in English in Anglophone geographic contexts. Most journals that are not published in English are excluded from various international indexes, and this exclusion means that the journals published in English enjoy higher impact factors (IFs). For this reason, many people *arguably* consider English as the language of knowledge and research. The Institute of Science Index (2013) states on its website that “English is the universal language of science at this time in history. It is for this reason that we focus on journals that publish full text in English” (para. 8).

This status of English in academic text production means that scholars around the world are always under pressure to write and publish their findings in English. This phenomenon puts the Anglophone scholars in a privileged position, but many of them often seem to be unaware of their position and privileges (Lillis & Curry, 2010). Hence, the geopolitics of academic writing is central to an understanding of whose knowledge is being globalized. As Canagarajah (2012) believes:

The knowledge of minority, remote, and under-resourced communities is marginalized or appropriated by the more developed communities. Also the knowledge of wealthy communities is legitimated as established knowledge and spread to other communities. Implicated in this process, academic writing/publishing plays a significant role in the material and ideological hegemony of certain privileged communities. (para. 4)

We need to address this politics of academic writing and publishing if we want to have a successful itinerant curriculum theory. If the critical curriculum river travels beyond the Western harbor and carries only the knowledges of Western English-speakers in its



current, then we will not be able to achieve the global cognitive justice that Santos (2008) advocates for.

Generating one-sided knowledge is not only unethical, but also impoverishing for all of us. Citing several examples, Canagarajah (2002) shows how the “periphery” scholars face great difficulty in publishing their writings in the “center” journals. In addition to the scholars’ identity, the geographical locations in which they live are also vital. As an example, he cites Kailasapathy who, immediately after finishing his doctoral research at Birmingham, published his work on classical Tamil poetry with the Oxford University Press. However, after returning to Sri Lanka he was not able to publish his works with Western publishers. In the meantime, his scholarship on classical Tamil poetry was overshadowed by some Western scholars who undertook research years after he had done so. Canagarajah believes that a lack of resources is the key factor for why “periphery” scholars are unable to compete with the “center” scholars in terms of academic publishing. Physical and financial resources as well as infrastructure for publishing and marketing journals and books are more readily available to “center” scholars than to the “periphery” ones. Thus, Canagarajah’s argument of geopolitics of academic writing provides insights for us to understand how knowledge is generated and disseminated at the global level. This geopolitics is a potential barrier for an itinerant curriculum theory (Paraskeva, 2011) and consequently for the internationalization of curriculum studies (Gough, 2003).

Academic Capitalism

The third major obstacle for an itinerant curriculum theory is academic capitalism. In last couple of decades, much discussion has been centered on the marketization of higher education (e.g., Lynch, 2006). Opinions regarding this issue are polarized. The pro-market group argues that universities are part of a competitive market; therefore, they must effectively showcase and sell their products for their own survival. Financial gains and reputation of universities are dependent on how effectively they market their products—packages of knowledge as human capital—in a worldwide competitive marketplace. There is another group of scholars, educators, and students who believe that marketization devalues education, commodifies knowledge, and treats students as customers. Members of this camp are also “concerned about the university as a social institution” and argue that “marketization is corrupting the university as an embodiment of public goods” (Barnett, 2011, p. 39). Due to this marketization, money values control and dictate university-centered intellectual activities (Inglis, 2004), and what is often ignored is the value of higher education as a public good (Nixon, 2011). Nevertheless, the proponents of market-model of education contend that the market is the best “means of social coordination whereby the supply and demand for a good or service are balanced through the price mechanism” (Brown, 2011, p. 11).

While much discussion is focused on the marketing of degree programs and maximizing profits from student tuition and other fees, little has been said about marketing and selling research findings. I argue that marketing of research findings has far-reaching impacts on the global scholarly community in terms of global cognitive and epistemological justice. In addition to English linguistic imperialism and geopolitics of academic writing, the West’s ability to sell research findings in the global market provides the Western scholars with a monopoly of producing and distributing knowledge. As a consequence, the knowledges of the economically-weak communities are often marginalized or ignored. Therefore, I argue that Paraskeva’s itinerant curriculum theory



will be successful if the non-West can resist what Slaughter and Leslie (1997) call academic capitalism.

Although we can approach academic capitalism from the *human capital* perspective, for the purpose of this article, I look at academic capitalism through the lens of *marketlike* and *market* behaviors. According to Slaughter and Leslie (1997):

Marketlike behaviors refer to institutional and faculty competition for moneys, whether these are from external grants and contracts, endowment funds, university-industry partnerships, institutional investment in professors' spinoff companies, or student tuition and fees. What makes these activities marketlike is that they involve competition from funds from external resource providers...*Market behaviors* refer to for-profit activity on the part of institutions, activity such as patenting and subsequent royalty and licensing agreements, spinoff companies, arm's-length corporations, and university-industry partnerships, when these have a profit component. (p. 11)

I argue that through this academic capitalism, universities and other research institutes not only make money by selling research findings, but they also export their self-acclaimed scholastic superiority. A rising academic capitalism is evident in the policies of higher education in most Western countries. Scholars use various words/phrases to describe the changes that are taking place in the institutions of higher education. Some terms that are currently being used include the commercialization of higher education, the corporate university, the marketization of higher education, the entrepreneurial university, and the like. At the heart of these changes is "the shift from earlier knowledge regimes to an academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime" (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2008, p. 20). Under this new regime, universities and research institutes are competing with each other to enter the global marketplace to sell their research knowledge.

One of the tenets of this academic capitalism, I argue, is the commodification of research. Radder (2010) defines commodification in two ways: "In a narrow sense commodification is identified with commercialization, that is, the pursuit of profit by academic institutions through selling the expertise of their researchers and the results of their inquiries" (p. 4). In a broader sense, it refers to the economization of all human activities. From this perspective, "academic commodification means that all kinds of scientific activities and their results are predominantly interpreted and assessed on the basis of economic criteria" (p. 4). In the light of this definition, it seems that the Western universities have been very successful in selling their research findings and thus maximizing their economic profits.

While economic profit-making is on the very surface of this enterprise, I contend that there are multiple layers of benefits associated with this marketization. By distributing thousands of academic texts across the world, the English-speaking West assumes the role of the producer of "authentic" and "objective" knowledge. Many non-English speaking local communities cannot but accept the scholastic superiority of the West. In this way, the market for the Western knowledge is constantly expanding. The West is reaping economic benefits and, at the same time, creating an inferiority complex in the psyche of many non-Western consumers of Western knowledge. The non-West is remaining dependent on the West for "reliable and authentic" knowledge. Thus, the West maintains an unequal relationship with rest of the world by means of its already established networks of



economic, social, and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1985). For example, there is a great demand of “native-speaker” teachers of English all over the world. Organizations such as the British Council provide these teachers with necessary connections (social capital) to teach English, which creates opportunities for earning money (economic capital) and for spreading Western cultures and epistemologies (cultural capital). Moreover, while travelling abroad, the Western teachers can use their own language (linguistic capital) and do not have to learn other languages. This hierarchical relationship of giver and taker of knowledge severely harms the epistemological diversity of the world. For these reasons, the Western academic capitalism is a major obstacle for an itinerant curriculum theory.

Concluding Thoughts

Paraskeva (2011) claims that “non-Western scholars know a lot more, in some cases in precise detail, about what has been called Western epistemology than those in the West know, or care to know, about non-Western epistemologies” (p. 186). If true, this claim has profound consequences for curriculum studies because the non-Western scholars—by knowing less about their own epistemologies—remain dependent on the West. This situation resonates with Alatas (2006) thesis of academic dependency, and may be understood from his discussion of problems that are plaguing the Asian social sciences. Alatas (2006) maintains that most theories and concepts that dominate the Asian social sciences “originated from a Greco-Roman, Latin-Christian and European tradition” (p. 15). This fact in itself is not a problem, but he argues that it becomes problematic as “the concepts are passed off as universal when in fact they derive their characteristics from a particular cultural tradition” (p. 15). Similarly, many current practices of curriculum inquiry invite the global audiences to interpret Western knowledges as universal discourses (Gough, 2003). This epistemological problem dates back to the beginning of colonialism since when the West has ignored, silenced, or appropriated the knowledges of other communities. In this way, the West has been able to establish and maintain its role as “giver” of knowledges. In the field of curriculum studies, this relationship of domination is evident in the fact that the Western curricular artifacts and practices are being imported, institutionalized, and reproduced in most parts of the non-Western world.

Being concerned about this epistemic hegemony of the English-speaking West, Paraskeva (2011) proposes his itinerant curriculum theory which, he believes, will be a respectable way to tackle the crisis of epistemic violence. However, I would like to add that we also need to critically examine why the Non-West consumes and reproduces the Western curricular practices. Is it only the West that deserves all the blames? Or, are there any other factors that feed into the global cognitive injustice? If we look at these questions from the perspectives of Deleuze and Guattari (1988), we see that Paraskeva’s theory suggests a binary position when it blames the West and idealizes the non-Western epistemologies by claiming that curriculum theory will be free from domination once it crosses the Western epistemic boundary. Contrary to Deleuze and Guattari’s notion of multiplicity, the proposed itinerant theory conceptualizes deterritorialization as a unidirectional movement. Thus, Paraskeva’s delineation of his itinerant curriculum theory does not fully capture the idea of deterritorialization that makes a strong case for us to understand and respond to any form of hegemony in curriculum studies. Deterritorialization of curriculum inquiry is of paramount importance to the internationalization of curriculum studies, which appears to be impossible if a monoculture of knowledge continues. Many scholars have discussed how a monoculture of knowledge is being promoted and how other



knowledges that do not fit this monoculture are being silenced or swallowed up. Santos (2004) calls it a sociology of absences, and Bennett (2007) describes it as epistemicide. Similarly, many feminist and post-colonial scholars have protested against this monoculture of knowledge production and distribution (Robertson, 2006). Yet, the field of curriculum studies seems to have made little progress toward deterritorialization (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988) as a way of achieving global cognitive and epistemological justice.

In conclusion, although Paraskeva's formulation and presentation of an itinerant curriculum theory suffers from conceptual and methodological confusions, the core of his argument, i.e., deterritorialization of curriculum inquiry, is a timely contribution to the debate of and struggle for freeing curriculum studies from Western domination. However, it should be noted that a true rhizomic deterritorialization of the field requires freedom from all forms of hegemony and relations of domination—not just the Western domination. A simple and essentialist category of West and non-West may blur our understanding of hegemony that operates in hazy, often invisible, networks of relationships based on power, control, and self-interest. In short, Deleuze and Guattari's conception of deterritorialization may be a very powerful and inspiring methodological tool for those who work for the internationalization of curriculum studies. Yet, as I argued in this article, deterritorialization as a means of fighting against epistemicide might remain an unattainable goal if we fail to address the issues of English linguistic imperialism, geopolitics of academic writing, and the Western academic capitalism. I also believe that these three are the main obstacles for Paraskeva's itinerant curriculum theory, or any other similar proposals. While I welcome Paraskeva's call for an itinerant curriculum theory, I want to put a cautionary note that without overcoming these three obstacles, this theory may not be able to contribute much to what Pinar (2003) envisioned as a worldwide field of curriculum studies.

Notes

¹ s.anwaruddin@mail.utoronto.ca

References

- Alatas, S. F. (2006). *Alternative discourses in Asian social science: Responses to Eurocentricism*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Altbach, P. G. (1995). Education and Neocolonialism. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 452-456). New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2000). *Post-colonial studies: The key concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Barnett, R. (2011). The marketised university: Defending the indefensible. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion, & E. Nixon (Eds.), *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 39 - 51). New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, K. (2007). Epistemicide! The tale of a predatory discourse. *The Translator*, 13(2), 151-169.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.



- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- British Council. (2012). Retrieved April 16, 2012 from <http://www.britishcouncil.org/hungary-teaching-centre-for-success.htm>
- Brown, R. (2011). The march of the market. In M. Molesworth, R. Scullion, & E. Nixon (Eds.), *The marketisation of higher education and the student as consumer* (pp. 11-24). New York: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2012). Personal webpage. Retrieved April 14, 2012 from <http://www.personal.psu.edu/asc16/mission.htm>
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Carson, T. R. (2009). Internationalizing curriculum: Globalization and the worldliness of curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39(1), 145-158.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1988). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. (B. Massumi, Trans.). London: The Athlone Press. (Original work published 1980).
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R., & Thiessen, D. (2012). Fomenting flows and internationalizing curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 42(1), 1-11.
- Giroux, H. A. (1991). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.
- Gough, N. (2003). Thinking globally in environmental education: Implications for internationalizing curriculum inquiry. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 53-72). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gough, N. (2004). Editorial: A vision for transnational curriculum inquiry. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Gough, N. (2007). Changing planes: rhizosemiotic play in transnational curriculum inquiry. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 26(3), 279-294.
- Hagood, M. C. (2009). Mapping a rhizome of 21st century language arts: Travel plans for research and practice. *Language Arts*, 87(1), 39-48.
- Huber, T. (Ed.). (2010). *Storied inquiries in international landscapes: An anthology of educational research*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Inglis, F. (2004). Education and the good society. In F. Inglis (Ed.), *Education and the good society* (pp. 23-41). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Institute of Science Index. (2013). Evaluation process. Retrieved May 15, 2013 from <http://www.isi-thonsomreuters.org/au.php>
- Lynch, K. (2006). Neo-liberalism and marketisation: the implications for higher education. *European Educational Research Journal*, 5(1), 1-17.
- Macaulay, T. (1995). Minute on Indian Education. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 428-430). New York: Routledge.
- Macedo, D. (2000). The colonialism of the English only movement. *Educational Researcher*, 29(3), 15-24.
- Nixon, J. (2011). *Higher education and the public good: Imagining the university*. London: Continuum.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.



- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. F. (2003). Toward the internationalization of curriculum studies. In D. Trueit, W. E. Doll, H. Wang, & W. F. Pinar (Eds.), *The internationalization of curriculum studies: Selected proceedings from the LSU Conference 2000* (pp. 1-13). New York: Peter Lang.
- Radder, H. (2010). The commodification of academic research. In H. Radder (Ed.), *The commodification of academic research: Science and the modern university* (pp. 123). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Rhizome. (2012). In *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/501483/rhizome>
- Robertson, S. L. (2006). Absences and imaginings: The production of knowledge on globalization and education. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 303-318.
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Santos, B. S. (2004). *The world social forum: A user's manual*. Retrieved April 15, 2012 from http://www.ces.uc.pt/bss/documentos/fsm_eng.pdf
- Santos, B. S. (Ed.). (2008). *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond northern epistemologies*. London: Verso.
- Santos, B. S., Nunes, J. A., & Meneses, M. P. (2008). Introduction: Opening up the canon of knowledge and recognition of difference. In B. S. Santos (Ed.), *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond northern epistemologies* (pp. xix-lxii). London: Verso.
- Scheurich, J. J. & Young, M. D. (1997). Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher*, 26(4), 4-16.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2008). The academic capitalist knowledge/learning regime. In A. S. Chan & D. Fisher (Eds.), *The exchange university: Corporatization of academic culture* (pp. 19-48). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues*. S. Harasym (Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- UNESCO. (2013). Endangered languages. Retrieved May 15, 2013 from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/endangered-languages/>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Editorial: The imperialism of English. *Discourse and Society*, 8(3), 291-292.

Submitted: May, 16th, 2013

Approved: June, 15th, 2013

