"Brutti, Sporchi & Cattivi": Towards a Non-Abyssal Curriculum*

*João M. Paraskeva**

Abstract

The Western Cartesian Modernity model as an hegemonic model with its arrogant claim to address global social issues is not just moribund, it is dead. This article claims the twentieth century as 'the last Eurocentric century'. Relying on the work of some key decolonial thinkers, such as Sousa Santos, the article denounces the way Western eugenic curriculum of modernity created an abyssal thinking in which 'this side' of the line is legitimate and 'the other side' has been produced as 'non-existent'. In so doing curriculum as we knowing is part of the 'epistemicide'. The article argues for an Itinerant Curriculum Theory that will help create new avenues to understand the field in the light of the classes within and beyond Eurocentrism, paying attention to other epistemologies beyond the Western framework. The article echoes Ettore Scola metaphor "Brutti, Sporchi & Cattivi" to challenge how hegemonic and specific (or so called) counter hegemonic curriculum platforms – so connected with Western Eurocentric Modernity - have been able to colonize the field without any prudency to "fabricate" and impose a classed, raced and gendered philosophy of praxis, as unique, that drives the field to an ideological surrealism and collective suicide. The article challenges curriculum studies to assume a non-abyssal position one that respects epistemological diversity. This requires an Itinerant Curriculum Theory, which is a commitment with da ruthless epistemological critique of every existing epistemology.

Key-words: Itinerant Curriculum Theory; Curriculum Epistemicide; Eurocentrism

"Feios, Sujos e Malvados"
Rumo a um currículo não-abissal

Feos, sucios y malos
Hacia un currículo no abisal

Resumo

O modelo cartesiano da Modernidade Ocidental, como um modelo hegemônico, com a sua arrogância de que consegue tratar as questões sociais globais não está apenas moribundo, mas sim está morto. Este artigo defende o século XX como 'o último século Eurocêntrico'. Apoiado no pensamento e obra de intelectuais decoloniais, como por exemplo Sousa Santos, o artigo denuncia a forma como o currículo eugénico Ocidental da Modernidade criou e legitimou um pensamento abissal, no qual 'este lado da linha é legítimo' e o outro lado 'foi produzido como inexistente'. Ao fazê-lo, o currículo tem de ser estudado como parte do 'epistemicídio'. O artigo defende uma Teoria Curricular Itinerante que vai ajudar a criar novos caminhos para entender o campo à luz dos desafios que emergem dentro e fora do Eurocentrismo, prestando atenção a outras epistemologias para além do quadro Ocidental. O artigo faz ainda eco da metáfora de Ettore Scola "Feios, Sujos e Malvados" desafiando assim como determinadas plataformas curriculares contra hegemônicas – que se encontram tão associadas com a Modernidade Eurocêntrica Ocidental - foram capazes de colonizar o campo sem qualquer prudência 'fabricando' e impondo uma filosofia da práxis classista, racista e genderista, como única, impulsionando o campo para um surrealismo ideológico e suicídio coletivo. O artigo desafia os estudos curriculares a assumirem uma posição curricular não-abissal que respeite a diversidade epistemológica. Isto requer uma Teoria Curricular Itinerante, que impõe um compromisso com a crítica epistemológica cruel a toda a epistemologia existente.

Palavras-chave: Teoria Curricular Itinerante; epistemicídio curricular; eurocentrismo

Resumen

El modelo cartesiano de la modernidad occidental, como un modelo hegemónico, con su arrogancia de que puede manejar los problemas sociales globales, no sólo se está muriendo, pero está muerto. En este artículo se defiende el siglo XX como 'el último siglo eurocéntrico'. Apoyado en el pensamiento y la obra de intelectuales descoloniales, como Sousa Santos, el artículo expone cómo el currículo eugenésico occidental de la modernidad creó y legitimó un pensamiento abisal, donde 'este lado de la línea es legítimo' y el otro lado 'fue producido como inexistente'. De este modo, el currículo tiene que ser estudiado como parte del 'epistemicídio'. El artículo defiende una Teoría Curricular Itinerante que ayudará a crear nuevas formas de entender el campo a la luz de los desafíos que surgen dentro y fuera del eurocentrismo, prestando atención a otra epistemología más allá del contexto occidental. El artículo aún refleja la metáfora de Ettore Scola "feos, sucios y malos" desafiando así como determinadas plataformas curriculares contra hegemónicas - asociadas con la modernidad occidental eurocéntrica - fueron capaces de colonizar el campo sin ninguna prudencia, 'fabricando' la imposición de una filosofía de la praxis clasista, racista y genderista, como única, propulsando el campo a un surrealismo ideológico y suicidio colectivo. El artículo desafía a los estudios curriculares para tomar una posición curricular no abisal que respete la diversidad epistemológica. Esto requiere una Teoría Curricular Itinerante, que requiere un compromiso con la crítica epistemológica cruel a toda la epistemología existente.

Palabras clave: Teoría Curricular Itinerante; epistemicídio curricular; eurocentrismo.

Let's go comrades,
the European game is definitely finished,
it is necessary to find something else.
(FANON, 1963)

An Introit

The Schwab-Huebner dialogism would be an interesting option to grasp the current state of modernity and pointing to new directions. That is, within the current context Schwab (1978) would probably say, "the field of [modernity] is moribund. It is unable by its present methods and principles, to continue to work and contribute significantly to the advancement of [society in general and] education [in particular]. It requires new principles, which will generate a new view of the character and variety of its problems. It requires new methods appropriate to the new budget of problems" (p. 287).

If modernity was already in a moribund state, struggling to address the major challenges in facing the predatory demands imposed and framed by the third hegemonic phase of capitalism (see ARRIGHI, 2005), with the advent of a full blast negative globalization (GIROUX, 2011) - with all its local sometimes quasi irreversible consequences (see BAUMAN, 1998) – its condition went well beyond a state of agony. To rely on the words of one of the greatest Tillichean progressive theologists, Dwayne Huebner, 'now the end is n[h]e[re]ar let us acknowledge its demise, gather at the wake, celebrate joyously what [Western Cartesian modernity model] made possible and then disperse to do our work, because we no longer members of one household" (HUEBNER, 1976, pp. 154 – 155). I guess Latour (1993) was not that wrong, and we were never modern.

Sabet (2008) claims that "modernity thus far has failed to achieve the multi-dimensional fulfilment required by human society [that is] its alluring promise of a better life has masked a dwindling concern with human self-realization through spiritual as well as material development" (p. 31). Modernity, Dussel (2013), argues, is under the gun due the impossibility of perpetual submission from the 'the others.' That is, "the exclusion and cornered into poverty [quasi termination] of African, Asian, and Latin American alterity and their indomitable will to survive" pushed modernity to an unsustainable point (DUSSEL, 2013, p. 40).

Modernist arrogance of the so-called "scientificity of science" (GIROUX, 1981), is in crisis, Munslow (1997) claims, "because of the objection that meaning is generated by socially encoded and constructed discursive practices that mediate reality so much so that they effectively close off direct access" (p. 11). That is "the metanarrative of scientific objectivity and the unfolding of progress through our grasp of the past is now under challenge" (MUNSLOW, 1997, p. 17). More to the point, the real(ity) cannot be framed only from Western modern Eurocentric dynamics of ideological production in which class, race, and gender play a key role, especially when such dynamics are framed and frame the non-capitalist modes and conditions of production of non-Western pre-colonial societies as well (see RODNEY, 1973). Modernity got lost (intentionally?) between the real(ity) and representations of the real(ity).

For all practical purposes, the Western Cartesian modernity model is a hegemonic model with its supercilious claim to address global social issues is not just moribund, it is dead. Modernity was/is a "misleading dream" (HARDING, 2008, p. 23). Modernity's final sentence was determined partially by modernity itself and its truly totalitarian cult, a cultural and economic napalm that attempted to erase all other epistemological manifestations, which paradoxically ended up being systematically reinforced and strengthened from the belligerent clashes with modernity. If colonialism is a crime against humanity, and colonialism and imperialism had no existence outside of modernity, then modernity is also not innocent in such crime against humanity. Not because it was inconsequential in avoiding/thwarting genocidal policies and practices, but precisely because it's very existence relies on its capacity to perpetuate massive genocide. History is not absolving, and it will not absolve the Western Cartesian modernity model. Great achievements in areas, such as space conquest and technologies

have been reduced to a pale inconsequentiality for the massive majority of the world's population in face of slavery, genocide, holocaust, poverty, inequality, social and cognitive apartheid, intergenerational injustice, and the temerity to change nature, among other issues. Painfully all of these sagas are at the very root of such modern societal technological advancements. To rely on Eagleton's (2003) metaphor "it seems that God was not [modern]" (p. 1). The twentieth century "was the last Eurocentric century" (THERNBORN, 2010, p. 59).

From Abyssal to Non-Abyssal Thinking

As I was able to unveil elsewhere (PARASKEVA, 2016, 2014; 2011), Boaventura Sousa Santos (2007a; 2007b) denounces Western modern thinking as "an abyssal thinking" (p. 45), consisting "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. Nonexistent means not existing in any relevant or comprehensible way of being".

In a way, Sousa Santos goes well beyond the notion of 'incomplete other' (TODOROV, 1997). That is there is no 'incomplete other' (and also 'incomplete self') since there is nothing beyond the abyssal line. Hence, "non-existence, invisibility and non-dialectical absence" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 45) of the "one side" are the roots of visibility and existence of the "[an]other side." That is the "exclusionary character of this abyss is at the core of the modern epistemological disputes between scientific and nonscientific forms of truth" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 47). Such monopoly has been able to confine the epistemological struggle within a particular framework regarding "certain kinds of objects under certain circumstances and established by certain methods" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 47). A monopoly that by producing other forms of knowledge as non-existent - since unfitted with the scientific scientificity of the Western

modern thinking (GIROUX, 2011) ruled by "reason as philosophical truth or faith as religious truth" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 47) – erases its own relativism and the relativism of "scientific" truth. In such context, not just knowledge, but the very question/answer "what is to think" is totally prostituted.

Chomsky (1971) argues that a "central problem on interpreting the world is determining how, in fact, human beings proceed to do so. It is the study of the interaction between a particular biologically given, complex system – the human mind – and the physical and social world" (p. 3). The irrefutability of such insightful claim throws the Western Cartesian model abyssal thinking to the pillory sentenced to death without a possibility for an appeal. Chomsky's sharp claim (1971) validates the impossibility of one single way through which human beings will try to grasp the world, as well as the relativism of the totalitarian impulses that have been secularly produced by the Western Cartesian modern model to produce, reproduce, and legitimate one dimensional human beings (MARCUSE, 1964) – a one dimensionality that it is based on production of the 'other dimensions as non-existent' (SOUSA SANTOS, 2014).

The intricate and different ways human beings experience the world exhibits how flimsy is the very modern hegemonic learning theory that has been coined scientific and thus official. Echoing Russell's consulate, Chomsky (1971) argues that the very study of "human psychology has been diverted into side channels by an unwillingness to pose the problem of how experience is related to knowledge and belief, a problem which of course presupposes a logicality prior to investigation of the structure of systems of knowledge and belief" (p. 47).

An abyssal framework fuels such only-one dimensionality "to the extent that effectively eliminates whatever realities are on the other side of the line" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 48). Curriculum is bloody tainted in such abyssal line. Curriculum as we know it, needs to be understood as part of the epistemicide (SOUSA SANTOS, 2014) Moreover, such radical denial of co-presence, Sousa Santos argues (2007b), "grounds the affirmation of the ra-

dical difference that, on this side of the line, separates true and false, legal and illegal. The other side of the line comprises a vast set of discarded experiences, made invisible both as agencies and as agents, and with no fixed territorial location" (p. 48). Welcome to the colonial zone, "par excellence, the realm of incomprehensible beliefs and behaviours which in no way can be considered knowledge, whether true or false. The other side of the line harbours only incomprehensible magical or idolatrous practices". (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 51)

One cannot delink the abyssal thinking from the political economy and culture of the material conditions underlying the emergence and development of capitalism. Capitalism and abyssal thinking are the two faces of the same coin; the cultural and economic politics of radical negation have been upgraded since its emergence. Such nexus imposes a pedagogy of domination and violence based on a cult of Western Eurocentric superior culture, fostering a fallacy of development that paves the way for the necessary violence as the price of development and naturally "victims are culpable for their own violent conquest and for their own victimization" (DUSSEL, 1995a, p. 66).

Needless to say, the abyssal global lines that have been framing the modern Western thinking are not static or fixed constructions. Nor do they express a monolithic movement. There are contradictory impulses within the very core of the modern Western thinking within the turfs of philosophy and religion as well as between both. Also the advent of globalization opened space for the emergence of a post-abyssal thinking produced by what Sousa Santos (2007b) calls "subaltern cosmopolitanisms" (p. 55).

Acknowledging the limitations of particular modern Western counterhegemonic impulses, Fraser (2014) requests a new critical theory that adapts to the new reality of our times by incorporating the dimensions of the social crises a crisis that was unable to interrupt as well. What Fraser (2014) is demanding is the need to run away from the functionalist temptation to focus exclusively in the logic of the system and to grasp the logic

of the social action. Every critical approach that wants to address current social problems, needs to excel economicism by being multidimensional and excel functionalism by paying attention to the structure and agency. That is, "today's crisis is multidimensional, encompassing not only economy and finance, but also ecology, society and politics" (FRASER, 2014, pp. 541-542).) Critical theory addresses the three strands fuelled by such crises: the ecological, the financialization and the social reproduction strands of the crisis (FRASER 2014, p. 542). However, as she (2014) argues, today "we lack such a critical theory". (p. 542).

Fraser's (2014) claim, I argue, is crucial and reinforces the claim to engage and move the critical path into a decolonized process. Otherwise, it is inconsequential. It needs to show the temerity to be post-abyssal. That is to be non-abyssal. Post-abyssal thinking "starts from the recognition that social exclusion in its broadest sense takes very different forms according to whether it is determined by an abyssal or by a non-abyssal line, and that as long as abyssally defined exclusion persists, no really progressive post-capitalist alternative is possible" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 65). By recognizing the abyssal thinking as a hegemonic epistemological cartel, critical thinking – to be worth of its name – needs to play a huge role in debunking such eugenicist platform. That is "without such recognition, critical thinking will remain a derivative thinking that will go on reproducing the abyssal lines, no matter how anti-abyssal it will proclaim itself" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 65). Post-abyssal thinking "is a non-derivative thinking; it involves a radical break with modern Western ways of thinking and acting [it implies] to think from the perspective of the other side of the line, precisely because the other side of the line has been the realm of the unthinkable in Western modernity" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 65).

It goes without saying that challenging post-abyssal thinking, requires "a global [collective] response by its victims" (AMIN, 2008, p. 77). Post-abyssal thinking is an alternative way thinking of alternative, an ecology of knowledges beyond the autocratic cult of 'scientific' knowledge founded on the idea that knowledge is inter-

-knowledge, (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 66). It claims a general epistemology of the impossibility of a general epistemology" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b, p. 67). It claims a radical co-presence.

Transmodernity, Boderthinking or Radical Co--Presence? Yes, Please.

With that said, Sousa Santos (2007b) post-abyssal thinking with its non-negotiable claims of "radical co--presence" and of "a general epistemology of the im-possibility of a general epistemology," establishes a powerful liturgy with decolonial platforms, such as trans-modernity (MALDONADO-TORRES, 2008a) and border thinking (TLOSTANOVA & MIGNOLO, 2012). I argue that Sousa Santos (2007b) post-abyssal thinking while rub-bing fluently against the transmodernistic claim – per-fectly tuned with some of its crucial fundaments – shows a different interface with some of the claims that frame the border thinking theorists and platform.

Transmodernity, Maldonado-Torres (2008) argues, ne-eds to be framed within the complex matrix of the de-colonial turn. The decolonial turn, can be perceived as "an expression or a particular manifestation of the skep-ticism toward Western theodicy [a]. a simultaneous response to the crisis of Europe and the condition of radicalized and colonized subjects in modernity; it po-sits the primacy of ethics as an antidote to the problems with Western conceptions of freedom, autonomy, and equality, as well as the necessity of politics to forge a world where ethical relations become the norm rather than the exception" (p. 7).

Transmodernity is the call against the bloodthirsty, modern Western model, a wholeheartedly paradoxi-cal momentum that relies simultaneously on rational emancipation and on a praxis of violence (DUSSEL, 1995a). As Maldonado-Torres (2008) argues, "while mo-dernity takes emancipation to an abstract universal or a global design, transmodernity offers the possibility of thinking commonality diversely" (p. 231). Transmoder-nity, not only validates that "neither modernity nor co-loniality (or modernity/coloniality) has entirely erased

the histories, the memories, and the epistemological and hermeneutical resources of colonized cultures or religious traditions" (MALDONADO-TORRES, 2008, p. 232) but also reaches out to crucial counter-hegemonic impulses within the very core of the modern Western thinking to transgress the abyssal global lines (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007b).

It is right here that post-abyssal thinking walks away from border thinking, not due to a negation of commonalities regarding the impact of the ruthless project of moderni-ty, but due to the refusal of border theorists to compro-mise in the importance of radical co-presence position as the need to search for a general epistemology of the impossibility of a general epistemology. While the search for a general epistemology of the impossibility of a gene-ral epistemology is a leitmotiv of border theorists, they defend that such aim could be achieved not necessarily by the radical cult of co-presence.

Mignolo (2012) examines border thinking in conjunc-tion with colonial difference to unmask the dangers of simplifying modernity and coloniality as just two sides of the same coin. The wrangle between moder-nity and coloniality – although an integral part of the capitalist matrix – stretched differently (or should we say, as LATOUR [1999] does, "happened" differently) around the globe.

Tlostanova and Mignolo (2012) defend border thinking as the epistemology of the exteriority and, as such, is the necessary condition for the decolonial projects. Contrary to Western critical paradigm, decolonial bor-der thinking "is grounded in the experiences of the colonies and subaltern empires [thus denying] episte-mic privilege of the humanities and the social sciences - the privilege of an observer that makes the rest of the world an object of observation" (p. 60). That is, border thinking is a move from the post-colonial through the de-colonial "shifting the geo and the politics of know-ledge [a] fracture of the epistemology of the zero point" (p. 60)..Border thinking is the epistemology of the futu-re, without which another world is impossible. (TLOS-TANOVA & MIGNOLO, 2012, p. 61).

It is precisely here that Sousa Santos' post-abyssal thinking complexifies border thinking and thinkers. The claim that border thinkers need to "walk away from imperial abstract universals (e.g. critical theory, semiotics of culture or nomadology for everyone on the planet) that will account for all experiences and geohistorical violence and memories" (TLOSTANOVA & MIGNOLO, 2012, p. 65) clashes frontally with the radical co-presence of the ecology of knowledges that frames post-abyssal thinking. While border thinking, "from an imperial perspective, is almost an impossibility [and] from a colonial perspective is a straightforward necessity," my argument is that the call should be to decolonize, not necessarily just the imperial abstract universals pumped by Western modernity but the very source of such universals.

Andreotti (2013) suggests a different and interesting way out of such wrangle. She (2013) acknowledges that both transmodernity and border-thinking raise some problems. For instance, on one hand, she alerts us to the fact that transmodernity could well fall in the same dangerous universalisms of modernity, imposing a single story, one grammatology; on the other hand, border-thinking by 'the cult of cleansing' could well be in a kind of reproductive position that border-thinkers so accurately challenge. To resolve such content, Andreotti (2013) put forward the concept of hospicing, that is, one needs to look, say, at modernity like a dying human being who due to the mess that created destroys its legitimacy to claim what one should do or not do.

My argument, tries to complexify such wrangle. My claim is that Western colonial modernity has been inconsequential in addressing and terminating social sagas, such as poverty, segregation, starvation, and misery not because it has a weak conceptual thesaurus, but precisely because its very existence relies on the production of those social sagas. While "economic equality is again increasing after its historical trough in the 1970's, class structure of social forces is eroding" (THERNBORN, 2010, p. 57). Needless to say, that I am not defining modernity monolithically. However, while modernity dominant traditions were actually focused on genocidal practices as a way of existence, the counter-dominant traditions – who,

I must admit, we all owe great deal – despite the dents created within the dominant platform, have run out of answers and cornered with frustrations exacerbated by dehumanized poiesis, such as Stalinism and Maoism. In a way, both dominant and counter-dominant perspectives were cornered in the same "tunnel of history" (HARDING, 1999) and due to that not immune to the functionalist bug (PARASKEVA, 2011a). While the former is the master mind of the epistemicide, the latter, while in some cases led the struggle to denounce the epistemological cleansing at the very core of the modernity capitalist project, in too many cases and occasions have done little to terminate such purging. Epistemicides is endemic to the Western modernity. More to the point, modernity is a moribund platform to challenge such epistemological cleansing. Let me pause here and recapture a comment I just made previously, when I claimed that we owe quite a bit to specific counter-dominant platforms in the struggle against epistemicides. If modernity is a tool kit to revert the epistemicide, how come we are in debt to certain counter-dominant traditions within modernity? And, it is here that I am more syntonic with Sousa Santos radical co-presence.

An Itinerant Curriculum Theory

ICT aims precisely '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. It is non-abyssal since not only challenges the modern Western cult of abyssal thinking but also attempts to dilute such fictional vacuum between lines. In such context, ICT is an act of resistance also 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 substitution of Cartesian model for another one. Also, the task is not to dominate such model or to rap with a more humanistic impulse. The task is to pronounce its last words, to prepare its remains for a respectful funeral. The task is not to change the language and concepts although that is crucial. The task is to terminate a particular hegemonic

geography of knowledge, which promotes an epistemo-logical euthanasia.

Frustrated, like so many of us, with ambiguities and gaps within the vast and complex critical and post--structural terrains – despite the countless and crucial gains–, I respectfully sought to go beyond such appro-aches and cautiously propose the need for an Itinerant Curriculum Theory (ICT) (PARASKEVA, 2014; 2011) to address the complex issues that we are all facing under the pressure of a liquid momentum (BAUMAN, 1998), which characterize the current terrestrial globalization (SLOTERDIJK, 2013).

The field immediately reacted to ICT. Such reactions came from different Western and non-Western angles and epistemological axles, through varied informal and formal academic ways. Some were quite positive. Others raised justifiable concerns in particular cases, and others not only completely misrepresented ICT but demonstra-ted by their objections precisely how important it is to challenge the epistemicide. It goes without saying that this is not an adequate space to address such reactions. But, for example, those who claim that I use ICT as an attack on Judea–Christian Western white male hege-monic epistemology – intentionally or non-intentionally – misinterpret profoundly the argument. ICT goes well beyond such notions. Other reactions, again some of them either welcoming and praising the merits of ICT or flagging understandable concerns, deserved attention, and I will probably address these concerns in the near future. Needless to mention, for so many liberals, epis-temological differences are terribly inconvenient. Hu-manized capitalism, tempered with flamboyant forms of multiculturalism are so dear to them and, in some cases, they are not even prepared to go that far. The problem is that 'that far' is not enough. As Dwayne Huebner's words (2005) remind me repeatedly, "many educators are not necessarily magnanimous individuals – neither open to diverse ways of thought, nor to significant criticism. Wel-come to the club" (p. 1).

ICT did/does try to say something to the field. It presents new terrains and theoretical situations. ICT participates in the complicated conversation (see TRUEIT, 2000; PI-NAR, 2000) - that cannot bend under the yoke of Western academicism – challenging Western curriculum episte-micides and alerting us of the need to respect and in-corporate non-Western epistemes. 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 pe-ripheral … One sign is the synoptic text composed by João M. Paraskeva. Hybridity is the order of the day. Pertinent to the dis-cussion in that even Paraskeva's determi-nation to contain in one "critical river" mul-tiple 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 "ri-ver" has gone "south" (2011, 186). That South is Latin America, where we can avoid "any kind of Eurocentrism" (2011, 186) whi-le not "romanticizing indigenous knowled-ge" (2011, 187). Addressing issues [such as hegemony, ideology, power, social eman-cipation, 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 clari-fy (maybe complexify) that 'the' South is not just Latin America. 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 (SOU-SA SANTOS, 2009, p 12). Thus, we "designate the epis-temological diversity of the world by South epistemo-logies" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2014; 2009, p. 12). In this way, ICT addresses Sousa Santos (2006, p. xi) claim about the need for a new critical theory, a new emancipatory praxis that needs to be decolonized as well. As he (2006) 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" (p. xi).

ICT attempts to create an itinerant path to face an undesirable yet unavoidable and needed black holes (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1987). ICT sees the confrontation with such holes as a re-assembled set of processes towards a creative and desirable plan of consistency only possible by respecting a perpetual itinerancy. Such 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 so many others. That is ICT reads and challenges such codes that frame each social formation and fuelled the wrangle oppressor – oppressed. This is crucial since it allows one to master the complex processes of axiomatization of specific codes within the capitalist society from slavery in the 1400's 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, 2007a, pp. xxiii – xxiv) – that have been legitimizing a monoculture of scientific knowledge that needs to be defeated and replaced by an ecology of knowledges (SOUSA SANTOS, 2014). ICT challenges the coloniality of power, being, knowledge, and labor (cf. QUIJANO, 2000; MIGNOLO, 2013; 2012; GROSFOGUEL, 2007); it 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, 2007a, p. xxvi).

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 was perhaps the case for Michelangelo and Picasso 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, 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. Similarly, 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, 2007a, xxvi). Western counter-dominant perspectives are crucial in the struggle for social and cognitive justice, yet not enough. As Sandra Corazza (2002) courageously argues, "we need to start taking seriously the task of a real theory of curriculum thought" (p. 131); that opens the Western canon of knowledge and is responsive 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, which 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" (SOUSA SANTOS, 2007a, p. xx).

As any other theoretical exercise to understand the educational world in order to transform it (PINAR, 2004), ICT certainly exhibits a latitude and longitude borderless

space 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 'camfrenglish' – "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 doing they desacralize such imperial languages (MARC ELA, 2013, p. 24). Camfrenglish, in cities such as Yaonde is the people's language.

ICT is a claim for a non-stop production of an epistemology of liberation, in the very best way promulgated by Sousa Santos, that rejects the perversity of colonial praxis of dominance based on "the ontic realization of Being" (DUSSEL, 1995b, pp. 44-45; see also DUSSEL, 2013), and works based and through a philosophy that liberates the very own liberatory philosophical posture - real philosophy of liberation that tries to "formulate a metaphysics – not an ontology demanded by revolutionary praxis and techno-design poesis against the background of peripheral social formations".. (DUSSEL, 1995b, p. 15)

That is ICT consciously aligns with the need for an epistemology of liberation that requires the liberation of the epistemology itself. ICT also warns about the need to challenge any form of indigenitude or the romanticization of the 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.

More importantly, ICT confronts and throws the subject to a permanent unstable question of 'what is 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 mastering 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 how big is infinite, the infinite of thought and action. If one challenges infinity, 'than 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 poiesis. It plays in the plane of immanence. Being immanence '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 poiesis 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 poiesis 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 Ela (2013) argues, in a country financially and economically moribund, is not just a way to face inequality and oppression. It is, he (2013) states, "the very best way to face discouragement" (p. 26). ICT is an attempt to help us to think in another form of human 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 unaddressable, the unthinkable, the non-thinkable of the curriculum thought, the exteriorities, the self different, the self other, the other self" (CORAZZA, 2002, p. 140). 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 and 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, 2007a; 2007b).

ICT is a clarion call to challenge curriculum epistemicides by engaging fully in the complex struggle for social and cognitive justice. This is an intergenerational matter of justice, as well. ICT is seeing to rely on Saramago's metaphor. 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 towards a world that we wish to see, a humane world that was proposed in the Bamako Appeal, . (AMIN, 2008, pp. 108 – 111). More to the point, and, as I have mentioned in Conflicts in Curriculum Theory: Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies, ICT is not to please everybody. It will certainly not, as I was able to see in certain academic events in our field (to be honest more in the U.S.). While appeals for a co-presence conversation to rub Sousa Santos (2014) and Pinar (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, p. 29) helps a great deal here. One needs to radically question the notion of cross cultural conversation "not 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". 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), 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 paradigm 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). Eurocentered Western modernity, Escobar (2010) cannot be dissociated from the quarrel global-local (p. 37). That is, Eurocentered 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 eighteen 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 thorough some counter-dominant modernist great narratives, such as Marxism, for example in

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 religion, i.e. 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. A liberation from certain constrains of critical pedagogy as well without denying it. More to the point, ICT sees such 'collective struggle over knowledge' is a struggle that today needs to go well beyond the Western epistemological platform. We all stand respectfully in the shoulders of others, and Giroux (2011) helps a great deal. He insightfully frames critical theory and pedagogy as a language of critique and of hope and possibility in which critical pedagogy "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 precariously of any fixed ossified theoretical position. 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 de-colonizing processes within the very core of critical and Marxist matrix. Isn't this what Marx (1978) actually alerted us to when he claimed the need for a ruthless critique of everything that exists?

Final Notes: The Scola's Crux

The state of curriculum field cannot be detached from the complex phase facing the Western Eurocentric epistemological hegemonic platform. To a point that, as Harvey (2015) would suggest, the very mechanisms put forward to address 'a' crisis are in itself the promoters of 'such' crisis. In one of my dialogues with Noam Chomsky last Fall 2014, he told me that "if people from other pla-

nets would look to planet earth, they would clearly see a bunch of clumsy bodies in meaningless fights against each other that would lead to final termination of all." In a way, the same could be said for the field as Dwayne Huebner so accurately announced and denounced four decades ago before banging the door and moving to divinity studies. That is, seeing from outside, we actually might look like a clumsy populated space clashing – most of the times irreversibly - against each other. That is, looking from a far, the planet, or at least specific areas of the planet, looks like a gawky set of dysfunctional 'ugly, dirty, and ruthless interactions' that flabbergast the most inattentive. The savagery of human history flooded by rivers of blood speaks volumes of such awkwardness, yet shockingly naturalized. The state of field, in a way, cannot be delinked from such similar obnoxious canvas.

Ettore Scola's Brutti, Sporchi & Cattivi allegorically depicts a scenario of interactions that metaphorically takes one to a world of lethal chaos. Scola insightfully satirizes how modern poverty corrodes four generations of a family that lived crowded together in a cardboard shantytown shack in the squalor of inner city Rome. Murder, poison dinners, sexuality, became a daily township triviality. Scola's class analysis paints a pitiless portrait of human race by 'coloring' the life of the poor and oppressed in a litany of human violence with no compassion, showing all their miseries and perfidies in a disconcerting way. Paradoxically, immanent existence, as DeLeuze would suggest, could only be possible within such suicidal spiral.

However, Scola's movie is obviously more than this. It is about a debauched, decadent, and dirty (human) environment, flooded with opportunism, a perverted social framework fuelled by awkwardly twisted interactions – sexually inclusive - yet aberrantly normalized as the only way to survive in extreme conditions of poverty, hungry and lack of basic hygiene conditions.

Scola's Brutti, Sporchi & Cattivi is a powerful blow to (post)modernity, and its colonialities, bringing to the stage not only the greedy Giacinto Mazzatellas of modernity and their métier, but also the ability of such italiani brava gente – as he labeled in his Concorrenza Sleale

["Unfair Competition"] -, to exist within poverty as one of the worst social constructions of modernity. Brutti, Sporchi & Cattivi is about what I would call 'the momentum'.

Scola's barbaric barbarism in (de)coloring an opus of modernity allows a nexus with certain fringes of our field. Despite the crucial and amazing achievements, as is so well documented (PARASKEVA, 2014; KLIEBARD, 1995, WATKINS, 1993, BAKER, 2014, PINAR, 1995), it is although undeniable that, especially with the advent of globalization and internationalization, vacuity, brutal voids, submission, alienation, 'followism', autochthone nullification, and captivity, paved the way, in Scola terms, for ugly, dirty and bad ways of (non)interaction within the wor(l)d(s) by those who, despite the fact that they are not part of the global North, considered themselves the global North's intellectual ambassadors within the global South. 'Familyless', theoretical timesharing, confusion, impasses, unwillingness to grasp not just new ideas beyond the Western Epistemological platform, but to create, groom, and work genuine autochthonous epistemes, challenging the eugenicism of Western Eurocentric Epistemologies, and the linguistic yoke of English language, opening the veins of the local to irrigate the global and thus to decolonize it. Working on Pinar's (2004) insightful claim, of 'presentism', I would go beyond him, and define 'momentism' as the rust that eats the field. 'Momentism' as I see it, is the absolute superlative of 'presentism', the next step towards irreversible disaster that, not only strokes any non-Western, non-Global northern epistemological flux but, worse than that, produces such framework as non--existent (SOUSA SANTOS, 2014). In so doing, such unfortunate 'curriculum modus operandi,' not only denies any existence of any epistemological avenue beyond the Western Eurocentric core, blindly rebuffs how such Western Eurocentrism has the copy rights of the perpetual genocide, but also it shows concomitantly incapacity to go above and beyond specific dominant and counter-dominant functionalist approaches. And paradoxically we have an heavy armada of self proclaimed heavy weight intellectuals that laudably master, in detail, the metamorphoses of the field situated in the global north, but they are quite incapable of understan-

ding that concomitantly they silence the noisy silences of the non-global north.

In this context, what we need is an 'enough is enough commitment' from the global South matrix or semi-peripheral global North milieu, challenging such epistemological subservience that fertilizes the destruction of indigenous and autochthonous values and ways of seeing the wor(l)d, challenging openly the theoricide in which they are engaged.

So much has been said about internationalization and globalization of the field, so much has been spinning within the circuits of cultural production controlled by specific Western Eurocentric frameworks. However, what we do need, as the field embraces such global journey, is to take such opportunity to act not as 'cipaios' of a global curriculum master – it is really impossible to position anyone outside overlooking to the matrix – but to see this third stage of neoliberalism (ARRIGHI, 2005) as an opportunity to impose other epistemological apparatuses. As the field globalizes, so some say, the state of the curriculum field beyond the Western Eurocentric global North platform, cannot operate as a 'gas station.' There is no curriculum globalization, at all, with submission. What we have is a curriculum (re)(neo)-colonialization. I find it really hard to accept that, for example specific human constituencies within a non-global north, (a) that led a world revolution to end colonialism and destroy almost 50 years of dictatorship, and thus gain the legitimacy to be at least 'los maestros de la democracia', (b) that was one of the very first one civilizations in the world to end the slavery, (c) that does not have 1/3 of its population incarcerated, that does not have 1/3 of its population without any – I repeat any – health care cover (Obamacare is not about free health care for all), (d) that does not spend 45% of its budget in global wars, that maintains a incomparably better and more human health care and pension social system than despite the crisis and the inability to address the crisis, that did not institutionalized a school to prison pipeline, that did not criminalizes youth, is hostage of any non-autochthonous epistemological vein; it refuses to assume a project for the world and in so doing, (de)colonize the epistemological terrain of the

global north, short circuiting the mechanisms of epistemological production and reproduction. I guess we – the Souths of the Global North - have a lot to offer to this reality. It is time, in my sense, for the curriculum field in certain nations that are not exactly within the global north, and its peripheries, like so many others did it, to join the struggle against the yoke of Western Eurocentrism thus engaging in a ruthless critique of every existent epistemological apparatuses.

References

AHMAD, A. **In Theory**. London: Verso, 2008.

AMIN, S. T**he World we Wish to See. Revolutionary Objectives in Twenty First Century** – 'The Bamako Appeal', 2008, 107 – 112.

_____ **Global History**: A View from the South. Dakar: Pambazuka Press, 2011.

ANDREOTTI, V. **Actionable Postcolonial Theory in Education**. New York: Palgrave, 2011.

_____ Renegotiating Epistemic Privilege and Enchantments with Modernity: the Gain in the Loss of the Entitlement to Control and Define Everything. **Social Policy, Education and Curriculum Research Unit**. North Dartmouth: Centre for Policy Analyses/UMass Dartmouth, 2013, pp. b-s.

ANZALDUA, G. **Borderlands. La Frontera. The New Mestiza**. S. Francisco. Aunt Lute Books, 2007.

ARRIGHI, G. **The Long Twentieth Century. Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times**. London: Verso, 2005.

BAKER, B. Borders, Belonging, Beyond: New Curriculum History. In Bernadette Baker (ed) **New Curriculum History**. Rotterdam, 2009.

BAUMAN, Z. **Globalization. The Human Consequences**. London: Blackwell Publishers, 1998.

CHO, S. **Critical Pedagogy and Social Change. Critical Analysis on the Language of Possibility**. New York: Routledge, 2013.

CHOMSKY, N. **Problems of Knowledge and Freedom**. New York: The New Press, 1971.

CORAZZA, S. M. Noologia do currículo: Vagamundo, o problemático, e assentado, o resolvido. **Educação e Realidade**, 27 (2), 2002, pp. 131 – 142.

DELEUZE, G. & GUATTARI, F. **A Thousand Plateaus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987.

DELEUZE, G. **Negotiations 1972 – 1990**. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

DUSSEL, E. **The invention of Americas**. The Eclipse of the Other and the Myth of Modernity. New York: Continuum, 1995a.

_____ **Philosophy of Liberation**. Oregon; Wipf & Stock, 1995b.

_____ **Ethics of Liberation**. In the Age of Globalization and Exclusion. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.

EAGLETON, T. **After Theory**. New York: Basic Books, 2003.

ESCOBAR, A. Words and Knowldges Otherwise. In W. Mignolo & A. Escobar (eds). **Globalization and the Decolonial Turn**. New York: Routlegde, pp., 33 – 64, 2013.

FANON, F. **The Wretched of the Earth**. New York: Grove, 1963.

FRASER, N. Can Society be Commodities all Wa Down? Post--Polanyian Reflections on Capitalist Crisis. **Economy and Society** 43, 4, 2014, pp. 541– 558.

GALEANO, E. A Child Lost in the Storm. In R. Blacburn (Ed.) **After the Fall**. The Failure of Communism and the Future of Socialism. London: Verso, 1991, pp. 250 – 254.

GIROUX, H. **Ideology, Culture & the Process of Schooling**. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

_____ **Zombie Politics in the Age of Casino Capitalism**. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.

GROSFOGUEL, R. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn: Beyond Political Economy Paradigms." **Cultural Studies** 21(2-3), 2007, 211-23.

_____ Epistemic Islamophobia. Colonial Social Sciences. **Human Architecture**: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, VIII, 2, 2010, pp. 29 -39.

HARVEY, D. **Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism**. London: Profile Books, 2015.

HUEBNER, D. "The Moribund Curriculum Field: It's Wake and Our Work," **Curriculum Inquiry**, 6 (2), 1976, pp. 153–67.

KLIEBARD, H. **The Struggle for the American Curriculum**: 1893–1958. New York: Routledge, 1995.

LATOUR, B. **We have never been Modern**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.

_____ **Pandora's Hope**. Essays on the Reality of Science Studies. London: Harvard University Press, 1999.

MACEDO, D. et al. **The Hegemony of the English Language**. Boulder: Paradigm, 2003.

MALDONADO-TORRES, N. **Against War**. Views from the Underside of Modernity. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008a.

MARCUSE, H. **One Dimensional Man**. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

MARX, K. & Engels, F. **The Communist Manifesto**. New York: Verso, 2012.

MARX, K. **For a Ruthless Critique of Everything Existing**. In R. Tucker (Ed.) The Marx Engels Reader. New York: W.W. Norton, 1978 (1843), pp. 12 – 15.

MIGNOLO, W. **Local Histories / Global Designs. Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

_____ Introduction. Coloniality of Power and Decolonial Thinking. In W. Mignolo & A. Escobar (Eds) **Globalization and the Decolonial Turn**. New York: Routlegde, 2013, pp. 1 – 21.

MUNSLOW, A. **Deconstructing History**. New York: Routledge, 1997.

PARASKEVA, J. **Conflicts in Curriculum Theory. Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies**. New York: Palgrave, 2011.

_____ **As Dinamicas dos Conflitos Ideologicos e Culturais na Fundamentacao do Curriculo**. Porto: ASA, 2001.

_____ **Conflicts in Curriculum Theory**. Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies. New York: Palgrave, 2014.

_____ **Curriculum Epistemicides**: Towards and Alternative Thinking of Alternatives. New York: Routledge, 2015.

PINAR, W. Introduction: Toward the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies. In D. Trueit, W. Doll Jr, H. Wang and W. Pinar (Eds) **The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies**. New York: Peter Lang, 2000, pp. 1 – 13.

_____ **What is curriculum theory?**. New Jersey: Lawrence and Earlbaum Associates, 2004.

_____ **Curriculum Studies in the United States**. New York: Palgrave, 2012.

_____ **Curriculum states in the United States**: Present Circumstances, Intellectual Histories. New York: Palgrave, 2013.

QUIJANO, A. Colonialidad del poder y classificacion Social. J**ournal of World Systems Research**, 6 (2), 2000, pp. 342 – 386.

RODNEY, W. **How Europe Underveloped Africa**. Retrieved http://www.blackherbals.com/walter_rodney.pdf, 1973.

SABET, A. **Islam and the Political.** Theory, Givernance and International Relations. London: Pluto Press, 2008.

SCHWAB, J. **Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

SLOTERDJIK, P. **In the World Interior of Capital.** Towards a Philosophical Theory of Globalization. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013.

SOUSA SANTOS, B. **The Rise of the Left the World Social Forum and beyond.** London: Verso, 2006.

_____ **Another Knowledge is Possible**. London: Verso, 2007a.

_____ **Beyond abyssal thinking**. From global lines to ecologies of knowledges, Review, XXX (1), pp. 45 – 89, 2007b.

_____ **Epistemologias do sul.** Coimbra: Almedina, 2009.

_____ **Epistemologies from the South**. Boulder: Paradigm, 2014.

THERNBORN, G. **From Marxism to Post-Marxism**. New York: Verso, 2010.

TLOSTANOVA, M. & Mignolo, W. **Learning to Unlearn**. Decolonial Reflections from Euroasia and the Americas. Ohio: Ohio State University, 2012.

TRUEIT, D. Democracy and Conversation. In D. Trueit, W. Doll Jr, H. Wang and W. Pinar (Eds) **The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies**. New York: Peter Lang, 2000, pp. ix – xvii.

WATKINS, W. Black Curriculum Orientations. **Harvard Educational Review**, 63 (3), 1993, pp. 321 – 338.