

Teoricid kurikulumuma! Poziv na lutajuću teoriju kurikulumuma¹

Žoao Paraskeva² 

Fakultet humanističkih i društvenih nauka, Univerzitet u Stratklajdu,
Glazgov, Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo

Apstrakt

Oblast kurikulumuma suočava se s „teoricidom“, pojmom koji ne mora da podrazumeva odsustvo teorije, već predstavlja pomagalo u širenju „neteoretične teorije“, što se naročito pogoršalo u drugoj polovini prošlog veka. Služeći se kritičkim, antikolonijalnim i dekolonijalnim teorijskim okvirima, moj cilj je da putem ovog eseja ispitam hegemonijske i kontrahegemonijske debate evrocentričnog usmerenja u domenu naše naučne oblasti, ali u kontekstu modernosti i njene eugeničke kolonijalnosti – Prosperovog rasuđivanja – čime se ističe epistemicidna priroda naše oblasti. Postupajući na taj način, ovaj esej raščlanjuje uzrok rane koju je zadobila savremena teorija naše naučne oblasti, a koju ja još nazivam i „kurikularnom involucijom“ ili „kurikularnim imparitetom“. Kobna teorijska praznina nastala je kao ishod građanskih ratova vođenih između dominantnih i kontradominantnih tradicija, kao i unutar obeju sukobljenih strana, čime je izazvano ono što ja nazivam teoricidom. Ovaj članak zagovara izlaz iz takve „involucije“ putem lutajuće teorije kurikulumuma (u daljem tekstu: LTK) – nederivativnog, antikolonijalnog i dekolonijalnog pristupa osetljivog na epistemološke različitosti u svetu, kao i na epistemološku raznovrstnost. Ovaj esej prikazuje LTK kao deklaraciju epistemoške nezavisnosti od evrocentričnog naučnog monumentalizma, koji sramno dehumanizuje legitimitet Kalibanovog rasuđivanja.

Ključne reči:

epistemicid kurikulumuma, teoricid, lutajuća teorija kurikulumuma, kurikularna involucija, kurikularni imparitet, raskidanje kolonijalnih veza.

1 Ovaj članak predstavlja ažuriranu verziju prethodnog rada. Želeo bih da iskažem svoju zahvalnost Ljanu Kičinu i Sari Hejs na njihovim dragocenim komentarima na prethodne verzije ovog rada. Takođe, veliko hvala mojim doktorandima sa Univerziteta u Stratklajdu na nekim od ideja za ovaj naučni rad. Naše teorijske diskusije, naročito petkom na seminarima o marksizmu i obrazovanju, pomažu nam da bolje razumemo političku prirodu obrazovanja, kao i da razumemo koliko je od krucijalne važnosti uklopiti tu njegovu političku prirodu u složenu dinamiku ideološke proizvodnje.

2 joao.paraskeva@strath.ac.uk

Lutajuća teorija kurikuluma jeste epistemologija oslobođenja koja može da neumorno dovodi u pitanje autoritet, hijerarhiju i dominaciju u svakom životnom aspektu.

(Darder, 2016)

Uvertira

Više od sto godina nakon svog nastanka, oblast izučavanja kurikuluma se tokom prvih decenija dvadeset i prvog veka utapa u onome što ja istrajno nazivam „teoricidom“; nazivom koji suštinski ne podrazumeva odsustvo teorije, već se u većoj meri odnosi na davanje prevlasti „neteoretičnoj teoriji“. Pisan u kritičkim i antikolonijalnim teorijskim okvirima, ovaj esej počiva na prethodnim istraživanjima koja sam sprovodio u drugim kontekstima (Paraskeva, 2024; 2023; 2022; 2021), istražujući i predstavljajući sveže prokružene pravce razmišljanja kojima se može zaputiti. Svrha ovog dela jeste proces trostrukog razlistavanja (Gil, 2009) koji poštuje jedan od osnova moje putanje – suočavanje s uzrocima rezonovanja teorije kurikuluma i njene istorije. Prvo, da se ispituju hegemonijske i kontrahegemonijske prepirke u polju našeg kurikuluma (Schubert & Schubert, 1980), ali unutar konteksta modernosti i njenog rasuđivanja baziranog na eugeničkoj kolonijalnosti (Walsh, 2012), drugim rečima, Prosperovog rasuđivanja (Henry, 2000; Paraskeva, 2023; 2021), čime se ističe epistemicidna priroda naše oblasti. Drugo, da se raščlani teorijska rana koju je istovremeno zadobilo naše polje izučavanja, što sam još nazvao i „kurikularnom involucijom“ ili „kurikularnim imparitetom“ (Paraskeva, 2024; 2023; 2021; 2016), odnosno, kobna teorijska praznina koja je izbila iz sudara dominantnih i kontradominantnih tradicija. Krhotine takvih polemika osvetljavaju manjkavosti naše teorije, što dovodi do opasne regresije i produžava „okcidentozu kurikuluma“ (Paraskeva, 2021). Treće, da se zalaže za izlaz iz takve „involucije“ putem lutajuće teorije kurikuluma (LTK); tvrdim da je LTK nederivativan, antikolonijalan i dekolonijalan pristup osetljiv na epistemološke razlike i raznovrsnost – svet u neprestanoj dinamici promene; drugim rečima, teorija prevođenja (Santos, 2014) oslobođena je od okova evrocentrizma, ali nije nužno njemu usprotivljena. LTK zahteva da se formira matrica interdisciplinarnog učenja, koja se neposredno bavi stvarnim izazovima sa kojima je suočeno čovečanstvo i njegov razvoj.

Esej ističe hitnu potrebu za otpetljavanjem od evrocentričnog fundamentalizma i učešćem u dekolonijalnom poduhvatu kako bi se razvila robusnija, nederivativna kritička teorija; esej takođe brani stanovište prema kojem LTK uspostavlja deklaraciju epistemološke nezavisnosti i slobode nasuprot muškom naučnom monumentalizmu karakterističnom za evrocentizam (Harding, 2008; Popkewitz, 1976), koji na sraman način dehumanizuje legitimitet Kalibanovog rasuđivanja (Fanon, 2001; Henry, 2000).

Istrošeno i razorno Prosperovo rasuđivanje

Istorija naše naučne oblasti – iliti zaostavština (Paraskeva & Huebner, 2022) – prožeta je bojevitim bitkama vođenim između hegemonijskih i kontrahegemonijskih tradicija.

Kao što sam već istrajno tvrdio u drugim publikacijama (2022a: 63; takođe, 2022b; 2014; 2011), oblast je:

teorijski razbijena i podvrgnuta temeljnim diskusijama, do te mere da su diskusije postale endemska pojava, svedena samo na domen naše teorije i njenog nasleđa. U nekim slučajevima, takve rasprave su bile intelektualno krvave. Ponekad se čini da naučna oblast može da se opiše kao ušće na kojem se susreću ideologije obojene u raspravama, ili kao ruševine na kojima će se voditi nove kulturološke borbe.

Na našu oblast, kako Karlson (Carlson, 2005) s pravom tvrdi, ne može više da se gleda kao na „distinktivno polje izučavanja jedinstvene istorije, složene sadašnjosti i neizvesne budućnosti“ zato što se kategorija ne može jasno definisati (Carlson, 2005: 3). On podvlači da oblast mora da bude shvaćena kao „istorijski konstrukt sačinjen od kulturoloških bitaka za prevlast moći i znanja, kao i... prema njoj treba da se postupa kao „klizavoj“ kategoriji čije je značenje neutemeljeno, štaviše osporeno.“ Teoretisanje kurikuluma je zaista „izazovan poduhvat [izveden] potpunim rasuđivačkim potencijalom [čoveka]“ (Macdonald, 1967: 166-169).

Pažljiva analiza srži ovih rasprava rasvetljava nam niz problema, među kojima postoje dva koja bih voleo da istaknem. Jedan se odnosi na činjenicu da u istoriji ne postoji vremenski period tokom kojeg je bilo koja društvena grupa imala apsolutnu prevlast nad nekom drugom (Baker, 2009; Cremin, 1964; Kliebard, 1995; Krug, 1969; Schubert, 1986; Tyack, 1974; Watkins, 1993). Uzastopnim „dominantnim grupama“ nikada nije pošlo za rukom da unište ili istrebe druge grupe ili pokrete u okviru svojih planova i programa, niti mimo njih. Od nastanka ovog naučnog polja krajem devetnaestog veka – put dosadašnje sukobe između „humanista“, „developmentalista“, „socijalnih eficientista“ i „socijalnih meliorista“, uz brutalnu moć neoliberalizma koji je nekako uspeo da nametne neoliberalno obrazovanje, kurikulum i pedagogiju (Ball, 2007; Giroux, 2004; Harvey, 2005), možemo primetiti da nijedan od pokreta ili društvenih grupa – hegemonijskih ili (kamoli tek) kontrahegemonijskih – nije uspeo da svoja stanovišta nametne na apsolutistički način. Bilo je – i uvek će biti – nemilosrdnog pružanja otpora (Paraskeva, 2022b; 2021; videti: Apple, 1979; Giroux, 1981). Drugi nam ukazuje na to da su bitke vođene među hegemonijskim i kontrahegemonijskim pokretima potpale pod radioaktivni funkcionalizam – opasnu i pogubnu teorijsku zonu. Drugim rečima, kontradominantni pokreti su se, u svojoj složenoj borbi protiv funkcionalističkih perspektiva stvorenih i odbranjenih od strane dominantnih tradicija, uprkos znatnim postignućima, na kraju uvrstili u jezivi reakcionarni funkcionalizam – paradoksalno, u isti funkcionalizam koji su tokom godina kritikovali i protiv kojeg su se borili.

Kao što sam i ranije tvrdio u svojim delima (Paraskeva, 2025; 2024; 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2021; 2018; 2016; 2015; 2014; 2011), ključno je postaviti, između ostalog, i sledeća pitanja: Zašto su kontrahegemonijski pokreti potonuli u isto funkcionalističko more protiv kojeg su se toliko vatreno borili? Zašto nisu bili u stanju da se sami uspostave kao hegemonijski blok? Zašto je kritičkim teorijama i pedagogijama bilo nesvakidašnje teško da uspostave dominaciju, čak i u okviru kontrahegemonijskih stanovišta? U svetu gde je toliko toga podložno kritici, „zašto je postalo tako teško proizvesti [dominantnu] kritičku teoriju [kurikuluma]?“ – kao što bi Santos (Santos, 1999) sročio? Ako ne

manjkaju problemi koje treba podvrgnuti kritici, „čemu ovo odsustvo utopije?“ (Alba, 1998: 12) Šta se to desilo? Zbog čega to ne preovladava u visokoškolskim obrazovnim programima i u programima za obrazovanje učitelja? Kako smo dovde dospeli? Kako je to moguće? Gde smo to „omanuli“? Ko je to omanuo? Zašto je tako očigledno bilo nemoguće da kontrahegemonijski pristupi osnaže ugrožene grupe? (Ellsworth, 1989) Ko izvlači korist iz takvih nemogućnosti? Zašto se vapaji pojedinih kritičkih intelektualaca uporno ignorišu? Na koji način mogu kritički pristupi da se, kao što Volter Minjolo zagovara, „podvedu pod projekat modernosti/kolonijalnosti i dekolonizacije“ (Mignolo, 2026: 125)? Ako ubrizgamo steroide marksizma u ovu kritičku debatu o kurikulumu, moramo da dovedemo u pitanje čiji to čuvari sprečavaju da se ova pitanja postave u srž naših briga o kurikulumu. U vreme kada je kurikulum postao roba i kada se neoliberalizam nameće kao dominantan pravac u pedagogiji i kurikularnim oblicima, sama činjenica da snažna dekonstruktivna stanovišta, poput, na primer, Elsvortovih (Ellsworth, 1989) nisu prisutna čak ni u periferijama naših proglaša, trebalo bi da nas natera da zastanemo i da se zamislimo. Funkcionalističko i determinističko obrazloženje koje prožima kurikulum povezano je i sa vrednošću upotrebe i vrednošću razmene, gde je kurikulum društveno konstruisan i gde on artikuliše i dezartikuliše načine i uslove proizvodnje kapitalističkog sistema (Marx, 1976). Zajedno s Hjubnerom (Paraskeva & Huebner, 2023; 2022), na drugom forumu, pokušao sam da doprinesem ovoj kritičkoj debati. Na neki način može da se nasluti ostvarenje stvari koje je Dvejn Hjubner predskazao pre nekoliko decenija (Huebner, 1976). Ovoj naučnoj oblasti predstoji plaćanje visoke cene zbog ignorisanja tako bezizlazne situacije.

Kao što sam već zaključio tokom svog istraživanja u drugim delima, ova propast je delimično povezana s trijumfalizmom dominantnih grupa koje naginju pozitivizmu i bihejviorizmu. Međutim, ovakav trijumfalizam objašnjava samo jednu stranu medalje. Druga strana predstavlja suštinu kontrahegemonijske hemisfere i njenog ograničenog epistemološkog matriksa. Drugim rečima, bitke vođene između dominantnih i kontra-dominantnih grupa u našoj oblasti odvijaju se u domenu evrocentrične epistemološke hemisfere modernosti; ipak, one nam otkrivaju i da pluriverzumska „kritička i postkritička struja“ – što sam još nazvao i „generacijom utopije“ (Paraskeva, 2021) – nije u stanju da istupi iz takve hemisfere. Takva hemisfera je tokom milenijuma stavljena u kalup „monumentalnosti belačkog rasuđivanja“ (Santos, 2018; Mbembe, 2017), te odbija da prizna legitimitet epistemoloških principa koji nisu evrocentrični, kako u okvirima zapadnjačke modernosti tako i izvan njih.

Kao što je slučaj i s dominantnim tradicijama, kontrahegemonijske grupe oduvek su otvoreno pokazivale svoju nesposobnost – a u nekim slučajevima i protivljenje – da raskinu veze s različitim „Prosperovim kognitivnim matricama“ (Henry, 2000), koji podržavaju jedinstven naučni pristup tumačenju „reči i sveta“ (Freire, 1985) – čiji osnovni temelji počivaju na evrocentričnim epistemološkim principima (Mignolo, 2011; Walsh, 2012). Usled toga, kritički i postkritički stručnjaci upleli su se u složeni funkcionalizam – kao i „derivativizam“ (Santos, 2014) – kojem su se tako oštro protivili. Stoga, borba za kurikulum se desila u okvirima granica koje je nametnulo zapadnjačko evrocentrično rasuđivanje, odbacujući postojanje drugih epistemoloških principa mimo evrocentrične logike, sa osvrtima na

eugeničku prirodu naše naučne oblasti. Eugenika je prvobitni greh naše oblasti (Paraskeva, 2022b). Sukobi hegemonijskih i kontrahegemonijskih tradicija odraz su epistemicidne prirode oblasti. Dok su hegemonijske – u mnogim slučajevima bez prikrivanja – strastveno zagovarale epistemicid (ubistvo znanja), kontrahegemonijske nisu imale kapaciteta da prekinu takav epistemicid, čak se na kraju ispostavilo da su, na mnoge načine, i potpomogle u naučnom i društvenom ovekovečenju takvog prokletstva (Paraskeva, 2023; 2012; 2022a; 2018). Osporavajući epistemicid, kontrahegemonijske tradicije su proizvele reverzivni epistemicid (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2021).

Hegemonijski i kontrahegemonijski pokreti ovog polja delovali su u domenu razdorne eugeničke epistemološke matrice. Sastavili su argumente i produbili rasprave na osnovu istrošenog, razdornog i derivativnog rasuđivanja. Kao što sam tvrdio u svojim radovima (Paraskeva, 2016; 2011), istorija, teorija, nacrti i razvoj naše oblasti ne mogu se s tačnošću shvatiti putem modernog zapadnjačkog evrocentričnog epistemološkog eugeničkog rezonovanja, koje je Santos (Santos, 2007: 45) odlično definisao kao ponorni način razmišljanja. Drugim rečima,

[to] je sačinjeno od sistema vidljivih i nevidljivih razlika, pri čemu se one nevidljive nalaze u osnovi onih vidljivih. Nevidljive razlike uspostavljene su putem radikalnih zidova koje dele društvenu realnost u dva domena: domen „ove strane zida“ i domen „one strane zida.“ Podela je takva da „druga strana zida“ iščezava kao realnost, postaje nepostojeća i zaista se proizvodi kao nepostojeća. Kada kažemo „nepostojeća“, znači da ne postoji ni u kakvom relevantnom ili razumljivom obliku egzistencije. Sve što je proizvedeno kao nepostojeće se radikalno izopštava, budući da se nalazi izvan domena svega što prihvaćena koncepcija inkluzije ubraja u „drugu stranu“ u odnosu na sebe. Ono što u osnovi karakteriše ponorno razmišljanje, prema tome, jeste nemogućnost suživota dveju strana jednog zida. U meri u kojoj ova strana zida preovladava, ona ostvaruje svoju prevlast jedino putem crpljenja polja relevantne stvarnosti. Izvan nje se nalazi samo nepostojanje, nevidljivost, nedijalektičko odsustvo.

Santos (Santos, 2007) odlazi dosta dalje od stanovišta koje je formulisao Enrike Dussel (Dussel, 2026: 103), koje o misli i kulturi zapada kaže da „svojim očiglednim „okcidentalizmom“ predstavlja sve druge kulture kao primitivne, premoderne, tradicionalne i nerazvijene.“ Izvan te ponorne linije, prema tvrdnji Santosa (2007), realnost je definisana nepostojanjem.

Ovakvo ponorno rezonovanje poprilično nadilazi nemogućnost suživota „obeju strana zida;“ ono je u temeljima fundamentalne, radikalne negacije postojanja [onog] drugog [u odnosu na sebe]. Radikalizacija tako ponorne episteme se, pak, nalazi u senci „jasno vidljivih razlika koje strukturišu društvenu realnost s ove strane zida i zasnovane su na nevidljivosti ikakvih razlika između ove strane zida i druge strane“ (Santos, 2007: 46). Na neki način, Santos nadmašuje Todorovu (Todorova, 1997) kada je reč o „nepotpunoj drugoj strani“. Ne postoji „nepotpuna druga strana“ (kao ni „nepotpuna naša strana“), zato što ne postoji ništa iza ponornih granica. Nevidljivost i nepostojanje „jedne strane“ su u korenu postojanja bilo kakve „druge strane“. Hegemonijski i kontrahegemonijski pokreti

borili su se „s ove strane zida“; stručnjaci koji dolaze iz raznolikih beskonačnih kritičkih epistemoloških struja polemicali su u domenu matrije koja je definisana i proklamovana kao jedinstvena, jedina na svetu koja može da proizvede naučno znanje isuviše dragoceno da bi se uhvatilo u koštac sa izazovima s kojima se sreće kurikulum.

U oblasti kurikularnog znanja, „ponorno razmišljanje sastoji se iz toga što se modernoj nauci pruža monopol univerzalne distinkcije između tačnog i netačnog“ – kao što bi Santos (Santos, 2007: 47) sročio, naša oblast je time prožeta. Takav monopol je ograničio epistemološku borbu na domen u određenim okvirima koji se tiču „određenih vrsta objekata pod određenim okolnostima, uspostavljenim određenim metodama“ (Santos, 2007: 47).

Kurikularno rasuđivanje podređeno je hegemoniji pozitivizma i teoriji učenja (Paraskeva & Huebner, 2023). Radi se o obliku rasuđivanja koji je postao „prevladavajuća kulturna hegemonija, koja prožima tehnokratsku racionalnost kao izvor logike koji poriče značaj istorijske osvešćenosti“ (Giroux, 1979: 267). Dominantno kurikularno rasuđivanje odražava „pozitivističku racionalnost u čijem je sadržaju filozofija istorije koja samoj istoriji otima kritičke mogućnosti“ (Giroux, 1979: 267); stoga, to oslikava istorijski tačne epistemološke boje monopola monumentalnosti jednog razdornog kognitivnog Carstva (Santos, 2018), koje oblike znanja „druge strane“ prikazuje kao nepsotojeće – budući da su nepodobni u domenu naučne naučnosti zapadnjačkog modernog razmišljanja (Giroux, 2004). Sve za šta se vredi boriti može jedino da se pojmi s „ove strane zida“ i u domenu te strane – u osnovi evrocentrično. Na „drugoj strani linije“, dodaje Santos (2007: 47), „ne postoji pravo znanje; ne postoje verovanja, mišljenja, intuitivna ili subjektivna razumevanja, koja, u najvećoj meri, mogu da postanu predmeti ili sirovine za naučna istraživanja“. Borbe za odgovor na pitanje „čije je mišljenje najvrednije“ potonule su u otvoreni epistemicid. To je bila otvorena epistemicidna bitka.

Kao što sam tvrdio u drugim kontekstima (Paraskeva, 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016; 2011), u tako „eugeničkom“ kontekstu, potpuno je „prostituisano“ ne samo znanje već i samo pitanje „šta misliti“, kao i odgovor na njega. Kako iko može da tvrdi da zna ono što tvrdi da zna ukoliko je ogroman epistemološki skup principa koji okuplja beskrajno mnoštvo drugih epistemoloških oblika podmuklo predstavljen kao nepostojeći (Paraskeva, 2016)? U ovako beskonačno raznovrsnom društvu, naš kurikulum nije – za razliku od stanovišta za koje se Djui (Dewey, 1916; 1902) tako neumorno borio – mikrokosmos društva. Naš kurikulum oslikava „selektivnu tradiciju“ (Williams, 1976: 205), ali je uspostavljen na „ovoj strani zida“. Kurikulum je „rasuđivanje nerazumnosti“, kako bi to sročio Goldberg (Goldberg, 2018). Predmeti kurikulumu ne postoje u mreži koju su iskale moderne zapadnjačke epistemologije.

Da je priroda naše oblasti epistemicidna, to je neosporno. Kurikulum – od predškolskog vaspitanja do visokoškolskog obrazovanja – jeste laboratorija razdornog eugeničkog Prosperovog rasuđivanja, laboratorija epistemicida. On proizvodi i potvrđuje nepostojanje „Kalibanovog rasuđivanja“ (Fanon, 2001; Henry, 2000). Ograničavanjem rasprava na samo „ovu stranu zida“ – što je diskusija utkana u epistemološku mrežu zapadne evrocentrične modernosti, koju usmerava i pokreće eugeničko i razdorno rasuđivanje – hegemonijski i kontrahegemonijski pokreti ne samo da su pooštrili epistemicidnu prirodu naše oblasti,

nego su ovu situaciju doveli i do – skoro nepovratne – teorijske *slepe ulice*. Kao i Henri Žiru (Giroux, 1979: 268-269), tvrdio bih da je, kada je reč o kurikulumu, „teorija okoštala unutar izvesnih ograničenih metodoloških prohibicija“. Ukoliko kultura pozitivizma odbacuje budućnost slaveći sadašnjost, kao što Henri Žiru (Giroux, 1979: 271) tako vatreno izjavljuje, i ako je preovladavajuća kurikularna logika u tako užasnoj meri pozitivistički nastrojena, onda se preovladavajući oblici kurikularnog znanja u našim školama takođe sukobe s budućnošću i poštuju sadašnjost, uprkos zbrci u kojoj se nalazi, pri čemu oni onemogućuju širenje svake utopijske težnje, istrebljujući im svaku moguću svrhu u budućnosti, uništavaju beskonačnu moć utopijske prirode čovečanstva. Prilično oklevetanom, jednodimenzionalnom čoveku, kojeg je analizirao Herb Markiz (Marcuse, 2002), mesto rođenja je u našem kurikulumu, a učitelji i nastavnici su savršene akušerske sestre.

Živimo u vremenu stagnacije – potpunog teorijskog raspada – kurikularne involucije, opasne teorijske regresije. Odgovori na izazove bezgraničnog epistemološki raznovrsnog čovečanstva ne može se „samo“ pronaći „na ovoj strani zida“; izazovi ne mogu da se razreše na osnovu razdornog evrocentričnog rasuđivanja – koje je i samo, ipak, u mnogim slučajevima, vodeći arhitekta kompleksnih događaja koje nastoji da razreši. Kao što Lord (Lorde, 2007) kaže, „gospodarevu kuću ne mogu da sruše alati koji su je izgradili“. Evrocentrizam kojim je prožet teorijski i praktični kurikularni proces potpuno je obavio našu oblast opasnom otuđenošću od realnosti – ono što nazivam „kurikularnim imparitetom“ (Paraskeva, 2022a; 2022b; 2021).

Teoriciid kurikuluma

Kao što sam tvrdio, obračuni između dominantnih i specifičnih kritičkih i postkritičkih kontradominantnih tradicija demonstrirali su nam kako su postkritičke tradicije potpale pod reduktivni funkcionalistički pristup. U svojoj borbi protiv epistemicida, oni su pogoršali takav epistemicid putem izrađivanja reverzivnog epistemicida (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2021; 2018; 2016).

Štaviše, borbe između takvih tradicija i unutar njih okrepile su ono što bih, nadahnut Žilom (Gil, 2009), nazvao „kurikularnom involucijom“ – ili mrtvom tačkom. Kao što biva u takvim – ponekad – nemilosrdnim borbama, ni dominantne ni kontradominantne tradicije nisu mogle da odnesu potpunu pobedu; stoga stalno doživljavamo sve veći jaz između, s jedne strane, odsustva konsolidacije potpuno izdvojenog kurikuluma – u čemu zaista imamo bezbroj primera pobeđe kontradominantnih tradicija – i, s druge strane, potpunog odsustva pojave novog ljudskog bića. Unutar takvog zastoja, epistemicid i reverzivni epistemicid (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2021; 2018; 2016) nastavljaju da se održavaju. Drugim rečima, niti je „staro ljudsko biće“ umrlo, niti je „stvaranje“ novog ljudskog bića potpuno materijalizovano. Niti je stari društveni poredak ostao na sigurnom, niti se pojavilo stvaranje novog društvenog poretka; dakle, „staro umire, a novo se ne može roditi“ (Gramsci, 1999: 276). Ove bitke nisu predstavljale „pravu“ tragediju, budući da su lišene svoje tragičke dimenzije, kao što bi Žil (Gil, 2009) to sročio. Umesto toga, dogodila se kurikularna involucija (Žil, 2009), koja, na previše načina, ukazuje na „regresiju“. Stručnjaci iz

dominantnih i kontradominantnih tradicija se služe argumentima zasnovanim samo na istrošenom i obmanjujućem „Prosperovom evrocentričnom okviru“, koji je dokazani deo problema (Harding, 2008; Mignolo, 2011; Quijano, 1991; Walsh, 2012). Kao što Volter Minjolo (Mignolo, 2026: 144) tvrdi, „sama genealogija dekolonijalnog razmišljanja nepoznata je genealogiji evrocentričnog razmišljanja“.

Štaviše, epistemicidna priroda naše oblasti izaziva talas oštećenja koja su tokom godina prožimala našu oblast, teorijski „imparitet“ koji zagađuje našu teoriju; teoriju u permanentnom stanju kratkog spoja s realnošću. „Stadijum involucije“ razotkriva i pogoršava imparitet ove oblasti. Kurikularna teorija i „realnost“ kretale su se beskrajinim paralelnim putanjama – onemoćalost je nastanila hegemonijske i kontrahegemonijske principe ove oblasti. Takav imparitet je, pak, izazvao nelagodu u kritičkom plodnom tlu. Ovaj teoretski imparitet – ili oštećenje – svojstva kritike je, stoga, preplavio obale tokova kojima su se kretale radikalne kritičke kurikularne ideje – što je pojava koja je pohvalno osuđena i ispitana u krucijalnim pristupima koje su obezbedili Veksler (Wexler, 1976; 1987), Elsvortova (Ellsworth, 1989), Liston (Liston, 1988), Gor (Gore, 1993) i drugi, pri čemu nam je omogućeno da ovu problematiku ispitamo u drugim kontekstima (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2021; 2018; 2016). „Involucija“ i „imparitet“ pogoršali su mrtvu tačku u kojoj se ova oblast zatekla.

Kao što sam ranije tvrdio, Elsvortova (Ellsworth, 1989) je ključni primer – neopravdano potcenjen – impariteta kritičnog u visokoškolskom obrazovanju i programa za obuku nastavnika. Pre nego što se proširilo rasističko nasilje u zajednicama i univerzitetskim sredinama u periodu od 1987. do 1988. godine, što uključuje i Univerzitet Viskonsina, Elsvortova je iskoristila priliku da diskutuje o ovoj vrsti previranja na kursu Nastavni plan i program 608: Mediji i antirasistička pedagogija na Univerzitetu Viskonsina. Prema Elsvortovoj (Ellsworth, 1989), izvesni koncepti kritičke pedagogije, kao što su osnaživanje, glas studenata, dijalog, pa čak i sam termin „kritički“, reprezentativni su mitovi koji održavaju odnose dominacije. Prema njenim (Ellsworth, 1989) tvrdnjama, zasnovanim na njenim tumačenjima Nastavnog plana i programa 608, „ključne pretpostavke, ciljevi i pedagoške prakse fundamentalni u literaturi za kritičku pedagogiju – naime, „osnaživanje“, „glas studenata“, „dijalog“, pa čak i sam termin „kritički“ – jesu represivni mitovi koji održavaju odnose dominacije“ (Ellsworth, 1989: 298). Štaviše, ona tvrdi da su nas „naši naponi da diskurse kritičke pedagogije primenimo u praksi doveli do reprodukcije odnosa dominacije u učionici [odnosno, diskurse koji su] „delovali kroz nas“ na represivne načine, te i sami postali sredstvo represije“ (Ellsworth, 1989: 208). Dakle, kako smo se udaljili od takvih pitanja i krenuli drugim putem, „obradili smo“ izrazito apstraktni jezik literature i delali putem njega. U svojoj posvećenosti, oslobođenju i emancipaciji, kritički pristupi su učvrstili i umnožili odnose dominacije i sramotno su ćutali pred patrijarhatom.

Prisećanje šta su rekli Burdje i Bauman ovde je od velike pomoći. Burdjeovi koncepti „imigracije“ i Baumanovi koncepti „stranaca“ krucijalni su za naš argument. Kritička kurikularna teorija – kojoj svi mi toliko dugujemo – daleko je od noćne more za hegemonijski blok; odavno je prestala da proizvodi „čudnovatost“; već dugo više ne označava „čudnovatu, stranu“ stvar koju su proizveli „stranci“; postala je predvidljiva. S obzirom

na njenu epistemološku predvidljivost, kritička kurikularna teorija više ne predstavlja pretnju. Ona ne može da nastavi sa „sakaćenjem i iskorenjivanjem“ (Bauman, 2005: 7) dominantne teorije mišljenja i načina izgradnje sveta. Kritička teorija je čak prestala da označava teoriju pobune (Saramago, 1999: 43). Stoga, ona je izašla iz uloge proizvođača i dirigenta „imigracije novih ideja“ (Bourdieu, 2001: 7), pri čemu čak i ono što je zamišljeno kao novo ostaje isključivo vezano onto-epistemološkim stegama, koje mu onemogućuju da se razvija dalje od evrocentričnih modernih zapadnjačkih principa. Kritičke i post-kritičke teorije istrošene su „evrocentričnom koncepcijom vremena, prostora, broja, uzroka“ (Bourdieu, 2001: 9), koja na neki način abdicira od radikalnog epistemološkog suživota „druge strane zida“ (Santos, 2014). Nesposobnost da se prevaziđu takva involucija i oštećenje jasan su dokaz *capitis diminutiu* (gubitka statusa), koji izaziva *hypertrophia theoricæ* (povećanje teorije), čime se krči put *teoricidu*.

Ratoborni sukobi koji su suprotstavljali hegemonijske i kontrahegemonijske pokrete, uključujući i sukobe unutar pokreta, podstakli su svojevrsni teorijski državni udar – napad na prostor i vreme teorije, potištenje teorije, *teoricid*, krčeći put opasnim antiintelektualnim oblicima intelektualizma, koji su jedan od enzima za dekalifikovanje prosvetnih radnika. Intelektualizam postaje redak antikvitet u obrazovnim istraživanjima i školskim okruženjima (Paraskeva, 2013).

„Neoteoretična“ atmosfera vlada. Ova teorija, u stvari, predstavlja „neteoretičnu teoriju.“ Teorija je, u suštini, odsustvo teorije. Neuznemirenost je osvojila naše područje. Utopija teorijske histerije je sahranjena. Živimo u „ateorijskom“ trenutku, pošasti koja je kontaminirala različite odeljke naše oblasti poput korozije, zatim se, noseći svu svoju imovinu, smestila u somotsku fotelju naše akademije. Teoricid je zabiberio zdrav razum, što ne mora da podrazumeva odsustvo teorije, već predstavlja pomagalo u širenju „neteoretične teorije“. Sezona lova na teoriju i teoretičare se normalizovala. Slaba teorija koju smo pokušali da proizvedemo ne komunicira s našim školama. Teorijskom talasu nedostaje istorijska perspektiva i izgubio je na kvalitetu, naročito u drugoj polovini prošlog veka. Nema teorijske strepnje u našoj oblasti. Doživljavamo paralizu. Gore od teorijske stagnacije, suočavamo se s „nepostojanjem“ bio kakve teorijske turbulencije. Bučni teorijski požari prošlosti – čak i u skorijoj istoriji – davno su iščezli. Naša oblast više nije tlo za potpirivanje vatre u domenu razvijenih društvenih nauka.

Neophodna je još jedna teorija – ruku na srce, lutajuća – što bi moglo da se postigne jedino putem novog teoretisanja, nove epistemološke logike, i koja nam, verna etičkim principima epistemološke pravde, pomaže da „posložimo reči“ na drugi način (Saramago, 1999: 86). Nema budućnosti bez smrti, kao što bi Saramago (2009) rekao. Drugim rečima, i kao što sam već tvrdio i podrobno analizirao u drugim kontekstima (Paraskeva, 2022; 2021), kritičke i postkritičke teorije, uopšte uzev, kao i kritičke i postkritičke obrazovne kurikularne teorije, posebno, moraju da izumru. Ovo nije kraj kritičkih teorija i pedagogija. Ovo je način da se stvori istinski mnogobrojan, supradisciplinarni, nederivativni kritički pristup rešavanju beskrajsnih, raznovrsnih, onto-epistemoloških izazova sveta.

Iako je provokativan, ovaj izazov ne traži okončanje u evrocentričnom smislu. On traži nešto radikalno drugačije. Traži da stvari stoje „na drugi način“ (Paraskeva, 2021).

Moramo svi da se borimo kako se ne bi, kao što bi to Žil (Gil, 1998) rekao, „kritička teorija okamenila kao tribalna teorija“. Pravedan način da se reše takvi nedostaci jeste posvećivanje „procesu razlistavanja“ (Gil, 1998: 127-128), što rasklapa trenutni razdorni „komplikovani razgovor“ (Pinar, 2004) i dekolonizuje ga, budući da je u svojoj prirodi epistemicidan (videti: Huebner, 2022).

Ovaj proglas je signalizirao uzbunu u nekim regijama naše oblasti, naročito među onima koje su se, tokom decenija, samoprolašavali jedinim čuvarima kontraargumenta sa velikim „K“, takođe jedinstvenog, zanemarujući da sve vreme delaju u domenu epistemicidne matrice – pri čemu su se upustili u epistemicidne procese i ishode. Uočavam da takve kurikularne liberalne republike tvrdoglavo odbijaju da priznaju da je njihovo vlastito rasuđivanje, ma koliko multikulturno i polihromatsko, bilo, i uvek će biti, „izraz zapadnjačke kulture koja ograničava mogućnost opstanka svih drugih kultura“ (Dussel, 2026: 104).

Teoricid govori o slepoj ulici koju su stvorile bitke vođene između hegemonijskih i kontrahegemonijskih evrocentričnih tradicija, koje nisu bile u stanju da se uključe u neevrocentrične perspektive. Ta slepa ulica pogoršava umiruću prirodu oblasti, kako je to Hjubner obznanio (Huebner, 1976). Kako bismo mogli da poreknemo da naše polje ne uživa u teorijskom blagostanju kakvo je nekada imalo? Kako bismo mogli da poreknemo da više ne doživljavamo teorijsku strepnju kakvu smo iskusili u prošlosti, čak i nedavnoj? Jedan od razloga ovom ozbiljnom zastoju leži u poricanju apsolutističke i istrošene prirode evrocentričnog rasuđivanja, koja je prožela kontrahegemonijsku matricu. Pokazalo se da ova matrica nije sposobna da nadmaši svoje epistemološke granice, razreši ili ublaži svoje inherentne kontradikcije, kao i da prizna legitimitet neevrocentričnih epistemoloških perspektiva.

Takozvana generacija utopije (Paraskeva, 2021) – koja se zalaže za toliko pohvalnih borbi za pravedno obrazovanje i kurikulum – uprkos poteškoćama nastoji da se odvoji od jezivog epistemološkog potčinjavanja zapadnim modelima, kao da su ovi modeli jedini jezik, jedini skup koncepata i jedinstvena matrica koja može da odgovori na brojne različite i raznovrsne izazove sa kojima se čovečanstvo suočava (Paraskeva, 2023; 2021). Naši kontrahegemonijski kurikularni principi nisu u stanju da zamisle „reč i svet“ mimo zapadnjačkog evrocentričnog matriksa (Paraskeva, 2023; 2021). Promena oblika teorici-da, koja kontaminira oblast, u suštini je sinhronizovana sa zamahom širenja „ateoretičnosti“ koji prožima akademsku zajednicu (videti: Reckwitz & Rosa, 2023). Dok, s jedne strane, moramo da priznamo značajne prednosti i postignuća koje su ostvarili brojni kontrahegemonijski pokreti, realnost nas, s druge strane, primorava da priznamo da su se ti pokreti pokazali kao nedovoljni da okrenu situaciju u sopstvenu korist. Ponestaje im pitanja i odgovora. Naša oblast tone u „pleonastičko [rasuđivanje] u kojem se pitanja i odgovori svode na istu stvar“, kako bi to sročio Emil Čoran (Cioran, 1975: 51). Čini se da se „komplikovani razgovor“ može odvijati samo u granicama koje nameće određeno evrocentrično rasuđivanje. Priznavanje izuzetnih postignuća koja su ostvarili brojni kontrahegemonijski pokreti nije nepodudarna realnost sa katastrofalnim teorijskim stanjem izazvanim teoricidom u kojem živimo. Naprotiv, njihova otvorena kompatibilnost bi trebalo da nas natera da se zapitamo kako je uopšte došlo do toga da se nađemo u

ovom teorijskom vakuumu, uprkos brojnim dostignućima. Teoriciđ ne može da se posmatra kao čin poštovanja bilo kog antikolonijalnog ili dekolonijalnog matriksa.

Negiranje epistemicidne prirode kurikuluma, negiranje despotske prirode evrocentričnog razuma u čijoj osnovi deluju hegemonijski impulsi, kao i negiranje teoriciđne prirode polja – sve to ne samo da predstavlja savršeni primer despotske smelosti modernih zapadnih evrocentričnih epistemoloških paradigmi, nego sve više opravdava centralnost sledećeg pitanja: mogu li dominantne kurikularne teorije (ovde uključujem i hegemonijske i kontrahegemonijske) da opišu stvarnost sa kojom se suočavamo kao čovečanstvo? Da li one opisuju društvo u kojem živimo? Da li one opisuju i beskonačne, bezbrojne singularnosti koje obuhvataju čovečanstvo?

Ukoliko je kurikularno rezonovanje prožeto eugeničkim prvobitnim grehom, kako bi ijedan teorijski okvir – ma kakav bio – koji proizilazi iz takvog rasuđivanja, mogao da objasni bezgraničnu raznovrsnost i epistemološke razlike stvarnosti? Beskrajno pluralno više nego ikad, o rizomatskom čovečanstvu se teorijski jedino može govoriti putem bezbrojnih rizomatskih teorija, lutajućim putem. Istrajavanje u takvom poricanju oglašava se o „nemogućnost objedinjavanja svih otpora i radnji pod jednu zajedničku veliku teoriju“ (Santos, 1999: 203); „što predstavlja samo odjek“ onoga što je Ellsvortova (Ellsworth, 1989) tako prikladno proglasila, a što ne smemo ignorisati. U duhu njenog rada (Ellsworth, 1989: 301), ponovio bih da nam većina kritičnih paradigmi i dalje ne pruža

jasnu izjavu o svojim političkim agendama [a] napore ulažu u to da sakriju da oni, kao kritički pedagozi, zapravo nastoje da javne resurse (učionice, školski pribor, plate nastavnika i profesora, akademske zahteve i diplome) prilagode raznim „progresivnim“ političkim agendama u koje veruju kao zastupnike javnog dobra – koji, kao takvi, zaslužuju javne resurse.

Iako to predstavlja pravi izazov, krucijalno je odvojiti se od fundamentalizma evrocentričnog razmišljanja i postaviti se u nezapadne, neevrocentrične, antikolonijalne i dekolonijalne epistemološke okvire. Takvo raskidanje veza uspostavlja dekolonijalan zaokret, čime se izaziva ne samo komplikovan nego i nederivativan razgovor, koji poziva na „neponorne kulturne kontakte“ (De Alba, 2026), kao radikalni kurikularni kohabitus. Budući da se i dalje poriče da matriks modernosti nazaduje ili da mora pažljivo da se čuva usled svojih palijativnih potreba, upornost u poricanju „hospiciđne“ prirode fundamentalizma karakterističnog za kartezijsko rasuđivanje (Andreotti 2002; Darder, 2026) ničim ne doprinosi rešavanju izazova sa kojima se suočavamo kao oblast. Na primer, upadljiva tišina koja bi zavaljala kad god bi se, tokom decenija, u bezbrojnim komplikovanim razgovorima metode *currere* povelala reč o kastama, istovremeno je upečatljivi simptom i posledica naučne oblasti koja je izgubljena u vremenu i dugoročno teorijski sakaćena, proizvođaća nepredvidljivih, nepromišljenih i opasnih pravaca ili teorijski manjkave oblasti koju je zarobio ponorni intelektualni i teorijski rad, koju uporno promovise epistemicidan matriks, te je stoga nepopravljivo osuđena da nastavi da proizvodi ponorne teorijske podele i fabrikuje razdornu istoriju.

Iz navedenih razloga, ključno je otvoriti epistemicidni kanon ovog polja, koji raskršta s evrocentričnim epistemološkim impulsima (Amin, 1990) i rastavlja ponornu podelu pu-

tem izlaganja problema koje je sociološka intervencija zaobišla, poput pojave kaste, kao temu za obradu u kurikulumnim debatama (Paraskeva, 2025; 2023; 2015). Preko potrebno je da se posvetimo „multikulturnom dijalogu koji ne nagađa iluzorno prisustvo nepostojeće simetrije među kulturama“ (Dussel, 2026: 107). To implicira, kako Dasel (Dussel, 2026: 112-113) dodaje,

interkulturni dijalog koji nije, niti u većoj meri niti isključivo, tip dijaloga vođen između kulturnih apologeta koji nastoje da drugima prikažu vrline i vrednosti svoje sopstvene kulture. To je, iznad svega, dijalog između kritičkih inovatora kulture (intelektualaca na „granicama“), između njihove sopstvene kulture i modernosti. To je, pre svega, dijalog između „kriza periferije“; taj dijalog prvo mora da bude interkulturni oblik dijaloga vođen između dveju kulturnih sredina na istom razvojnem stadijumu, pre nego što može da pređe u oblik dijaloga između dveju sredina na različitim razvojnim stadijumima.

Takav potez zahteva posvećenost priznavanju legitimiteta epistemologija s juga, odnosno, iz sredina u razvoju (Santos, 2007), radikalnog kohabitusa (Paraskeva, 2023; 2024; 2025) različitih i raznovrsnih epistemoloških pravaca, što vodi do kritičke teorije kastinskog kurikuluma, krčeći put „ekologiji – kurikulumnih – znanja“ (Santos, 2014). Takva ekologija implicira raskidanje veza, što zagovara epistemološku neposlušnost kao bolji izbor od kontinuirane težnje ka „novini“ u okvirima tog istog eugenički zaraženog matriksa (Dussel, 2025; Mignolo, 2025). Takva teorija pomaže sastavljanju postponornog matriksa. Oblast pravednog kurikuluma zalaže se za teoriju pravednog kurikuluma, onakvu vrstu teorije koja je epistemološki „neambisalna“. Postponorna kurikulumna teorija i razvoj podrazumevaju deambisalni zamah širenja – „raskid veza“, koji ne stremlji nužno neponornom matriksu, već prokrčuje put „neambisalnom“ kurikulumnom nacrtu koji vešto oslikava brojne epistemološke impulse čovečanstva, pružajući položaj nedodirljivosti kurikulumnim debatama.

Ne postoji savršena teorija (Quantz, 2011). Međutim, naša kritika će uvek biti katalitična i izolovana od oblasti koja uporno ostaje dislocirana tako što ignoriše krucijalne kategorije – kao što su kaste – koje brutalizuju milijarde ljudskih bića širom sveta. Ne može biti socijalno pravedne teorije bez teorije koja odražava antikolonijalnu i dekolonijalnu misao, kao ni bez vodećih teorijskih učešća antikolonijalnih i dekolonijalnih teorija, koje takođe potiču iz globalnog juga. Od krucijalne je važnosti da priznamo da se „dekolonijalno razmišljanje razlikuje od postkolonijalne teorije i postkolonijalnih studija na taj način da njihova genealogija leži u francuskom poststrukturalizmu pre nego u teško shvatljivoj istoriji planetarnog dekolonijalnog razmišljanja“ (Mignolo, 2026: 127). Mignolo (Mignolo, 2026: 132) tvrdi:

Dekolonijalno razmišljanje se još uvek nije pojavilo, čak ni u najekstremnijim levičarskim publikacijama. A razlog tome leži u činjenici da dekolonijalno razmišljanje ne pripada levici, već nečemu sasvim drugačijem: to je raskidanje odnosa s modernom političkom epistemom artikulisanom kao desnica, centar i levica; to otvara prolaz nečemu sasvim drugom, u hodu, tražeći sebe u razlici.

Teoriciđ jeste i posledica decenija komplikovanih razgovora koji su sistematično marginalizovali upozorenja mnogih kritiĉkih teoretiĉara, da se „kritiĉko mišljenje kao naĉin razmišljanja pomraĉilo kako u širem društvenom kontekstu, tako i u sferi javnog školanja“ (Giroux, 1979: 281). Teoriciđ je rendgenski snimak oblasti putem nederivativnog raskidanja veza, iskopavanja oblasti „iz drugih lokaliteta“ (Mignolo, 2026: 135).

Oni koji su rođeni i odrasli u Africi, ubrzo su mogli da ĉuju od svojih predaka da su problemi u svetu nastali kada su zebre belih pruga proglasile svoju superiornost nad zebroma crnih pruga. U kurikulumu, svi smo mi zebre. Nema svrhe da one sa „belim prugama“ tvrde da su nadmoćne. Onima koji prihvataju postojanje u ovirima premisa koje Pjer Tejar brani – da „mi nismo ovde kao ljudska bića sa spiritualnim iskustvom, već stvari stoje suprotno: svi smo mi beskonaĉna spiritualna bića sa privremenim ljudskim iskustvom“ – metafora zebri daje drugaĉiji odjek.

Ovo je bitka beskonaĉnog, borba za beskonaĉno, vođena u beskonaĉnom, ali ipak ne beskrajna bitka. „Beskonaĉno je tada moguće“ (Pessoa, 2006: 56), a sadašnjost je moguća kao „jedina stvarnost koja je veĉno prisutna, sada neumiruća“ (Pessoa, 2006: 47). Kritiĉkim teorijama i pedagogijama potrebna je nova „postambisalna“ logika za moguću utopiju pravednog sveta. Mi moramo da teoriju „vratimo“ u epicenter visokog obrazovanja i kurikularnih debata u školovanju uĉitelja i nastavnika – ova bitka mora da bude pobeđena na univerzitetima na kojima se obrazuju uĉitelji i nastavnici. Nova teorija, ipak. Nederivativna, neponorna, samo teorija za pristojan život, kako se Santos (Santos, 2018) zalaže.

Lutajuća teorija kurikuluma (LTK): nederivativni pristup

Svestan mrtve taĉke u kojoj se našla ova oblast – i pod dubokim uticajima antikolonijalnog i dekolonijalnog neevrocentriĉnog pristupa – proglasio sam epistemicidnu prirodu ove oblasti (Paraskeva, 2011) i zagovarao potrebu za sukob „na frontu“ s njenim istorijskim epistemicidnim rasuđivanjem. Zalagao sam se za potrebu za deteritorijalizacijom *tout court* i za pretpostavku lutajuće teorijske kurikularne (LTK) perspektive. Tvrdio sam da je kurikularno rasuđivanje razdorno, eugeniĉko u svojim hegemonijskim i kontrahegemonijskim evrocentriĉnim principima, pritom i zagovarao nederivativan neponoran pristup (Santos, 2014; Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016; 2011), jedan deteritorijalizovani, dekolonijalni, lutajući kurikularni pristup teorijskoj stazi (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016; 2011). Teoretiĉar LTK jeste „prelom [eugeniĉkog] toĉka vremena“, kako Fridrih Niĉe (Nietzsche, 1990: 6) prekida i destabilizuje kurikulum kao eugeniĉku privremenost ljudskog bića, kao što je Hjubner proglasio.

Takva konfrontacija izaziva istorijsko-sociološka odsustva našeg polja (Santos, 2014) i dovodi u pitanje institucionalizaciju vidljivosti i postojanja određenih formi znanja – u svojoj osnovi evrocentriĉnih – ĉime kurikularnu teoriju i istoriju ove oblasti izguruje iz kolonijalne zone. Ja ovakav moment sile nazivam „epistemološkim zaokretom“, dekolonijalnim momentom (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016; 2011).

LTK je bila prihvaćena od strane uĉenjaka u Sjedinjenim Ameriĉkim drŹavama i izvan njih, pri ĉemu su prihvatili i ono što Enrike Dusel (Dussel, 2013) naziva analektikom – ili

ana-dijalektičkim pristupom – što prekida ponorni jaz koji su stvorile modernističke i postmodernističke rasprave, što uporno oslikava globalni jug kao nepostojeći. LTK postavlja borbu protiv epistemicida i reverzibilnih epistemicida kao centar gravitacije nove utopijske logike, onakve kakva je posvećena svojoj ulozi performativnog iskaza (Austin, 1962), drugim rečima, „tip lutajuće teorije koja nešto učini tako što to izgovori“. LTK je osetljiv na epistemološku raznolikost i razlike u svetu. Teoretičar LTK jeste epistemološki izgnanik – njegov pravednički politički stav duboko je posvećen društvenoj, kognitivnoj i intergeneracijskoj pravdi. Kritičke i postkritičke teorije i pedagogije – način na koji svi mi razmišljamo i postupamo – moraju da se završe, kao i da se deteritorijalizuju; moraju da radikalno raskrste sa sopstvenim opresivnim zapadnjačko-evrocentričnim matriksom na takav način da ga ne odbacuju, kao i da se posvete „radikalnom suživotu obeju strana zida“ (Paraskeva, 2023). Kao što Žao (Zhao, 2019: 27) tvrdi:

LTK je oblik dekolonijalnog mišljenja koji prepoznaje ekološku koegzistenciju različitih epistemoloških oblika znanja širom sveta, obraćajući pažnju na znanje i epistemologije koje su u velikoj meri marginalizovane i diskreditovane u trenutnom svetskom poretku.

Teoretičar LTK je „epistemološki i kulturni lekar“, kako bi to Fridrih Niče (Nietzsche, 1990: 55) formulisao, koji izrađuje LTK kao, i kroz, novu konceptualnu gramatiku (Jupp, 2017), koja luta unutar i izvan: (a) kolonijalnosti moći, znanja i bivstovanja; (b) epistemicida, lingvicida, ambisalnosti i ekologije znanja; kao i (c) poststrukturalističkog hermeneutičkog lutanja koje proizvodi neponornu abecedu znanja (Paraskeva, 2022a; 2022b).

LTK teži „opštoj epistemologiji nemogućnosti opšte epistemologije“ (Santos, 2007: 67), čuvajući i negujući „besmrtnost beskrajnog pluridiverzalnog intelekta ostvarenog putem obrazovanja“ (videti: Nietzsche, 1990: 4). To je teorija ljudskih prava, kako bi Santos (Santos, 2009) nesumnjivo formulisao. LTK podrazumeva drugačijeg teoretičara, koji izaziva i izazivan je teorijskim usmerenjem koje je neprecizno, ali rigorozno; on ili ona „beži“ od svakog nesrećnog kanona; to podrazumeva teoretičara koji je posvećen kretanju put „ambisalnog epistemološkog terena“, izazivajući epistemološku apstinenciju teorijske uniformnosti i stabilizacije. Teorija (i teoretičar) lutajućeg kurikuluma jeste vulkanski lanac koji pokazuje neprestano odsustvo ekvilibrija; teorija (i teoretičar) lutajućeg kurikuluma uvek je stranac svom sopstvenom jeziku. Međutim, ne radi se o izolovanom postupku; u pitanju je nastanjenost usamljenost. LTK se hvata u koštac sa svakim oblikom *prirodno naklonjenog istraživanja*; drugim rečima, hvata se u koštac sa svakim oblikom romantizacije domorodačkih kultura i znanja, i nije povezan ni sa kakvim dihotičnim kosturom zapada, niti ostalih (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016). Kao i Niče (Nietzsche, 1990: 10), teoretičar LTK „nastoji da shvati unutrašnju koherentnost i potrebu svake istinske kulture“.

LTK, kako to tvrdi Darder (Darder, 2016), jeste „epistemologija oslobođenja koja je u stanju da uporno dovodi u pitanje strukture autoriteta, hijerarhije i dominacije u svakom životnom aspektu i mora da bude kultivisana, negovana i otelotvorena u blagoslovenom neredu i nezgrapnom haosu svakodnevice u školama i zajednicama“ (Darder, 2016: 12). LTK dosta govori o legitimitetu Kalibanovog koscijentizma (Nkrumah, 1964). LTK, koja je

po svojoj prirodi metamorfoza raslojavanja, „prag beskonačne žalosti“ (Couto, 2008: 105), zagovara da se ide protiv zamaha širenja „okcidentoze i mehanotike“, kao i da se to stanovište prevaziđe (Al-L-Ahmad, 1984: 31). LTK „nije samo prizivanje ili izazivanje; ono daje primer kako ideje mogu ostavljati snažan utisak kada se dodaju izvorima kurikularnih studija tako što značajno uključuju radove“ (Schubert, 2017: 10) koji nadmašuju moderne zapadne evrocentrične epistemološke dominantne i kontradominantne tradicije. Pored toga, teoretičari LTK dovode u pitanje apsolutistički kult dominantne naučnosti nauke – u osnovi evrocentrične – potčinjene merkantilističkim krugovima cirkulacije kultrune proizvodnje. LTK zagovara kurikularnu transmodernost koja je

multikulturalna, svestrana, hibridna, postkolonijalna, pluralistička, tolerantna i demokratska (ali mimo moderne liberalne demokratije Evropske države). Imaće sjajne hiljadugodišnje tradicije i uvažavaće eksterioritet i heterogene identitete. Većina čovečanstva održava, reorganizuje (obnavljajući i uključujući elemente globalnosti) i kreativno razvija kulture u svom svakodnevnom, prosvetljenom horizontu. Kulture ove većine produbljuju vrednosni „zdrav razum“ stvarnih i posebnih postojanja svojih učesnika, suprotstavljajući se isključujućem procesu globalizacije, koji upravo zbog ovog procesa nenamerno „gura“ k procesu „transmodernosti“. To je povratak ka svesti značajnih većina čovečanstva, od njihove isključene nesvesti tokom istorije! (Dussel, 2002: 236)

Drugim rečima, LTK „nastoji da ispuni nedovršeni i nepotpuni projekat dekolonizacije iz dvadesetog veka koji teži svetu izvan modernosti“ (Grosfoguel, 2007: 179). LTK prevazilazi tradicionalne dihotomije; teži artikulaciji kritičkog kosmopolitanizma koji nadilazi nacionalizam i kolonijalizam; teži proizvodnji znanja koje nadilazi fundamentalizme koji karakterišu treći svet i evrocentrizam; teži proizvodnji radikalne postkapitalističke politike koja nadilazi politiku identiteta; teži prevazilaženju tradicionalne dihotomije između političke ekonomije i kulturnih studija; nastoji da se pomakne od ekonomskog redukcionizma i kulturalizma (Grosfoguel et al., 2007).

LTK je naprasno obeznačavanje i reoznačavanje, odnosno, „trijangulisana svest u-akciji, locirano i onako-kako-se-dogodilo“ (Garza & Jupp, 2026). Kapacitet i posvećenost koje LTK gaji prema kohabitusu beskrajnih onto-epistemoloških struja na globalnom severu i globalnom jugu poništava jedan od najozbiljnijih aspekata mišljenja u domenu moderniteta, njegovu ponornu prirodu. Takav kohabituz raznovrsnih i različitih epistemoloških tokova implicira ono što su Noa de Lisovoj i Selin Norman (Lissovoy & Norman, 2016) nazvali „rekonekcija“, što se suprotstavlja eugeničkoj monumentalnosti modernog zapadnog evrocentrizma.

Dok zapadni projekat, zajedno sa iskrivljenom logikom koju proizvodi, produkuje pedagoške pristupe koji se suprotstavljaju istraživanju, dijalogu i samom razmišljanju, pluriverzalno epistemološko preusmerenje u podučavanju odbacuje prikazivanje nastavnika i kurikuluma kao fiksiranih i nepokretnih, te umesto toga pristupa podučavanju na fluidan način, znatiželjom i ljubavlju. Dekolonijalni i analektički kurikulum, neograničen zidovima koji je postavio

svet evropeidne rase, radi na tome da poremeti mit o kolonijalnoj trajnosti i zapadnoj univerzalnosti – mit koji širi ideju da ne postoje održive opcije mimo naše trenutne stvarnosti i znanja koje je u njoj konstituisano. (De Lissvoy & Norman, 2026: 326).

Raskidanje veza i dekolonizacija – uz odavanje počasti nasleđu kritičkog puta, podižući ga na drugi nivo – takođe je dekolonijalni pokušaj bavljenja kritičkom teorijom (Kellner, 1989: 2). Postupajući na taj način, lutajuća teorija kurikulum preispituje utopizam; odgovara na Habermasov (Habermas, 1981) izazov modernosti kao nepotpunog projekta i posvećuje se procesima dekolonizacije. Pomaže nam da razumemo koliko je ključno preispitati tačne epistemološke boje naše bitke za pravedno obrazovanje i društvo. Naš zadatak nije da „pucamo u utopiste“ (Santos, 1995) niti u utopiju, koja ne samo da obitava u nama, nego i izvire iz krhotina modernosti. Zadatak koji imamo mi, kao učenjaci u polju obrazovanja i kurikulum, jeste da dekolonizujemo tu utopiju i raskrstimo veze s njom, što jeste ključna posvećenost beskrupuloznoj kritici svake postojeće epistemologije kao sine qua non uslova za pravednu teoriju kurikulum. Ovo je nesumnjivo najbolja bitka koju možemo da vodimo kako bismo otvorili zapadni evrocentrični kanon demokratije (Santos, 2007), te na taj način popločali put ka neponornom i pravednom društvu putem nederivativne kurikularne teorije. LTK je onto-epistemološka deklaracija nezavisnosti. To je narodna teorija koja odražava epistemološke razlike i raznolikost sveta. U tom smislu, LTK će uvek biti neizvestan manifest za manifest neizvesnosti. Teoretičar LTK razume da je, više od traženja „istine“, krucijalno da se na nederivativan način shvate metamorfoze u ljudskom biću (Nietzsche, 1990: 50).

Literatura

- Alba, A. (1998). *Curriculum: Crisis, Mito y Perspectivas*. Miña y Dávila.
- Al-I-Ahmad, J. (1984). *Occidentosis: A Plague from the West*. Mizan Press.
- Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and Curriculum*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Baker, B. (2009). *The New Curriculum History*. Sense Publishers.
- Ball, S. (2007). *Education Plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*. Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). *Identity*. Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *O Poder Simbólico, [Symbolic Power]*. DIFEL.
- Carlson, D. (2005). The Question Concerning Curriculum Theory. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 1, 1 – 14.
- Cioran, E. M. (1975). *A short history of decay*. Penguin.
- Couto, M. (2008). *Terra Sonambula, [Sleepwalking Land]*. Leya.
- Cremin, L. (1964). *The Transformation of School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. Vintage Books.

- Darder, A. (2016). Foreword. Ruthlessness and the Forging of Liberatory Epistemologies: An Arduous Journey. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Curriculum Epistemicides* (pp. 9 - 16). Routledge.
- Darder, A. (2026). Teaching for the End of the World (As We Know It) Decolonizing the Curricular Limits of Modernity, In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 243 – 276). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- De Alba, A. (2026). Itinerant Curriculum and Cultural Contact in the Transmodernity of the World-Worlds. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 332 - 342). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- De Lissovoy, N. & Norman, C. (2026). Beyond Curricular Monumentalism. Whiteness as a Defense Against Thinking. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp 315 - 331). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The Child and the Curriculum*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. MacMillan.
- Dussel, E. (2002). World system and trasmodernity. *Neplanta, Views from South*, 3(2), pp. 221–244. Duke University Press.
- Dussel, E. (2013). *Ethics of liberation. In the age of globalization and exclusion*. Duke University Press.
- Dussel, E. (2026). Transmodernity and Interculturality. An Interpretation from the Perspective of Philosophy of Liberation. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 90 - 123). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297 - 324.
- Fanon, F. (2001). *Wretched of the Earth*. Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The Politics of Education. Culture, Power, and Liberation*. Bergin and Garvey. <https://doi.org/10.1525/AA.1986.88.1.02A00910>
- Garza, R. & Jupp, J. (2026). Arrebato's Arc of Meaning. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 343 – 369). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- Gil, J. (1998). *Metamorphoses of the Body*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Gil, J. (2009). *Em Busca da Identidade. O Desnorte, [In Search of Identity. The Bewilderment]*. Relógio D'Água.
- Giroux, H. (1979). Schooling and the Culture of Positivism. Notes on the Death of History. *Educational Theory*, 29(4), 263 – 284.
- Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling*. Temple University Press.
- Giroux, H. (2004). *The terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Goldberg, D. (2018). The Reason of Unreason: Achille Mbembe and David Theo Goldberg in conversation about Critique of Black Reason. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 35, 205 - 227.
- Gore, J. (1993). *The Struggle for Pedagogies. Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth*. Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1999). *Antonio Gramsci: Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.
- Grosfoguel, R., Saldivar, J. D., & Torres, N. M. (2007). *Unsettling postcoloniality: Coloniality, transmodernity and border thinking*. Duke University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1981). Modernity versus Postmodernity. *New German Critique*, 22, 3 - 14.

- Harding, S. (2008). *Sciences from Bellow: Feminisms, Postcolonialities and Modernities*. Duke University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Henry, P. (2000). *The Caliban Reason*. Routledge.
- Huebner, D. (1976). The Moribund Curriculum Field: It's Wake and Our Work. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6(2), 153 - 167.
- Huebner, D. (2022). A Foreword—Second Edition: Theory Not as a Schema for “Acting,” But for “Looking”. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory* (pp. 5 - 10). Palgrave (2nd Edition).
- Jupp, J. (2017). Decolonizing and De-Canonizing Curriculum Studies. The Contribution of Joao M. Paraskeva Works. *Journal for the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1 - 25. <https://doi.org/10.14288/jaaacs.v12i1.189706>
- Kellner, D. (1989). *Critical Theory, Marxism and Modernity*. The John Hopkins University Press.
- Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. Routledge.
- Krug, E. (1969). *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Liston, D. (1988). *Capitalist Schools. Explanation and Ethics in Radical Studies of Schooling*. Routledge.
- Lorde, A. (2007). *Sister Outsider*. Crossing Press.
- Macdonald, J. (1967). An Example of Disciplined Curriculum Thinking, *Theory into Practice*, 6 (4). 166 - 171.
- Marcuse, H. (2002). *One-Dimensional Man*. Routledge.
- Marx, K. (1976). *Capital. Volume 1*. Penguin.
- Mbembe, A. (2017). *The Critique of the Black Reason*. Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity. Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2026). Epistemic Disobedience and the Decolonial Option. A Manifesto. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 124 - 151). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- Nietzsche, F. (1990). *Philosophy and Truth*. Humanity Books.
- Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2011). *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. Palgrave (1st Edition)
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2013). School Rituals as a Counter-hegemonic Performance: Rituals and Student Identity in Education: Ritual Critique for a New Pedagogy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 11(5), 484 - 493. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2013.11.5.643>
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2014). *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. Palgrave (Upgraded Paperback 1st Edition)
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2016). *Curriculum Epistemicides*. Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2018). *The Epistemicide. Towards a Just Curriculum Theory*. Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2021). *The Generation of Utopia*. Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2022a). *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. Palgrave (2nd Edition)
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2022b). *The Curriculum. A New Comprehensive Reader*. Peter Lang.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2023). *Critical Perspectives on the Denial of Caste in Educational Debate: Towards a Non-derivative Curriculum Reason*. Routledge.

- Paraskeva, J. M. (2024). *Itinerant Curriculum Theory. A Declaration of Epistemological Independence*. Bloomsbury.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2025). On caste: towards critical non-derivative caste curriculum theory. *Whiteness and Education*, 1 - 20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23793406.2025.2560411>
- Paraskeva, J. M., & Huebner, D. E. (2022). Curriculum Afterword: The Dialogue Dwayne Huebner & João M. Paraskeva. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory* (pp. 215 - 262). Palgrave (2nd Edition). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77420-2_10
- Paraskeva, J. M., & Huebner, D. E. (2023). Dialectical materialism: an alternative way of thinking and doing education alternatively. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 55(1), 270-289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2023.2207627>
- Fernando P. (2006). *Textos Filosóficos* (Vol. II). Nova Ática.
- Popkewitz, T. (1976). Myths of Social Science in Curriculum. *The Educational Forum*, 40(3), 317-328.
- Quijano, A. (1991). Colonialidad y Modernidad/Racionalidad. *Perú Indígena*, 29(1), 11-21.
- Santos, B. de S. (1995). *Towards a New Common Sense*. Routledge.
- Santos, B. de S. (1999). 'Porque é tão difícil construir uma teoria crítica? [Why is it so difficult to build a critical theory?];' *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 54(Junho): 197-215.
- Santos, B. de S. (2007). Beyond Abyssal Thinking. *From Global Lines to Ecologies of Knowledges*, Review, 30(1), 45-89.
- Santos, B. de S. (2009). 'If God Were a Human Rights Activist: Human Rights and the Challenge of Political Theologies. Is Humanity Enough? The Secular Theology of Human Rights.' *Law, Social Justice and Global Development*, 1. Retrieved www.go.warwick.ac.uk/elj/lgd/2009_/santos
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies from the South*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Santos, B. de S. (2018). *The End of the Cognitive Empire*. Duke University Press.
- Saramago, J. (1999). *Folhas Políticas*. Caminho.
- Saramago, J. (2009). *Death with Interruptions*. Houghton & Mifflin Harcourt Publishing.
- Schubert, W., Schubert, A. & Lynn, L. (1980). *Curriculum Books; The First Eighty Years*. University Press of America.
- Schubert, W. (1986). *Curriculum, Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility*. MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Schubert, W. (2017). Growing Curriculum Studies: Contributions of João M. Paraskeva. *Journal for the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.14288/jaaacs.v12i1.189714>
- Tyack, D. (1974). *The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education*. Harvard University Press.
- Todorova, M. (1997). *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford University Press.
- Walsh, C. (2012). 'Other' Knowledges, 'Other' Critiques Reflections on the Politics and Practices of Philosophy and Decoloniality in the Other America. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(3), 11-27. <https://doi.org/10.5070/T413012880>
- Watkins, W. (1993). Black Curriculum Orientations. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(3), 321-38.
- Wexler, P. (1976). *The Sociology of Education: Beyond Inequality*. The Bobbs-Merrill.
- Wexler, P. (1987). *Social Analysis of Culture. After the New Sociology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Williams, R. (1976). Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory. In R. Dale, G. Esland & M. MacDonald (Eds.), *Schooling and Capitalism. A Sociological Reader* (pp. 202-210). Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Zhao, W. (2019). *China's Education, Curriculum Knowledge, and Cultural Inscriptions. Dancing with the Wind*. Routledge.

Primljeno: 09.11.2025.

Korigovana verzija primljena: 14.11.2025.

Prihvaćeno za štampu: 14.11.2025.

Žoao Paraskeva

Fakultet humanističkih i društvenih nauka, Univerzitet u Stratklajdu, Glazgov, Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7893-5688>



Ovaj rad je objavljen pod licencom Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). Dopušteno je da se delo kopira i distribuira u svim medijima i formatima, da se prerađuje, menja i nadograđuje u bilo koje svrhe, uključujući i komercijalne, pod uslovom da se na pravilan način citiraju njegovi prvobitni autori, postavi link ka originalnoj licenci i naznači da li je delo izmenjeno. Korisnici su pri tome dužni da navedu pun bibliografski opis članka objavljenog u ovom časopisu (autori, naslov rada, naslov časopisa, volumen, sveska, paginacija), kao i njegovu DOI oznaku, a u slučaju objavljivanja u elektronskoj formi takođe su dužni da postave i HTML link.

Curriculum Theorycide! Calling for an Itinerant Curriculum Theory¹

João Paraskeva² 

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Strathclyde,
Glasgow, United Kingdom

Abstract *The curriculum field faces a ‘theorycide’, which is not necessarily the absence of a theory, but the yoke of a ‘non-theory theory’ momentum which has worsened, especially in the last half of the last century. Drawing on a critical, anticolonial, and decolonial theoretical framework, my aim in this essay is to examine the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic Eurocentric debates in our field, but within the context of modernity and its eugenic coloniality, the Prosperous reason, thus framing the epistemicidal nature of the field. In so doing, the essay dissects the contemporary theoretical hemorrhage we face as a field, what I have called ‘curriculum involution’ and ‘curriculum imparity’. A lethal theoretical void has emerged from the epistemological civil war within and between dominant and counter-dominant traditions, triggering what I call the theorycide. The article advocates a way out of such ‘involution’ through an itinerant curriculum theory, a non-derivative anti-colonial and de-colonial approach responsive to the world’s epistemological difference, and diversity. The essay frames ICT as a declaration of epistemological independence against the scientific monumentalism of Eurocentrism that egregiously dehumanizes the legitimacy of Caliban’s reason.*

Keywords: *curriculum epistemicide, theorycide, itinerant curriculum theory, curriculum involution, curriculum imparity, delinking.*

1 This article is an updated version of a previous piece. A word of gratitude to Ian Kinchin and Sarah Hayes for their valuable comments on previous versions of this essay. Also, many thanks to my doctoral students at the University of Strathclyde for some of the ideas in this piece. Our theoretical discussions, in particular in our Friday seminars on Marxism and Education make us better understand the political nature of education, and how it is crucial to frame it within the complex dynamics of ideological production.

2 joao.paraskeva@strath.ac.uk

The itinerant Curriculum theory is an epistemology of liberation that can persistently challenge structures of authority, hierarchy, and domination in every aspect of life.

(Darder, 2016)

Introit

More than a century after its emergence, the field of curriculum studies spends the first decades of the 21st century plunged in what I have persistently called ‘theorycide’, which is not exactly the absence of a theory, but rather the inauguration of ‘non-theory theory.’ Crafting within a critical and anti-colonial theoretical framework, this essay builds upon previous examinations I have conducted in other contexts (Paraskeva, 2024; 2023; 2022; 2021), exploring and presenting newer possible paths. The aim of this piece is a threefold exfoliation (Gil, 2009) process that respects one of the pillars of my trajectory – to confront the reasons for reasoning curriculum theory and its history. First, to examine the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic Eurocentric wrangles in our curriculum field (Schubert & Schubert, 1980) but within the context of modernity and its eugenic coloniality reason (Walsh, 2012), the Prosperous reason (Paraskeva, 2023; 2021; Henry, 2000), thus framing the epistemicidal nature of the field. Second, to dissect the coetaneous theoretical hemorrhage we faced as a field, what I have called ‘curriculum involution’ and ‘curriculum imparity’ (Paraskeva, 2024; 2023; 2021; 2016), a lethal theoretical void erupted from the clashes between dominant and counter-dominant traditions. The smithereens of such wrangles exhibit the insufficiencies of our theory glaringly, leading to a dangerous regression and perpetuating a ‘curriculum occidentosis’ (Paraskeva, 2021). Third, to advocate a way out of such ‘involution’ through an itinerant curriculum theory (ICT); I argue ICT as a non-derivative anti-colonial and de-colonial approach responsive to the world’s epistemological difference and diversity - a world in a perpetual dynamic of change; that is a theory of translation (Santos, 2014) out of the yoke of Eurocentrism – yet not necessarily against. ICT requests an interdisciplinary learning matrix addressing real challenges facing humanity and its development.

The chapter highlights the urgent need to disentangle from Eurocentric fundamentalism and engage in a decolonial endeavor to develop a more robust, non-derivative critical theory; it advocates how ICT constitutes a declaration of epistemological independence and freedom against the male scientific monumentalism of Eurocentrism (Harding, 2008; Popkewitz, 1976) that egregiously dehumanizes the legitimacy of the Caliban reason (Fanon, 2001; Henry, 2000).

An Exhausted and Divisive Prosperous Reason

Our field’s history - or what’s left (Paraskeva & Huebner, 2022) - is saturated with pugnacious battles between and within hegemonic and counter-hegemonic traditions. As I have persistently argued elsewhere (2022a, p. 63; also, 2022b; 2014; 2011), the field is:

theoretically shattered and profoundly disputed, to the extent that disputes have become an endemic part of the field's DNA. In some cases, such quarrels have been intellectually sanguinary. Sometimes, the field appears to be an estuary of ideological corpses and debris upon which new cultural battles will be fought.

Our field, Carlson (2005) accurately argues, can no longer be considered 'a distinctive field, with a unique history, a complex present, and uncertain future, because the category does not become reified (p. 3). He underlines that the field needs to be understood as 'a historical construct assembled out of cultural battles over power and knowledge, and... it needs to be treated as a 'slippery' category whose meaning is unsettled and even contested.' Curriculum theorizing is indeed a 'challenging undertaking [framed] by the total rational potential of [man]' (Macdonald, 1967, pp. 166 -169).

A careful analysis of the core of these disputes enables us to unpack a set of issues, of which I would like to highlight two. One is related to the fact that at no historical moment has there been absolute supremacy of any one group over another (Baker, 2009; Cremin, 1964; Kliebard, 1995; Krug, 1969; Schubert, 1986; Tyack, 1974; Watkins, 1993). Successive 'dominant groups' have never been able to annihilate/exterminate other groups or movements within and beyond their platforms. Since the field's emergence at the end of the nineteenth century - with the quarrels between 'humanists', 'developmentalists', 'social efficiencists', and 'social meliorists' until today, with the brutal power of 'neoliberal movements' that somehow imposed a neoliberal education, curriculum, and pedagogy (Ball, 2007; Giroux, 2004; Harvey, 2005) - we can see that none of the movements or groups - hegemonic or (let alone) counter-hegemonic - managed to impose their views in an absolutist way. There has been—and will always be—ferocious resistance (Paraskeva, 2022b; 2021; see also: Apple, 1979; Giroux, 1981). The other relates to the fact that the battles within and between hegemonic and counter-hegemonic movements fell into radioactive functionalism – a dangerous and lethal theoretical zone. That is, counter-dominant movements in their complex fight against the functionalist perspectives produced and defended by the dominant traditions – despite notable accomplishments - ended up falling into appalling reactionary functionalism as well - paradoxically the same 'functionalism' that they historically criticized and fought against (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2018; 2012).

As I have been arguing throughout my work (Paraskeva, 2025; 2024; 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2021; 2018; 2016; 2015; 2014; 2011), it is crucial to pose, among others, the following questions: Why did the counter-hegemonic movements sink into the same functionalist quagmire they fought so hard for? Why were they unable to establish themselves as a hegemonic bloc? Why has it been so difficult for critical theories and pedagogies to become hegemonic? Why has it become so oddly tough for critical theories and pedagogies to become dominant, *even* within counter-hegemonic platforms? In a world with so much to criticize, 'why has it become so difficult to produce a [dominant] critical [curriculum] theory? - as Santos (1999) would have put it? If there is no shortage of issues to criticize, 'what is this lack of utopia due to?' (Alba, 1998, p. 12) What happened? Why is it not dominant in Higher Education and teacher education programs? How did we get here? How was it possible? Where did 'we' fail? Who failed? Why were counter-hegemonic

approaches overtly unable to empower the 'have-nots'? (Ellsworth, 1989) Who benefits from such an inability? Why were the cries of particular critical intellectuals persistently ignored? How can critical approaches, Walter Mignolo (2026, p. 125) argues, "be subsumed into the project of modernity/coloniality and decolonization"? If we inject Marxist steroids into the critical curriculum debate, we must question whose guardians are preventing these questions from being placed at the core of our curriculum concerns. At a time when the curriculum has become a commodity and neoliberalism imposes itself as the dominant pedagogy and curricular forms, the fact that powerful deconstructions, such as those of Ellsworth (1989), for example, do not even constitute the periphery in our field's proclamations should make us stop and think. The functionalist and deterministic rationale that permeates the curriculum is also related to use value and exchange value, in which the curriculum is socially constructed and articulates and disarticulates the modes and conditions of production of the capitalist system. (Marx, 1976). Alongside Huebner (Paraskeva & Huebner, 2023; 2022), in another forum, we attempted to contribute to this critical debate. One somehow senses the realization of Dwayne Huebner's predictions decades ago (Huebner, 1976). The field is facing a heavy price for ignoring such a predicament.

As I have already examined elsewhere, part of this failure is related to the triumphalism of dominant groups with positivist and behaviorist inclinations. But this triumphalism explains only one side of the coin. The other side resides precisely at the core of the counter-hegemonic hemisphere and its limited Eurocentric epistemological matrix. That is, the battles between dominant and counter-dominant groups in our field occur within the Eurocentric epistemological hemisphere of modernity; however, they also unveil the inability of a pluriverse 'critical and post-critical river' – what I have called 'the generation of utopia' (Paraskeva, 2021) – to break with such hemisphere. Such a hemisphere is millennially framed within the 'monumentality of white reason' (Mbembe, 2017; Santos, 2018) and refuses to recognize the legitimacy of non-Eurocentric epistemological platforms within and beyond Western modernity.

Like the dominant traditions, counter-hegemonic groups always showed overt incapability – and in some cases refusal – to delink from different 'Prosperous cognitive matrixes' (Henry, 2000) that promote a unique scientific way of reading 'the word and the world' (Freire, 1985) – based fundamentally on a Eurocentric epistemological platform (Mignolo, 2011; Walsh, 2012). In doing so, critical and post-critical pundits became entangled in the complex functionalism – and 'derivativism' (Santos, 2014) – that they had so vividly opposed. Thus, the struggle for the curriculum occurred within the limits imposed by a modern Western Eurocentric reason, disregarding the existence of other epistemological platforms beyond the Eurocentric logic, which reflects the eugenic nature of our field. Eugenics is the field's original sin (Paraskeva, 2022b). The battles between hegemonic and counter-hegemonic traditions mirror the field's epistemicidal nature. While the former – in many cases openly – championed the epistemicide (the killing of knowledge), the latter ended up being incapable of interrupting such epistemicide and, in many ways, ended up helping the scientific and social perpetuation of such anathema (Paraskeva, 2023; 2012; 2022a; 2018). In challenging the epistemicide, the latter produced a reversionary epistemicide (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2021).

Hegemonic and counter-hegemonic movements in the field laboured within a divisive eugenic epistemological matrix. They crafted their arguments and drilled their disputes based on an exhausted, divisive, and derivative reason. As I have argued throughout my work (Paraskeva, 2016; 2011), our field's history, theory, design, and development cannot be grasped accurately out of the modern Western Eurocentric epistemological eugenic reason, accurately defined by Santos (2007, p. 45) as an abyssal thinking. That is,

[it] consists of a system of visible and invisible distinctions, the invisible ones being the foundation of the visible ones. The invisible distinctions are established through radical lines that divide social reality into two realms: the realm of 'this side of the line' and the realm of 'the other side of the line.' The division is such that 'the other side of the line' vanishes as reality, becomes nonexistent, and is indeed produced as nonexistent. Nonexistent means not existing in any relevant or comprehensible way of being. Whatever is produced as nonexistent is radically excluded because it lies beyond the realm of what the accepted conception of inclusion considers to be its other. What most fundamentally characterizes abyssal thinking is thus the impossibility of the co-presence of the two sides of the line. To the extent that it prevails, this side of the line only prevails by exhausting the field of relevant reality. Beyond it, there is only nonexistence, invisibility, non-dialectical absence.

Santos (2007) goes far beyond the position articulated by Enrique Dussel (2026, p. 103), which places Western thought and culture, "with its obvious 'Occidentalism,' has positioned all other cultures as primitive, pre-modern, traditional, and underdeveloped." Beyond the abyssal line, Santos (2007) argues, reality is defined by non-existence.

Such abyssal reason goes well beyond the impossibility of co-presence of 'both sides of the line;' it constitutes a fundamental, radical negation of [the] [an] other existences. The radicalization of such an abyssal episteme is outshone by the 'intensely visible distinctions structuring social reality on this side of the line are grounded on the invisibility of the distinction between this side of the line and the other side' (Santos, 2007, p. 46). In a way, Santos goes well beyond Todorova (1997) regarding the 'incomplete other.' There is no 'incomplete other' (and 'incomplete self') because nothing is beyond the abyssal line. Invisibility and nonexistence of the 'one side' are the roots of visibility and existence of the '(an)other side.' Hegemonic and counter-hegemonic movements fought 'on this side of the line'; pundits from endless diverse critical epistemological rivers wrangled within a matrix defined and proclaimed as unique, the only worldly one able to produce scientific knowledge so dear to unpack the curriculum challenges.

Within the field of curriculum knowledge, 'abyssal thinking consists in granting to modern science the monopoly of the universal distinction between true and false' – as Santos (2007, p. 47) would have framed, to the detriment of ceaseless other ways to grasp the real. The 'exclusionary character of this monopoly is at the core of the modern epistemological disputes between scientific and nonscientific forms of truth' (Santos, 2007, p. 47) that saturates our field. Such a monopoly has confined the

epistemological struggle within a particular framework regarding 'certain kinds of objects under certain circumstances and established by certain methods' (Santos, 2007, p. 47).

Curriculum reason is subjugated to the hegemony of positivism and learning theories (Paraskeva & Huebner, 2023). It is a form of reason that became "the prevailing cultural hegemony, saturating a technocratic rationality as the source of logic that denies the importance of historical consciousness" (Giroux, 1979, p. 267). Dominant curriculum reason mirrors a "positivist rationality that contains a philosophy of history that robs history of its critical possibilities" (Giroux, 1979, p. 267); it thus reflects historically the accurate epistemological colours of the monopoly of the monumentality of a divisive cognitive Empire (Santos, 2018) that produces forms of knowledge of 'the other side' as nonexistent - because unfitted within the scientific scientificity of Western modern thinking (Giroux, 2004). What is worth fighting for can only be grasped from and within 'this side of the line' - fundamentally Eurocentric. On 'the other side of the line,' Santos (2007, p. 47) adds, 'there is no real knowledge; there are beliefs, opinions, intuitive or subjective understandings, which, at the most, may become objects or raw materials for scientific inquiry.' The struggles over 'whose knowledge is of most worth,' sunk into an overt epistemicide. It was an epistemicidal battle.

As I argued in other contexts (Paraskeva, 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016; 2011), in such a 'eugenic' context, not just knowledge but the very question/answer 'what is to think' is totally 'prostituted.' How can 'one' claim that one knows what one claims to know if an immense epistemological platform that congregates an endless myriad of other epistemic forms has been viciously produced as nonexistent? (Paraskeva, 2016). In a society so endlessly diverse, our curriculum is not - as Dewey (1916; 1902) so tirelessly fought for - a microcosm of society. Our curriculum reflects a 'selective tradition' (Williams, 1976, p. 205) but drilled within 'this side of the line.' Curriculum is 'the reason of unreason' as Golberg (2018) would have phrased it. The subjects of the curriculum do not exist within a web provided by modern Western epistemologies.

That the nature of our field is epistemicidal is irrefutable. Curriculum - from kindergarten to Higher Education - is the lab of a divisive eugenic Prosperous reason, the lab of the epistemicide. It produces and certifies the non-existence of 'Caliban reason' (Fanon, 2001; Henry, 2000). By limiting the debate to just 'this side of the line,' - a discussion woven into the epistemological web of Western Eurocentric modernity that drives and is propelled by a eugenic and divisive reason -, hegemonic and counter-hegemonic movements have not only sharpened the epistemicidal nature of the field but also driven it to an - almost irreversible - theoretical *cul-de-sac*. Along with Henry Giroux (1979, pp. 268-269), I would argue that curriculum "theory ossified within certain circumscribed methodological prohibitions." If the culture of positivism rejects the future, celebrating the present, as Henry Giroux (1979, p. 271) so vehemently proclaims, and if the dominant curricular logic is terribly positivist, then the dominant forms of curricular knowledge in our schools also conflict with the future and venerate the present, regardless of its chaos, castrating any utopian aspiration, annihilating any future purpose, and destroying the infinite power of the utopian nature of humankind. The much-maligned one-dimensional

man, unpacked by Herb Marcuse (2002), finds its birthplace in our curriculum, and teachers are its perfect midwives.

We live in a time of stagnation - complete theoretical decay - a curriculum involution, a dangerous theoretical regression. The answers to the challenges of a limitless epistemologically diverse and different humanity cannot 'only' be found 'on this side of the line;' they cannot be resolved based on a divisive Eurocentric reason - itself, after all, in many cases, the leading architect of the sagas it seeks to solve. As Lorde (2007) says, 'the tools that built the master's house cannot destroy it.' The Eurocentrism that saturated the theoretical and practical process of the curriculum has completely sunk the field into a dangerous disconnect with reality – what I call 'curriculum imparity' (Paraskeva, 2022a; 2022b; 2021)

Curriculum Theorycide

As I have argued, the clashes between dominant and specific critical and post-critical counter-dominant traditions have demonstrated how the latter fell into the reductive functionalist approach. In their struggle against the epistemicide, they aggravated such epistemicide by crafting a reversionary epistemicide (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2021; 2018; 2016).

Moreover, the struggles between and within such traditions fueled what I would call, drawing from Gil (2009), a 'curriculum involution' – a deadlock. As in such – sometimes -ruthless struggles, neither the dominant nor the counter-dominant traditions were able to claim a complete victory; we thus keep experiencing an increasing void between, on the one hand, the absence of the consolidation of a fully segregated curriculum – we do have countless examples of counter-dominant victories – and, on the other hand, the whole absence of the emergence of the new human being. And, within such an impasse, epistemicide and reversionary epistemicide (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2021; 2018; 2016) continue to be perpetuated. That is, neither the 'old human being' died nor the 'creation' of the new human being was fully materialized. Neither the old social order remained safe, nor the new social order emerged; that is, 'the old is dying, and the new cannot be born.' (Gramsci, 1999, p. 276). These battles represented no 'real' tragedy as they were stripped of their tragic dimension, as Gil (2009) would have put it. Instead, a curriculum involution occurred (Gil, 2009), which, in too many ways, points to a 'regression.' Pundits within both dominant and counter-dominant traditions wield arguments based just on an exhausted and misleading particular 'Prosperous Eurocentric framework' that proved to be part of the problem (Harding, 2008; Mignolo, 2011; Quijano, 1991; Walsh, 2012). As Walter Mignolo (2026, p. 144) argues, "the very genealogy of decolonial thinking is unknown in the genealogy of European thinking".

Moreover, the epistemicidal nature of our field triggers an impairment wave that historically saturates the field, a theoretical 'imparity' that contaminates our theory, a theory that is in a permanent state of short circuit with reality. The 'involution stage' exposes and aggravates the field's imparity. Curriculum theory and 'reality' have been

walking endless parallel lines – a malaise populates the field’s hegemonic and counter-hegemonic platforms. Such imparity has triggered discomfort within the critical turf, though. This theoretical imparity - or impairment - of the critical has thus flooded the banks of the radical critical curriculum river—laudably denounced and scrutinized in crucial approaches provided by Wexler (Wexler, 1974; 1987), Ellsworth (1989), Liston (1988), Gore (1993), and others as we had the opportunity to examine in other contexts (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2021; 2018; 2016). ‘Involution’ and ‘imparity aggravated the field’s deadlock.

As I have argued, Ellsworth (1989) is a key example – unjustifiably undermined - of the imparity of the critical within Higher Education and teacher preparation programs. Before the nationwide eruption of racist violence in communities and on campuses from 1987 to 1988, including the University of Wisconsin–Madison, Ellsworth took the opportunity to discuss this kind of turmoil in the course Curriculum and Instruction 608: Media and Anti-Racist Pedagogies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. According to Ellsworth (1989), particular concepts of critical pedagogy, such as empowerment, student voice, dialogue, and even the term ‘critical’, are representative myths that perpetuate relations of domination. As she (1989) argues, based on her interpretation of C&I 608, ‘key assumptions, goals, and pedagogical practices fundamental to the literature on critical pedagogy - namely, ‘empowerment,’ ‘student voice,’ ‘dialogue,’ and even the term ‘critical’ - are repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination’ (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 298). Moreover, she (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 208) claims that ‘our efforts to put discourses of critical pedagogy into practice led us to reproduce relations of dominations in the classroom [discourses that] were ‘working through us’ in repressive ways and had themselves become vehicles of repression’. Thus, as we detached from such issues and moved into a different way, ‘we worked through’ and out of the literature’s highly abstract language. In their commitment to liberate and emancipate, critical approaches solidified and multiplied relations of dominance and were egregiously silent against patriarchy.

Revisiting Bourdieu and Bauman is of great help here. The concepts of ‘immigration’ in the former and that of ‘strangers’ in the latter are crucial to our argument. Critical curriculum theory - which we all owe so much - is far from being a nightmare for the hegemonic bloc; long ago, it ceased to produce ‘strangeness’; it ceased to be a ‘strange’ thing created by ‘strangers’; it became predictable. Given its epistemological predictability, critical curriculum theory is no longer a threat. It cannot continue to ‘mutilate or eradicate’ (Bauman, 2005, p. 7) the dominant thinking theory and way of building the world. Critical theory even ceased to be the theory of mutiny (Saramago, 1999, p. 43). Thus, it ceased to be a producer and conductor of the ‘immigration of new ideas’ (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 7), and even what is intended as new remains reductively tied to an onto-epistemological corset incapable of going beyond the Eurocentric modern Western platform. Critical and post-critical theories are exhausted with a ‘Eurocentric conception of time, space, number, causes’ (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 9) that somehow abdicates from a radical epistemological co-presence of the ‘other side of the line’ (Santos, 2014). The incapacity to overcome such involution and impairment is clear evidence of the curriculum’s *capitis diminutiu*, which triggers its *hypertrophía theoricae*, paving the way for the *theorycide*.

The belligerent battles that opposed hegemonic and counter-hegemonic movements, as well as the disputes within each movement, promoted a kind of theoretical *coup d'état* - an attack on the space and time of theory, a theoretical mope, a *theorycide*, paving the way for a dangerous anti-intellectual intellectualism, one of the enzymes of the de-skilling of educators. Intellectualism is becoming a rare collectible in educational research and school settings (Paraskeva, 2013).

A 'non-theoretical' atmosphere reigns. This is the theory, that is, the theory of 'non-theory'. The theory is, indeed, the absence of theory. Non-disquiets conquered the field. The utopia of theoretical hysteria was buried. We live in an 'atheoretical' moment, a plague that has contaminated the various areas of our field like rust and settled down with all its belongings in the velvet armchairs of our academy. The *theorycide* peppers the commonsense, which is not necessarily the absence of a theory, but the yoke of a 'non-theory theory' momentum. The hunting season for theory and theorists was normalized. The pale theory we have been trying to produce does not speak with/to our schools. The theoretical wave is ahistorical and has worsened, especially in the last half of the last century. There is no theoretical trepidation in our field. We are experiencing paralysis. Worse than a theoretical stagnation, we face the 'non-existence' of any theoretical turbulence. The roaring theoretical fires of the past - of even recent history - are long gone. Our field is no longer theoretically combustible within the vast social sciences.

Another theory is essential—admittedly itinerant—which can only be achieved with another theorizing, another epistemological logic, and which, faithful to the ethical principles of epistemological justice, helps us to 'arrange the words' in another way (Saramago, 1999, p. 86). There is no future without death, as Saramago (2009) would say. That is, and as I have argued and analyzed in greater depth in another context (Paraskeva, 2022, 2021), critical and post-critical theories, in general, and critical and post-critical educational and curricular theories, in particular, as we have discussed them, have to die. This is not the end of critical theories and pedagogies. It is a way to produce a truthfully plural, supradisciplinary, non-derivative critical approach to address the endless, diverse, onto-epistemological challenges of the world.

While provocative, the challenge is not begging for an end in Eurocentric terms. It begs something radically different. It begs 'the otherwise' (Paraskeva, 2021). We must fight collectively so that, as Gil (1998) would say, 'critical theory does not become petrified as a tribal theory.' A just way to address such insufficiencies is to commit to an 'exfoliation process' (Gil, 1998, pp. 127-128), which dismantles the current divisive 'complicated conversation' (Pinar, 2004) and decolonizes it, as it is itself epistemicidal (see Huebner, 2022).

This proclamation sounded alarm bells in some regions of the field, especially among those who, for decades, self-proclaimed themselves the sole guardians of 'thy' counterargument, also unique, ignoring that they were working within an epistemicidal matrix - thus engaging in epistemicidal processes and outcomes. I see such a curriculum liberal Republics stubbornly refusing to acknowledge that their own reason, however multicultural and polychromatic it might be, was, is, and always will be "an expression of Western culture and restricts the possibility for the survival of all other cultures" (Dussel, 2026, p. 104).

The *theorycide* speaks to the impasse created by the battles between hegemonic and counter-hegemonic Eurocentric traditions that were unable to engage with non-Eurocentric perspectives. This impasse exacerbates the moribund nature of the field, as Huebner proclaimed (1976). How can we deny that our field does not enjoy the theoretical health it once did? How can we deny that we do not experience a theoretical trepidation today like we did in the past, and even in the very recent past? One of the reasons for this gridlock lies in the denial of the absolutist and exhausted nature of Eurocentric reason, which has saturated the counter-hegemonic matrix. This matrix has proven incapable of transcending its epistemic boundaries, resolving or mitigating its inherent contradictions, and acknowledging the legitimacy of non-Eurocentric epistemological perspectives.

The so called generation of utopia (Paraskeva, 2021) – who champion so many laudable battles for a just education and curriculum – struggle to detach themselves from a chilling epistemological submission to Western models, as if within these models were the only language, the only concepts, and the unique matrix to respond to the many different and diverse challenges facing humanity (Paraskeva, 2023; 2021). Our counter-hegemonic curriculum platforms cannot envision the ‘word and the world’ beyond the Western, Eurocentric epistemological matrix. (Paraskeva, 2023; 2021). The *theorycide* morph contaminating the field is actually in sync with the normalized ‘atheoretical’ moment that saturates academia (see Reckwitz & Rosa, 2023). While on one hand, we must recognize the significant advances and accomplishments achieved by numerous counter-hegemonic movements, on the other hand, reality forces us to acknowledge that such advancements have proved to be quite insufficient to ‘flip the table’. They run out of questions and answers. Our field is sinking in a “pleonastic [reason] in which the questions and answers amount to the same thing” as Emi Cioran (1979, p. 51) would put it. It appears that the ‘complicated conversation’ can only occur within the confines imposed by a particular Eurocentric reason. The recognition of outstanding achievements made by many counter-hegemonic movements and the calamitous theoretical condition framed by the *theorycide* in which we live are not incompatible realities. On the contrary, this overt compatibility should lead us to consider how it was possible to find ourselves in this theoretical vacuum, despite numerous achievements. The *theorycide* cannot be seen as an act of veneration of any of the anti-colonial and decolonial matrices.

The denial of the epistemicidal nature of the curriculum, the denial of the despotic nature of Eurocentric reason on which counter-hegemonic impulses fundamentally operate, and the denial of the *theorycidal* nature of the field not only epitomizes the despotic nerve of Modern Western Eurocentric epistemological paradigms, but also increasingly justify the centrality of the following question: can the dominant curriculum theories (and here I include hegemonic and counter-hegemonic ones) narrate the reality we face as humanity? Do they narrate the society in which we live? Do they narrate the endlessly plural singularities that encompass humanity?

If curriculum reasoning is impregnated with a eugenic original sin, how can any theoretical framework - whatever it may be - deriving from such a reasoning explain the limitless diversity and epistemological difference of reality? An endless plural more than

ever, rhizomatic humanity can only be theoretically narrated through an endlessly plural rhizomatic theory, itinerantly. To persevere in such a denial ignores the “impossibility of bringing together all resistances and agencies under a common grand theory” (Santos, 1999, p. 203); it does nothing more than echo what Ellsworth (1989) so aptly proclaimed, which we must not ignore. Along with her (1989, p. 301), I would reiterate that most critical paradigms persist in not providing

a clear statement of their political agendas [and] the effort is to hide the fact that as critical pedagogues, they are in fact seeking to appropriate public resources (classrooms, school supplies, teacher/professor salaries, academic requirements and degrees) to further various ‘progressive’ political agendas that they believe to be for the public good—and therefore deserving of public resources.

While it is quite a challenge, it is crucial to disentangle oneself from the fundamentalism of Eurocentric thinking and to engage with non-Western, non-Eurocentric, anti-colonial, and decolonial epistemological frameworks. Such de-linking establishes a decolonial turn, triggering not just a complicated but a non-derivative conversation calling for ‘non-abysal cultural contacts’ (De Alba, 2026) as a radical curriculum cohabitus. Continuing to deny that the matrix of modernity is in decline and/or in intensive care suffering from palliative needs, the persistence in denying the ‘hospicidal’ nature of the fundamentalism of the Cartesian reason Andreotti (2002; see also: Darder, 2026), contributes absolutely nothing to address the challenges we face as a field. For example, the noisy silence on caste on decades of countless ‘currere complicated conversations’ is simultaneously a vivid symptom and consequence of a field lost in time, historically and theoretically mutilated, a producer of erratic, reckless, and dangerous avenues, a theoretically deficient field hostage to an abyssal intellectual and theoretical work that persistently promotes an epistemicidal matrix, and thus irremediably condemned to keep producing abyssal theoretical lines and fabricate a divisive history.

It is, therefore, crucial to open the field’s epistemicidal canon, delinking from absolutist Eurocentric epistemological impulses (Amin, 1990), and dismantling the abyssal divide by placing sociological absences such as caste at the table of curriculum debates (Paraskeva, 2025; 2023; 2015). It is vital to commit to “multicultural dialogue that does not presuppose the illusion of a non-existent symmetry between cultures” (Dussel, 2026, p. 107). It implies, Dussel (2026, pp. 112-113) adds,

an intercultural dialogue which is neither only nor principally a dialogue between cultural apologists who attempt to demonstrate to others the virtues and values of their own culture. It is, above all, a dialogue between a culture’s critical innovators (intellectuals of the “border,” between their own culture and Modernity. It is more than anything a dialogue between the “critics of the periphery,” it must be an intercultural South-South dialogue before it can become a South-North dialogue.

Such a move begs for a commitment to recognize the legitimacy of the epistemologies from the South (Santos, 2007), a radical co-habitus (Paraskeva, 2025; 2024; 2023) of different and diverse epistemological avenues, leading to a critical caste curriculum

theory, paving the way for an ‘ecology of - curriculum - knowledges.’ (Santos, 2014). Such an ecology implies de-linking, which suggests epistemic disobedience rather than an ongoing pursuit of ‘newness’ within the same eugenically tainted matrix (Dussel, 2025; Mignolo, 2025). Such a theory helps to coin a post-abyssal matrix. A just curriculum field sweats a just curriculum theory, one that is epistemologically ‘a-abyssal.’ A post-abyssal curriculum theory and development implies a de-abyssal momentum – a de-linking -, not necessarily towards a non-abyssal matrix, but one that paves the way to a ‘a-abyssal’ curriculum design that accurately mirrors humanity’s multiple epistemological impulses, thus bringing untouchability to the curriculum debates.

There is no such thing as a perfect theory (Quantz, 2011). However, our critique will always be catalectic, irrelevant, and out of touch in a field that persistently remains out of joint by ignoring crucial categories – such as caste – that brutalize billions of human beings globally. There can be no socially just curriculum theory without it also reflecting anti-colonial and decolonial thought, and without leading theoretical participation from decolonial and anti-colonial theories, also drawn from the Global South. It is crucial to recognize that “decolonial thinking is differentiated from post-colonial theory or post-colonial studies in that the genealogy of these is located in French post-structuralism more than in the dense history of planetary decolonial thinking.” (Mignolo, 2026, p. 127). Mignolo (2026, p. 132) states:

Decolonial thinking has not appeared yet, not even in the most extreme leftist publications. And the reason is that decolonial thinking is not leftist, but rather another thing entirely: it is a de-linking from the modern, political episteme articulated as right, center, and left; it is an opening towards another thing, on the march, searching for itself in the difference.

The theorycide is also a consequence of decades of complicated conversations that have systematically marginalized warnings raised by many critical theorists, that “critical thinking as a mode of reasoning was eclipsing in both the wider society and the sphere of public school education” (Giroux, 1979, p. 281). The theorycide is an X-ray of the field through a non-derivative de-linking, an excavation of the field, ‘from other palenques’ (Mignolo, 2026, p. 135)

Those who were born and raised in Africa soon heard from their elders that the problems in the world began when the white-striped zebras claimed superiority over the black-striped zebras. In the curriculum, we are all Zebras. There is no point in the ‘white striped’ ones claiming to be superior. For those who embrace existence within the scope of what Paul Teliard defends - ‘we are not here as human beings having a spiritual experience. It is the other way around. We are all infinite spiritual beings having a temporary human experience - the metaphor of the Zebras gains a different echo

This is a battle of the infinite, a struggle for the infinite, and within the infinite, yet not an endless battle. The ‘infinite is then the possible’ (Pessoa, 2006, p. 56), a present possible ‘as the only reality is the eternal present, the undying now’ (Pessoa, 2006, p. 47). Critical theories and pedagogies need a new ‘post-abyssal’ logic for a possible utopia of a just world. We must put ‘theory back’ at the epicenter of Higher Education and teacher education curriculum debates - this battle must also be won in the Universities where teacher

education programs reside. Another theory, though. A non-derivative, non-abyssal, just one for a decent life, as Santos (2018) advocates.

Itinerant Curriculum Theory (ICT): A Non-Derivative Approach

Sentient of the field's deadlock – and deeply influenced by anti-colonial and de-colonial non-Eurocentric approaches – I have proclaimed the epistemicidal nature of the field (Paraskeva, 2011) and advocated the need for a 'frontal' confrontation with its historical epistemicidal reason. I argued for the need for a deterritorialization *tout court* and to assume an itinerant theoretical curriculum (ICT) perspective. I claimed the curriculum reason as divisive, eugenic in its hegemonic and counter-hegemonic Eurocentric platforms, and argued for a non-derivative non-abyssal approach (Santos, 2014; Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016; 2011), a deterritorialized one, a decolonial one, an itinerant curriculum theoretical path (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016; 2011). The *ICTheoryst* is "the breakshow of the [eugenic] wheel of time" as Friedrich Nietzsche (1990, p. 6) interrupts and destabilizes curriculum as human beings' eugenic temporality, as Huebner proclaimed.

Such confrontation challenges the field's historical sociological absences (Santos, 2014) and questions the institutionalization of the visibility and existence of particular forms of knowledge – fundamentally Eurocentric – pushing curriculum theory and the field's history out of the colonial zone. I called this momentum 'the epistemological turn,' a decolonial momentum. (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016; 2011)

ICT has been embraced by scholars within and beyond the U.S., committed to what Enrique Dussel (2013) calls an *analectic* – or *ana-dialectic* approach – breaking the abyssal divide produced by modernist / post-modernist wrangles, which persistently makes the Global South non-existent. ICT places the struggle against the epistemicides and reverse epistemicides as a center of gravity of a new utopian logic, one that is committed to being a performative utterance (Austin, 1962), that is, a 'theory-itinerant-that does something by saying it.' ICT is responsive to the world's epistemological diversity and difference. The *ICTheorist* is an epistemological pariah – a justly committed political take deeply dedicated to social, cognitive, and intergenerational justice. Critical and post-critical theories and pedagogies – the way we have been thinking and doing – need to end, and they need to deterritorialize; they need to radically de-link from its own oppressive epistemological Western Eurocentric matrix without renegading it and commit to the 'radical co-presence of both sides of the line' (Santos, 2007, p. 45). Such radical co-presence needs to be viewed as a radical co-habitus (Paraskeva, 2023). As Zhao (2019, p. 27) states,

ICT is a form of decolonial thinking that recognizes an ecological co-existence of varying epistemological forms of knowledge around the world, paying attention to knowledge and epistemologies largely marginalized and discredited in the current world order.

The *ICTheoryst* is 'an epistemological and cultural physician' as Friedrich Nietzsche (1990, p. 55) would frame it, that crafts ICT as, and through, a new conceptual grammar

(Jupp, 2017) that moves itinerantly within and beyond '(a) the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being; (b) epistemicides, linguicides, abyssality, and the ecology of knowledges; and (c) poststructuralist hermeneutic itinerancy' producing a new non-abyssal alphabet of knowledge (Paraskeva, 2022a; 2022b).

ICT aims toward 'a general epistemology of the impossibility of a general epistemology' (Santos, 2007, p. 67), protecting and fostering 'the immortality of endless pluridiverse intellect which is achieved through education' (see Nietzsche, 1990, p. 4). It is a human rights theory, as Santos (2009) would undoubtedly frame it. ICT implies a different theorist who challenges and is challenged by a theoretical path that is inexact yet rigorous; s/he 'runs away' from any unfortunate canon; it implies a theorist who is committed to moving towards an 'abyssal' epistemological terrain, provoking abstinence of theoretical uniformity and stabilization. The ICTheory(ist) is a volcanic chain that shows a constant lack of equilibrium; the ICTheory(ist) is always a stranger in their language. It is not a sole act, however; it is a populated solitude. ICT challenges any form of *indigenistoude*; that is, it challenges any form of romanticization of indigenous cultures and knowledge, and it is not framed in any dichotic skeleton of West-rest (Paraskeva, 2023; 2022a; 2022b; 2018; 2016). Along with Nietzsche (1990, p. 10) the *ICTheoryst* "seeks to comprehend the internal coherence and necessity of every true culture".

ICT, as Darder (2016) argues, is 'an epistemology of liberation that can persistently challenge structures of authority, hierarchy, and domination in every aspect of life and must be cultivated, nurtured and embodied within the blessed messiness and unwieldy chaos of everyday life within schools and communities' (Darder, p. 12). ICT speaks volumes about the legitimacy of the Caliban's consciencism (Nkrumah, 1964). ICT, as inherently an exfoliation metamorphosis, a 'sill of infinite mourning' (Couto, 2008, p. 105), champions an anti and post 'occidentosis and 'mechanotic' (Al-L-Ahmad, 1984, p. 31) momentum. ICT is 'not merely invocation or evocation; it exemplifies how ideas can be added powerfully to the sources of curriculum studies by substantially including Works' (Schubert, 2017, p. 10) above and beyond the Modern Western Eurocentric epistemological dominant and counter-dominant traditions. Also, *ICTheorists* challenge the absolutist cult of the dominant scientificity of science – fundamentally Eurocentric – subjugated to mercantilistic circuits of cultural production. ICT advocates a curriculum transmodernity that is

multicultural, versatile, hybrid, postcolonial, pluralist, tolerant, and democratic (but beyond the modern liberal democracy of the European state). It will have splendid millenary traditions and be respectful of exteriority and heterogeneous identities. The majority of humanity retains, reorganizes (renovating and including elements of globality), and creatively develops cultures in its everyday, enlightened horizon. The cultures of this majority deepen the valorative 'common sense' of their participants' real and particular existences, countering the exclusionary process of globalization, which precisely because of this process inadvertently "pushes" toward a 'trans'-modernity. It is a return to the consciousness of the significant majorities of humanity, of their excluded historical unconscious! (Dussel, 2002, p. 236)

That is, ICT “attempts to fulfill the twentieth-century unfinished and incomplete project of decolonization towards a world beyond modernity” (Grosfoguel, 2007, p. 179). ICT moves beyond traditional dichotomies; to articulate a critical cosmopolitanism beyond nationalism and colonialism; to produce knowledge beyond third world and Eurocentric fundamentalisms; to produce radical post-capitalist politics beyond identity politics; to overcome the traditional dichotomy between the political economy and cultural studies; and to move beyond economic reductionism and culturalism. (Grosfoguel et al., 2007).

ICT *es uma arrebatada* of des-meaning and re-meaning, a ‘triangulated conscientização *in-action, located, as-it-happened*’ (Garza & Jupp, 2026). ICT’s capacity and commitment to a cohabitus of endless onto-epistemological rivers within and beyond the Global North and South nullifies one of the most aggravated aspects of modernity thinking, its abyssal nature. Such cohabitus of diverse and different epistemic veins implies what Noah De Lissovoy and Celine Norman (2026) call ‘re-connection,’ which counters the eugenic monumentality of modern Western Eurocentric reason.

While the Western project, along with the distorted logic it produces, produces pedagogical approaches that oppose inquiry, dialogue and thinking itself, a pluriversal epistemological reorientation in teaching rejects the framing of the teacher and curriculum as set and immovable, and instead approaches teaching in a fluid, curious and loving manner. A decolonial and analectical curriculum, not contained in the confines of whiteness, works to disrupt the myth of colonial permanence and western universality—a myth that perpetrates the idea that there are no viable options outside of our current reality and the knowledge constituted within it. (De Lissovoy & Norman, 2026, p. 326)

To de-link and decolonize – while honoring the legacy of the critical path, taking it to a different level – is also a decolonial attempt to do critical theory (Kellner, 1989, p. 2). In so doing, an itinerant curriculum theory re-thinks utopianism; it responds to Habermas’s (1981) challenge of modernity as an incomplete project and commits to decolonizing processes. It helps one to understand how it is crucial to question the accurate epistemological colours of our battle for a just education and society. Our task is not to ‘shoot the utopists’ (Santos, 1995) or the utopia that inhabits not just within us but also bubbles out of the debris of modernity. Our task as educational and curriculum scholars is to de-link and decolonize it, a crucial commitment toward a ruthless critique of every existent epistemology as a *sine qua non*-condition for a just curriculum theory. This is undeniably the very best battle we can engage to open up the Western Eurocentric canon of democracy (Santos, 2007) and, in doing so, paves the way for a non-abyssal and just society through a non-derivative curriculum theory. ICT is an onto-epistemological declaration of independence. It is the people’s theory echoing the world’s epistemological differences and diversity. In that sense, ICT will always be an uncertain manifesto for a manifesto of uncertainties. The *ICTheoryst* understands that more than seeking the ‘truth’ it is crucial to grasp non-derivatively the metamorphoses into the human being (Nietzsche, 1990, p. 50).

References

- Alba, A. (1998). *Curriculum: Crisis, Mito y Perspectivas*. Miña y Dávila.
- Al-I-Ahmad, J. (1984). *Occidentosis: A Plague from the West*. Mizan Press.
- Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and Curriculum*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Baker, B. (2009). *The New Curriculum History*. Sense Publishers.
- Ball, S. (2007). *Education Plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education*. Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (2005). *Identity*. Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *O Poder Simbólico, [Symbolic Power]*. DIFEL.
- Carlson, D. (2005). The Question Concerning Curriculum Theory. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 1, 1 – 14.
- Cioran, E. M. (1975). *A short history of decay*. Penguin.
- Couto, M. (2008). *Terra Sonambula, [Sleepwalking Land]*. Leya.
- Cremin, L. (1964). *The Transformation of School. Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957*. Vintage Books.
- Darder, A. (2016). 'Foreword. Ruthlessness and the Forging of Liberatory Epistemologies: An Arduous Journey'. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Curriculum Epistemicides* (pp. 9 - 16). Routledge.
- Darder, A. (2026). Teaching for the End of the World (As We Know It) Decolonizing the Curricular Limits of Modernity. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 243 – 276). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- De Alba, A. (2026). Itinerant Curriculum and Cultural Contact in the Transmodernity of the World-Worlds. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 332 - 342). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- De Lissovoy, N. & Norman, C. (2026). Beyond Curricular Monumentalism. Whiteness as a Defense Against Thinking. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity*. DeGruyter Brill, pp 315 – 331. [preprint]
- Dewey, J. (1902). *The Child and the Curriculum*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. MacMillan.
- Dussel, E. (2002). World system and transmodernity. *Neplanta, Views from South*, 3(2), pp. 221–244. Duke University Press.
- Dussel, E. (2013). *Ethics of liberation. In the age of globalization and exclusion*. Duke University Press.
- Dussel, E. (2026). Transmodernity and Interculturality. An Interpretation from the Perspective of Philosophy of Liberation. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 90 – 123). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 59(3), 297 - 324.
- Fanon, F. (2001). *Wretched of the Earth*. Penguin Books.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The Politics of Education. Culture, Power, and Liberation*. Bergin and Garvey.
- Garza, R. & Jupp, J. (2026). Arrebató's Arc of Meaning. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 343 – 369). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- Gil, J. (1998). *Metamorphoses of the Body*. University of Minnesota Press.

- Gil, J. (2009). *Em Busca da Identidade. O Desnorte*, [In Search of Identity. The Bewilderment]. Relógio D'Água.
- Giroux, H. (1979). Schooling and the Culture of Positivism. Notes on the Death of History. *Educational Theory*, 29(4), 263 – 284.
- Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling*. Temple University Press.
- Giroux, H. (2004). *The terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Golberg, D. (2018). The Reason of Unreason: Achille Mbembe and David Theo Goldberg in conversation about Critique of Black Reason. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 35, 205 - 227.
- Gore, J. (1993). *The Struggle for Pedagogies. Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth*. Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1999). *Antonio Gramsci: Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. International Publishers.
- Grosfoguel, R., Saldivar, J. D., & Torres, N. M. (2007). *Unsettling postcoloniality: Coloniality, transmodernity and border thinking*. Duke University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1981). Modernity versus Postmodernity. *New German Critique*, 22, 3-14. New German Critique.
- Harding, S. (2008). *Sciences from Bellow: Feminisms, Postcolonialities and Modernities*. Duke University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.
- Henry, P. (2000). *The Caliban Reason*. Routledge.
- Huebner, D. (1976). The Moribund Curriculum Field: It's Wake and Our Work. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6(2), 153 - 167.
- Huebner, D. (2022). A Foreword—Second Edition: Theory Not as a Schema for “Acting,” But for “Looking”. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory* (pp. 5 - 10). Palgrave (2nd Edition).
- Jupp, J. (2017). Decolonizing and De-Canonizing Curriculum Studies. The Contribution of Joao M. Paraskeva Works. *Journal for the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1 - 25. <https://doi.org/10.14288/jaaacs.v12i1.189706>
- Kellner, D. (1989). *Critical Theory, Marxism and Modernity*. The John Hopkins University Press.
- Kliebard, H. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum: 1893-1958*. Routledge.
- Krug, E. (1969). *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Liston, D. (1988). *Capitalist Schools. Explanation and Ethics in Radical Studies of Schooling*. Routledge.
- Lorde, A. (2007). *Sister Outsider*. Crossing Press.
- Macdonald, J. (1967). An Example of Disciplined Curriculum Thinking, *Theory into Practice*, 6 (4). 166 - 171.
- Marcuse, H. (2002). *One-Dimensional Man*. Routledge.
- Marx, K. (1976). *Capital. Volume 1*. Penguin.
- Mbembe, A. (2017). *The Critique of the Black Reason*. Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity. Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2026). Epistemic Disobedience and the Decolonial Option. A Manifesto. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.) *Curriculum Transmodernity* (pp. 124 - 151). DeGruyter Brill. [preprint]
- Nietzsche, F. (1990). *Philosophy and Truth*. Humanity Books.

- Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism*. Monthly Review Press.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2011). *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. Palgrave (1st Edition).
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2013). School Rituals as a Counter-hegemonic Performance: Rituals and Student Identity in Education: Ritual Critique for a New Pedagogy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 11(5), 484 - 493. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2013.11.5.643>
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2014). *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. Palgrave (Upgraded Paperback 1st Edition).
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2016). *Curriculum Epistemicides*. Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2018). *The Epistemicide. Towards a Just Curriculum Theory*. Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2021). *The Generation of Utopia*. Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2022a). *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. Palgrave (2nd Edition).
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2022b). *The Curriculum. A New Comprehensive Reader*. Peter Lang.
- Paraskeva, J.M. (2023). *Critical Perspectives on the Denial of Caste in Educational Debate: Towards a Non-derivative Curriculum Reason*. Routledge.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2024). *Itinerant Curriculum Theory. A Declaration of Epistemological Independence*. Bloomsbury.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2025). On caste: towards critical non-derivative caste curriculum theory. *Whiteness and Education*, 1 - 20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23793406.2025.2560411>
- Paraskeva, J. M. & Huebner, D. E. (2022). Curriculum Afterword: The Dialogue Dwayne Huebner & João M. Paraskeva. In J. M. Paraskeva (Ed.), *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory* (pp. 215 - 262). Palgrave (2nd Edition). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77420-2_10
- Paraskeva, J. M. & Huebner, D. E. (2023). Dialectical materialism: an alternative way of thinking and doing education alternatively. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 55(1), 270-289. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2023.2207627>
- Fernando P. (2006). *Textos Filosóficos* (Vol. II). Nova Ática.
- Popkewitz, T. (1976). Myths of Social Science in Curriculum. *The Educational Forum*, 40(3), 317-328.
- Quijano, A. (1991). Colonialidad y Modernidad/Racionalidad. *Perú Indígena*, 29(1), 11-21.
- Santos, B. de S. (1995). *Towards a New Common Sense*. Routledge.
- Santos, B. de S. (1999). 'Porque é tão difícil construir uma teoria crítica? [Why is it so difficult to build a critical theory?]', *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 54(Junho): 197-215.
- Santos, B. de S. (2007). Beyond Abyssal Thinking. From Global Lines to Ecologies of Knowledges, *Review*, 30(1), 45-89.
- Santos, B. de S. (2009), 'If God Were a Human Rights Activist: Human Rights and the Challenge of Political Theologies. Is Humanity Enough? The Secular Theology of Human Rights,' *Law, Social Justice and Global Development*, 1. Retrieved www.go.warwick.ac.uk/elj/lgd/2009_l/santos
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies from the South*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Santos, B. de S. (2018). *The End of the Cognitive Empire*. Duke University Press.
- Saramago, J. (1999). *Folhas Políticas*. Caminho.
- Saramago, J. (2009). *Death with Interruptions*. Houghton & Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Huebner, Dwayne.
- Schubert, W., Schubert, A. L. Lopez (1980). *Curriculum Books; The First Eighty Years*. University Press of America.

- Schubert, W. (1986). *Curriculum. Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility*. MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Schubert, W. (2017). Growing Curriculum Studies: Contributions of João M. Paraskeva. *Journal for the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, 12(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.14288/jaaacs.v12i1.189714>
- Tyack, D. (1974). *The One Best System. A History of American Urban Education*. Harvard University Press.
- Todorova, M. (1997). *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford University Press.
- Walsh, C. (2012). 'Other' Knowledges, 'Other' Critiques Reflections on the Politics and Practices of Philosophy and Decoloniality in the Other America. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(3), 11-27. <https://doi.org/10.5070/T413012880>
- Watkins, W.(1993). Black Curriculum Orientations. *Harvard Educational Review*. 63 (3), 321–38.
- Wexler, P. (1976). *The Sociology of Education: Beyond Inequality*. The Bobbs-Merrill.
- Wexler, P. (1987). *Social Analysis of Culture. After the New Sociology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Williams, R. (1976). Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory. In R. Dale, G. Esland & M. MacDonald (eds.), *Schooling and Capitalism. A Sociological Reader* (pp. 202-210). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Zhao, W. (2019). *China's Education, Curriculum Knowledge, and Cultural Inscriptions. Dancing with the Wind*. Routledge.

Article received: 09.11.2025.

Updated version received: 14.11.2025.

Accepted for publishing: 14.11.2025.

João Paraskeva

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, United Kingdom
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7893-5688>



This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). It is permitted to copy and distribute the work in all media and formats, to remix, transform, and build upon it for any purpose, including commercial purposes, provided that the original authors are properly credited, a link to the original license is included and it is indicated whether the work has been modified. Users are required to provide a full bibliographic citation of the article published in this journal (authors, title of the work, journal title, volume, issue, pagination), as well as its DOI identifier, and in the case of electronic publication, they are also required to provide an HTML link.