Globalization and Curriculum Inquiry: Performing Transnational Imaginaries

Noel Gough

The act of curriculum inquiry, for me, usually begins from a position informed by narrative theory and poststructuralism, one corollary of which is that I rarely feel any obligation to start an essay by providing stipulative definitions. In this essay, globalization is not a subject and/or object to be constrained by definition, but a focus for speculation—for generating rather than prescribing meanings. To paraphrase Gilles Deleuze & Félix Guattari's (1977, p. 109) orientation to the subject of desire, the question posed by globalization is not "What does it mean?" but rather "How does it work?" I am interested in what curriculum workers (teachers, administrators, academics, researchers) *do,* and *produce*, with the concept of globalization, and in working toward a defensible position on the concepts we create through our curriculum practices.

In the first version of this chapter (Gough, 2000), I quoted Miriam Henry and Sandra Taylor's (1997, p. 47) identification of two aspects of globalization—"the facts concerning transnational processes and communication" and "an increasing awareness of this reality"—and, as previously, I continue to focus here on the latter. There is, of course, no unitary "reality" of globalization, and I suggested that whatever "awareness" of globalization might then have been "increasing" was a somewhat inchoate apprehension of complex, multiple, proliferating, and immanent realities, overlaid (and further complexified) by our own reflexive "awareness" of the need to be—and to be *seen* to be—aware that globalization was, indeed, worthy of our attention. At that time I was drawn towards attending to those traces of globalization that Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake (1996, p. 6) describe as a "transnational imaginary," namely, "the *as-yet-unfigured* horizon of contemporary cultural production by which national spaces/identities of political allegiance and economic regulation are being undone and imagined communities of modernity are being reshaped at the macropolitical (global) and micropolitical (cultural) levels of everyday existence" [emphasis in original].

For those of us who identified ourselves as "reconceptualist" curriculum scholars in the wake of Joseph Schwab's (1969, 1971, 1973) immensely influential series of papers on curriculum as a discipline of "the practical",[1] a key imaginary informing curriculum inquiry during the 1990s was William Pinar et al.'s (1995, p. 848) foreshadowing of the "*as-yet-unfigured* horizon" of curriculum inquiry in terms of generating and sustaining "complicated conversations":

> Curriculum is an extraordinarily complicated conversation. Curriculum as institutionalized text is a formalized and abstract version of conversation, a term we usually use to refer to those open-ended, highly personal, and interest-driven events in which persons encounter each other. That curriculum has become so formalized and distant from the everyday sense of conversation is a profound indication of its institutionalization and bureaucratization. Instead of employing others' conversations to enrich our own, we "instruct" students to participate in others'—i.e. textbook authors'—conversations, employing others' terms to others' ends. Such social alienation is an inevitable consequence of curriculum identified with the academic disciplines as they

---

[1] Reconceptualist curriculum scholars shifted the emphasis of curriculum studies from theorizing curriculum *development* towards generating theoretical frames for *understanding* curriculum (see Pinar, 1975).

themselves have been institutionalized and bureaucratized over the past one hundred years. Over the past twenty years the [reconceptualized] American curriculum field has attempted to "take back" curriculum from the bureaucrats, to make the curriculum field itself a conversation, and in so doing, work to understand curriculum.

More recently Pinar (with the encouragement and support of many colleagues worldwide, myself among them) has deliberately sought to make participation in the complicated conversations that constitute curriculum work more culturally inclusive by establishing the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (IAACS) in 2000.[2] Through its triennial conferences, online journal, *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* (*TCI)*[3] and associated publications (see, for example, Pinar, 2003, 2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2013; Trueit et al., 2003) IAACS has provided a number of forums for such conversations, which now have additional layers of complication and complexity by virtue of being conducted transnationally, transculturally and, at least to some extent, translinguistically[4]. The focus and scope of these transnational curriculum conversations and deliberations is captured in the following statement about *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* (*TCI)*:

> although much curriculum work continues to take place within national borders (often informed by governmental policies and priorities), processes of economic globalisation are blurring nation-state boundaries and destabilising national authority in curriculum decision making. Thus, *TCI* encourages contributions that examine the impact of globalisation on curriculum work in relation to national and international debates on such matters as human rights, social justice, democratisation, national, ethnic and religious identities, issues of gender and racial justice, the concerns of indigenous peoples, and poverty and social exclusion. A specific aim of *TCI* is to examine the interrelationships between local, national, regional and global spheres of curriculum work.[5]

The work represented in *TCI*, together with the publications cited above, constitutes efforts through the past decade to deliberately *configure* transnational imaginaries for curriculum inquiry that I characterized in the previous version of this chapter as "*as-yet-unfigured*". As a result, this chapter differs somewhat from its predecessor, not least because I have been personally involved in the work of IAACS (as founding editor of *TCI*) and have also had experiences of working transnationally that have profoundly influenced the ethical standpoints from which I perform transnational curriculum work. One continuity between the two chapters is the persistence of economic restructuring—driven by the need for Australia to respond to international economic and technological trends—as the master discourse informing policy decisions at all levels of education. This discourse persisted through the '00s and reached its zenith (or, depending upon one's standpoint, its nadir) in 2009, when the Australian Labor federal government took office proclaiming an "education revolution" that featured calls for a knowledge economy to be achieved through a national curriculum that focused on "the basics" and an expanded testing and accountability system. Australia, like a majority of OECD nations (and many other countries aspiring to a similar economic status) thus continues to participate in what Allan Luke (2011) describes as

---

[2]   See IAACS homepage at www.iaacs.ca
[3]   See Transnational Curriculum Inquiry homepage at http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/tci/
[4]   *TCI* published and reviewed articles written in Chinese, Portuguese, French and Turkish; the fourth IAACS had no "official" language and was deliberately conceived as "a Babel experience", although plenary sessions were simultaneously translated in English and Portuguese; see http://www.periodicos.proped.pro.br/iviaacs/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3&Itemid=4&lang=en (accessed 3 February 2014)
[5]   http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/tci/about/editorialPolicies#focusAndScope <accessed 3 February 2014>

a move toward a global curriculum settlement around educational basics and "new economy" competences that focuses almost exclusively on the measurable production of human capital. It pushes for interoperability and equity of exchange, but in so doing, it simply excludes other goals of democratic education—debates and learnings about civics, civility, language, and culture; about diverse and common cultural touch-stones; and about learning to live together—and it altogether ignores Indigenous lessons about the stewardship of cultures, the land, and the planet.

In the previous version of this chapter I focused on three facets of globalization in curriculum discourse, namely, (i) the sedimented history of global perspectives in school curricula, (ii) popular expectations that globalizing technologies such as the Internet will transform schools and their curricula, and (iii) the "internationalization" of the field of curriculum studies itself. In the remainder of this chapter, I will revisit these foci of my previous inquiries, but extend my discussion of them in the light of more recent work and experiences.

GLOBALIZATION IN THE CURRICULUM

The move that Luke describes above has meant that many of the school curriculum programs and resources that dealt with global issues and concerns—such as the initiatives in development education, peace studies and environmental education that I previously argued were part of the sedimented history of global perspectives in school curricula—have been marginalized or removed from school programs under pressure to privilege "the basics". However, it is not difficult to argue that world history during the past decade has provided ample incentives for education that focuses on "learning to live together". For example, the *World Yearbook of Education 2011* (Yates & Grumet, 2011) brings a range of international contributors together to analyse and reflect on the ways in which curricula in their respective nations during the past decade have been shaped by events in the wider world.

The attacks by al-Quaeda upon the US on September 11, 2001 are a significant point of reference for the editors and some contributing authors in the *Yearbook.* Thus, in the Series Editors' Introduction we read, "Ten years on from 9/11, the idea of the world is in flux" (p. xvi), and Yates and Grumet (2011, p. 8) Editors' introduction recounts that they had originally intended to title the *Yearbook* "Curriculum in vulnerable times", noting in particular the association of the term *vulnerable* with the USA's awareness of its changed relationship with "the post-9/11 world". Some of the curriculum implications of al-Quaeda's attacks are examined in a chapter by Jeremy Stoddard, Diana Hess and Catherine Mason Hammer, "The Challenges of Writing 'First Draft History': The Evolution of the 9/11 Attacks and their Aftermath in School Textbooks in the United States". I was not surprised by Stoddard, Hess & Mason's US-centrism but I was deeply disappointed that Yates and Grumet—curriculum scholars for whom I have the utmost respect—should be so lacking in cross-cultural sensitivity that they recognize September 11 as a significant anniversary only of events that took place in the USA in 2001. Referring to "9/11" or "September 11" without including the year 2001 tacitly participates in a form of US-centrism and intellectual colonization signified by the privileging of an unmarked category (we see something similar in the informational domains of the Internet: US addresses are unmarked, but every other country's is identified by the final term: au for Australia, sg for Singapore, za for South Africa, etc.). For Chileans, and many other people in nations that have suffered from US political interventions, "9/11" is September 11, 1973, the day that Salvador Allende, then

President of Chile (and the first Marxist leader of a nation to be democratically elected), was assassinated during the US-backed military coup that unleashed the 17-years rule of the Pinochet regime during which it brutally and systematically violated civil liberties and human rights.

Culturally inclusive curriculum

Cultural inclusivity as a driver of change in schools and universities follows in part from the growth of export markets in educational services. In many Australian universities, "internationalization" is a code word for optimizing the institution's position in the global higher education market by increasing the enrolment of full fee paying overseas students, exporting coursework, establishing offshore and/or virtual campuses, and increasing student and staff participation in overseas exchanges. Market forces have made internationalization a user-friendly term among the senior executives of universities, attracting support for policies and programs that should already be in place in response to social and cultural diversity. Unfortunately, many academics and administrators still see cultural diversity as a difficulty— as a problem for someone else to solve—rather than as an invaluable social, cultural, economic, and educational resource. Thus, the challenges of internationalizing curricula reside, at least in part, in realizing the opportunities that policy imperatives provide for initiating and sustaining desirable changes in content, teaching methods, resources and attitudes.

In the West, especially in nations such as the US and Australia where there has been a resurgence of rightwing political power, cultural inclusivity often is criticized as (and/or co-opted by) 'political correctness'. In addition, many attempts to produce culturally inclusive curricula result in shallow or token multiculturalism that promotes cultural stereotypes by focusing on exotic cultural practices. The practical challenge is how to *perform* an ethics of inclusion rather than a politics of exclusion. For example, I argue that it is indefensible to teach any discipline solely from a US/Eurocentric standpoint, but many university and school teachers remain oblivious to how other civilizational perspectives on knowledge and knowledge production (such as Islam, Confucianism, Tantra, indigenous peoples etc.) are treated in courses and texts—if they are treated at all. We Western professors are faced with the difficult task of attempting to decolonize the spaces of academic discourse that we access from our own privileged positions.

For much of my academic career I—like many of my colleagues—have struggled with the difficulties and complexities of reading, representing and narrating cultural difference without fearing or fetishizing it, and of performing modes of inquiry that respond constructively to the effects of difference in mediating educational change. But I have become much more aware of the limits of my understandings in recent years, especially since 1998 when I began to participate in a number of research and teaching activities in southern Africa (see, for example, Annette Gough & Noel Gough, 2004; Gough, 2001, 2008)

My many years of living and working in Australia, Europe and North America did not prepare me for the visibility and viciousness of the racism, sexism, patriarchy, homophobia, class and language biases, and ethnic nationalism that constitute everyday life for most South Africans. I expected the effects of institutionalized racism to persist, but I was surprised by the continued normalization of other forms of discrimination, such as the pervasive hostility towards women. Despite decades of schooling for girls, men's subjugation of women prevails in South Africa regardless of race and ethnicity.[6] Sexual harassment of women teachers is rife and, according to one study, schoolteachers perpetrate one third of the reported rapes of girls under the age of 15 (Galloway, 2002). Traces of gender discrimination appear in some

---

[6]   South Africa has one of the highest reported rates of rape in the world, and an extremely high incidence of domestic violence and child abuse (see, for example, Meier, 2002)

unexpected places. For example, the Faculty of Education staff lounge at one prestigious (formerly whites-only) university in the Western Cape superficially epitomizes academic civility. It is a spacious, light-filled, tastefully furnished room in which faculty members gather at appointed times for morning or afternoon tea and polite conversation. But it was here that I overheard the predominantly white male professoriate exchanging "jokes" about wife beating.[7]

A visit to South Africa in August-September 2001 troubled me more than previous ones. At the time I left Australia, the so-called "*Tampa* affair" was headline news.[8] A Norwegian cargo ship (the *Tampa*) had rescued more 300 asylum seekers, mainly from Afghanistan, when their boat capsized, but the Australian Federal Government, led by Prime Minister John Howard and Immigration Minister Phillip Ruddock, refused to accept them. My thoughts about the politics of difference informing the government's (in)actions in this situation were inflected by my previous experiences in Africa. I wondered if Howard's and Ruddock's responses would have been different if the *Tampa* had rescued white farmers fleeing from Zimbabwe rather than refugees from middle-eastern conflicts.

The UN World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (to give its title in full) began in Durban on the day that I arrived in South Africa. My research methodology seminars and consultations with doctoral students at the University of Durban-Westville were interspersed with daily news of the conference's controversial proceedings, such as the protests that accompanied the USA's early withdrawal of its already low-level delegation. On this visit I worked more closely than previously on problems and issues in students' own workplaces, many of which gave new meaning to questions of diversity, difference and inclusion. A majority of the students were researching educational aspects of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, which accounts for more than 40% of all deaths in KwaZulu-Natal province.[9] For example, one student was analyzing trends in the impact of HIV/AIDS on teacher attrition. Another was interpreting the educational experiences of AIDS orphans through life history research. We all struggled with questions about what an "inclusive" curriculum could possibly be in classrooms where up to 20% of learners were terminally ill with HIV/AIDS.

I was still in Durban on Tuesday 11 September 2001, and during the next few days I observed some of the different ways in which various constituents of multicultural South Africa reacted to the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon and to the US Government's response. For example, Cape Town's broadsheet, *The Cape Times*, devoted 12 pages to detailed descriptions and global economic analyses whereas the tabloid *The Sowetan* (South Africa's biggest selling daily newspaper) had just three pages, most of which were filled with photographs. From page 4 *The Sowetan* was business-as-usual, which for most South Africans consists of everyday struggles for (and threats to) existence—HIV/AIDS, violent crime, access to safe drinking water, adequate sanitation and housing, and the seemingly endless work of repairing the social and economic fabric torn by decades of apartheid.

Many of the South Africans with whom I interacted in Durban, Cape Town and Johannesburg in the following days paid little attention to the attacks. I was not surprised by their relative indifference, because few people who call the African continent home are ever very far away from terrors of a much greater durability and magnitude. For example, if we

---

[7]   The 'wife-beating Boer' is a stereotypical figure among Afrikaners, but violence against women is also endemic in the predominantly black townships and informal settlements (see, for example, Levi, 2003).

[8]   See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tampa_affair (accessed 3 February 2014)

[9]   Nearly one-third of all deaths in South Africa are HIV/AIDS related. On the African continent, about 1.1 million children under the age of 15 are living/dying with HIV/AIDS; see *New Internationalist* November 2001, pp. 18-19.

assume that annual deaths are evenly spread then, on 11 September 2001, 24,000 people died from hunger, 6,020 children were killed by diarrhoea, and 2,700 children died from measles.[10] Sub-Saharan Africa suffers around 3 million deaths per year from malaria, a similar magnitude to deaths from HIV/AIDS but with two significant differences; most malaria deaths are children under age 5, and malaria, unlike AIDS, can be cured or its effects significantly reduced to non-life-threatening status. Extrapolating from these figures, I conservatively estimate that if the USA suffered from the same enduring 'terrors' as, say, sub-Saharan Africa, then its death toll would be equivalent to the events of 11 September 2001 being repeated *at least twice per week* for the foreseeable future.

When I returned to Australia on 14 September 2001 I found myself becoming increasingly irritable and impatient with what I saw as excessive public and media interest in the attacks on the USA. But I quickly realized that my irritation was not with others but with myself—with my frustration at the powerlessness I and my South African colleagues and students had felt in our deliberations about how best to do educational research in the circumstances they/we faced. What social, cultural and educational norms do we need to disrupt to make the enduring terrors of HIV/AIDS and child rape seem as shocking and horrifying and unendurable as the loss of 2988 lives in the USA on September 11? How might we as educators reduce the ignorance of 'educated' citizens in nations such as Australia and the USA that helps to produce more than 30,000 deaths per day from starvation, diarrhoea and preventable diseases such as malaria in the majority world?[11]

GLOBALIZING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES AND ACADEMIC PUBLISHING

In the previous version of this chapter I presented what I called an "airport fiction" to satirize a number of extravagant claims about the transformative effects of globalizing information and communications technologies on schools and their curricula. In this iteration I will briefly (and seriously) explore some of the transformative effects of digitalization, the Internet, open access initiatives, and trends towards multidisciplinary scholarship on transnational curriculum scholarship. These include questions, problems and issues of academic 'gatekeeping' (the conventional quality assurance role of journal editors and reviewers) that arise in complex networked systems, such as the diminishing likelihood of any peer reviews being 'blind', alternatives to peer review made possible by open access publishing, and the unpredictable emergence (cf. planned production) of knowledge within complex, open systems and networks. I suggest that these circumstances require that we reconceptualize academic gatekeeping in terms of facilitating boundary crossings, transgressions and transformations, rather than as policing traditional or arbitrary boundaries and borders. [12]

My practical interests in academic publishing and peer review arise in large part from my academic life history, which includes 15 years (1986-2000) as Asia-Pacific editor of a conventional print-based periodical, the *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, eight years (2004-11)

---

[10]   See *New Internationalist* November 2001, pp. 18-19.

[11]   I prefer the term 'majority world' to the largely inaccurate, outdated and/or non-descriptive terms 'developing' nations, 'Third World' and global 'South'. Since the early 1990s the communications cooperative New Internationalist (www.newint.org) has used 'majority world' to describe this global community by reference to what it is, rather than what it lacks, and also to draw attention to the disproportionate impact that the Group of Eight countries – which represent a relatively small fraction of humankind – have on the majority of the world's peoples.

[12]   For a detailed discussion of these issues, see Gough (2012)

as founding editor of an open access electronic journal, *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, and (membership of numerous international editorial boards.[13]

I was inducted into the culture of academic science during the 1960s, a time when the idea that peer review constitutes some sort of 'gold standard' for judging the quality of scientific publications was widely regarded as a truism. However, as Harriet Zuckerman and Robert Merton (1971, p. 68) point out, the referee system as we now know it has not always been an integral or unvarying component of the social institution of science but, rather, "evolved in response to the concrete problems encountered in working toward the developing goals of scientific inquiry and as a by-product of the emerging social organization of scientists".

In Western Europe, the social invention of the scientific journal can be traced to new scientific societies and academies which, during the seventeenth century, began to engage in more systematic modes of scientific interchange than the letters, pamphlets and books that had previously characterized such communication. For example, in England the council of the Royal Society authorized publication of its *Philosophical Transactions* in March 1665 (Weld, 1848, pp. 177-8) in an announcement that anticipated a form of peer review. However, although we can trace practices that resemble peer review back to the seventeenth century, it was not until the post-World War II period that the process became universally accepted. Furthermore, as Paul Manske (1997, p. 768) notes: "Just as there is no specific time when the concept of peer review was adopted, so also the process of peer review has never taken a standardized form and continues to vary from journal to journal".

Ann Weller's (2001, pp. 3-8) exhaustive studies of reviewing practices confirm that prior to World War II peer review was often uncodified, and editors frequently made all decisions themselves with informal advice from colleagues. An anonymous Editorial in *Nature*, 'Coping with peer rejection' (2003), alludes to what are perhaps the most celebrated examples of such unilateral editorial judgments, namely, the five extraordinary papers (on topics including special relativity and the photoelectric effect) that Albert Einstein published in *Annalen der Physik* in 1905. These papers were not peer-reviewed by anyone other than the journal's editor, Max Planck. Although Planck was clearly Einstein's peer, he did not deploy a panel of "blind" reviewers, because at that time established authors and editors were given more latitude in their journalistic discretion. As the *Nature* Editorial asserts:

> [Planck] recognized the virtue of publishing [Einstein's] outlandish ideas, but there was also a policy that allowed authors much latitude after their first publication. Indeed, in journals in those days, the burden of proof was generally on the opponents rather than the proponents of new ideas.

Understood historically, it seems clear to me that the relatively recent widespread adoption of what Fytton Rowland (2002, p. 248) calls "the paradigmatic 'editor plus two referees system" is, to paraphrase Zuckerman and Merton (1971), an evolutionary response to specific problems and circumstances encountered by academics as they work towards developing goals of scholarly inquiry and invent mechanisms of social organization that support their work. In this light, I would argue that the present conventions of academic gatekeeping have been shaped by the specific problems and circumstances of print-based publication and its intersection with discipline-based scholarship, and that these conventions need to be rethought in the light of the new problems and circumstances of digital publication and knowledge production in complex networked systems.

---

[13]   As a past president (2008) and executive member (2007-9) of the Australian Association for Research in Education I have also had an "industrial" interest in the effects on academic workers of government policies/agendas on research quality and evaluation, some of which are tied to assumptions about the measurability of quality in academic publications.

Reconceptualizing peer review in a digital era

Digitalization, the Internet and open access initiatives challenge print-based academic publishing practices in diverse ways. Most obviously, open access initiatives pose an economic threat to print-based publishers who provide academic authors—at a cost (to someone)—with evidence of their work's quality and/or impact by reference to rejection rates and citation indices. Alternatives to print-based publishers are plentiful; for example, the American Educational Research Association's Communication of Research Special Interest Group currently lists 258 scholarly education journals that are peer-reviewed, full text and openly accessible at no cost to readers.

The conventions of "double-blind" refereeing in print-era academic publishing presume that the author does not know the referee's identity and *vice versa*. But my experience is that "double-blind" refereeing tends not to work because (i) authorship can be obvious to a knowledgeable reader and (ii) search engines such as Google Scholar make it easy to determine authorship of an "anonymized" paper (e.g., I have recently reviewed several papers whose authors had already advertized their submission to the respective journals on their institutional homepages and/or personal websites). Rowland (2002) notes that the prestigious *British Medical Journal* (BMJ) now uses open peer review (where the referee is identified to the author), which has led to more constructive reviews, fewer abusive reviews, and helps to prevent plagiarism.

Rowland (2002) also notes that discussions about new approaches to online publication usually distinguish between peer review (in which a small number of individuals pass judgment on a paper), and peer commentary, where after publication other scholars may append notes or comments to a paper. Many advocates of change argue that existing review systems perpetuate an outdated approach to the distribution of research results—that they were needed to ration space in print journals, and that they are unnecessary in the relatively cost-free environment of the Internet because authors can post all their material and allow readers to sort out what they want to read. In the short term, national regulatory/compliance frameworks might determine the extent to which open peer commentary after publication is accepted as a valuable adjunct to traditional refereeing rather than a replacement for it.

A related approach is to mount papers online, identified as unrefereed, and then solicit comment on them. On the basis of comments received, the author then revises and improves the paper, after which it is refereed in its improved form in the usual way. If it is published as a refereed paper it undergoes no further changes. This overcomes many of the objections to non-refereeing. In effect this is what happens in the fields of physics, mathematics, computer science, quantitative biology and statistics via Cornell University's e-print archive[14] which mounts both unrefereed and published papers (each identified as such). Authors take pre-publication comments about their papers into account when submitting their papers to conventional journals. After publication the pre-print version is removed and replaced by the published version. This system has been slow to catch on in other fields, although attempts have been made in both economics and psychology.

One advantage of publishing in unrefereed open archives is that it helps to preserve scholarship that might be undervalued within understandings of what counts as knowledge at a given time. For example, Benoît Mandelbrot's inquiries in the mathematical representation of chaos were triggered by what he found among data discarded by the scientific establishment: "I got the habit of literally looking in the trash cans of science".[15] He recalls

---

[14]   See http://arXiv.org/
[15]   My initial source for this quotation and the one that follows was an article in the now defunct weekly magazine*, The Bulletin* (20 February 1990: 33) which I transcribed for use in a conference presentation (Gough, 1991). James Gleick (1987: 81) also quotes Mandelbrot as saying, 'I started looking in the trash

that after finding an article on measuring coastlines in a Yorktown (US) library's rubbish, "I systematically went through obscure journals. And again and again I found in those journals the idea that the world is complicated, erratic, bizarre, unclassifiable". This anecdote contains salutary lessons for those of us who hold gatekeeper roles in journals with high rejection rates. We live with the possibility that what we reject—and which may thus remain unpublished or be relegated to "obscure journals"—could be highly significant within frames of reference different from those we use as criteria for an article's acceptability for publication.

I was mindful of this anecdote when I founded the open access electronic journal, *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry (TCI)*, on behalf of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, and devised its peer review policies and procedures. These were deliberately designed to "enact and facilitate transnational conversations in curriculum inquiry" and "subject the process of peer review to transparent peer review".[16] Authors could choose to anonymise their papers if they wished, but the majority did not do so. Each referee's signed review was circulated to the other referees and, at my discretion, manuscripts accepted for publication were published together with the referees' comments and the author's response. Referees were also advised as follows:

> In deciding whether to accept or reject an article, the editors of *TCI* advise reviewers to ask themselves if the international community of curriculum scholars is better served by publishing or not publishing the article. In the absence of compelling reasons to reject the article, the editors of *TCI* advise reviewers to recommend acceptance, because the quality of the article will be judged eventually by the scholarly community after its publication.

These modifications to conventional peer review practices encouraged some reviewers to respond constructively and creatively to the submissions they appraised. For example, in their response to Pauline Sameshima and Rita Irwin's (2008) "Rendering dimensions of liminal *currere*", Warren and Marg Sellers (2008, pp. 69-70) wrote:

> we envision our approach as responding to an invitation to make opportunistic interconnections… Or, plainly put, a chance for us to join with Pauline and Rita in elaborating their ideas. For some readers this may seem a strange way to review, but our poststructural reading of reviewing calls on us to be excessive, rather than intercessive, and to contribute more than critique. That is, we choose to be both celebratory with and salutary to our colleagues…

David Greenwood (2008, p. 336) draws attention to this response as being "remarkable because of how much it differs from the typical academic disagreements journals sometimes publish" and sees it as an example of "scholarly collaboration that suggests how possibilities and opportunities are lost when individual critics work at building opposition rather than connection".

Reconceptualising gatekeeping in complex networked systems

---

cans of science for such phenomena, because I suspected that what I was observing was not an exception but perhaps very widespread'. Nigel Lesmoir-Gordon's (2010) obituary also recalls that, during the 1960s Mandelbrot 'scoured through forgotten and obscure journals', finding crucial clues for his inquiries in journals that were about to be pulped.

[16] http://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/tci/about/editorialPolicies#peerReviewProcess

Deborah Osberg, William Doll and Donna Trueit (2008, pp. iii-iv) address the implications for academic publishing of new conceptions of knowledge production in their discussion of what they call "gatekeeping-as-policing" in relation to their work as editors of *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*:

> Gatekeeper-police impose (and enforce) an already existing "official" order on the system (or academic field)—i.e., an external order—which ensures that "renegade" or "sub-standard" outsiders are prevented from entering. This policing activity, however, can be considered fundamentally anti-complexity if we understand complexity in terms of self-organization and the spontaneous emergence of new dynamic forms of order from within (rather than outside of) the complex system itself. In short, the idea of externally imposed order (policing) is anathema to complexity thinking. Policing reduces complexity and inhibits emergence. It is also antithetical to research, the purpose of which is to go beyond the already known to open new spaces of thought (or forms of order) which cannot be judged in terms of the standards of the known

Gatekeeping-as-policing assumes that the boundaries and standards of a particular academic discipline or field are well defined. However, the boundaries of many areas or foci of scholarly inquiry are fluid and open. For example, with respect to the conjunction of complexity and education as a research field, Brent Davis and Renata Phelps (2005) argue that contributions can be inter-, cross-, or transdisciplinary. Thus, Osberg, Doll & Trueit (2008) propose understanding gatekeeping in complexivist terms, which follows from new understandings of knowledge in complexivist or "emergentist" terms. The open relational logic of complexity invites us to understand all knowledge as already interconnected in complex non-linear relationships. Knowledge emerges in relational interactions and, in Gert Biesta's (2006, p. 47) terms, involves a "coming into presence" that cannot be predicted from any analysis of the interacting elements that facilitated its appearance. Such new knowledge cannot be assessed in terms of prior standards. As Osberg, Doll & Trueit (2008, p. vii) conclude:

> If these are the conditions under which new knowledge comes into being, then the free (unpoliced) exchange of ideas is the primary tool by means of which such knowledge comes into being'… Gatekeeping in this regard is no longer an activity of policing, *but an activity of facilitating engagement between different forms of knowledge, different meanings,* so that something else can take place. What takes place cannot be described before it appears as we cannot know where the search for connected meaning will take us… In this sense *gatekeepers hold the gate open*.

GLOBALIZING LOCAL KNOWLEDGE TRADITIONS: THE "INTERNATIONALIZATION" OF CURRICULUM STUDIES

In the previous version of this chapter I introduced the issue of the "internationalization" of curriculum studies by quoting the then-current guide for authors intending to submit manuscripts to the *Journal of Curriculum Studies* (*JCS*):

> All authors are asked to take account of the diverse audience of *Journal of Curriculum Studies.* Clearly explain or avoid the use of terms that might be meaningful only to a local or national audience. However, note also that *Journal of Curriculum Studies* does not aspire to be international in the ways that McDonald's

restaurants or Hilton Hotels are "international; "we much prefer papers that, where appropriate, reflect the particularities of each higher education system.

This advice[17] expresses a view of global/local relations that seems to resist "globalization"—understood as economic integration achieved through "free trade" in a deregulated global marketplace—while affirming "internationalism"(in the sense of promoting global peace, social justice, and well-being through intergovernmental cooperation and transnational social movements, agencies, and communities—such as the international community of curriculum scholars that produces and reads *JCS*).[18] My chapter sought to refine and amplify some of the tacit assumptions underlying this advice to authors, by considering ways in which diverse local knowledge traditions—as are still represented in at least some local and national curriculum policies and syllabuses, as well as in some "indigenous" approaches to curriculum studies per se—can be sustained and amplified transnationally while resisting the forms of cultural homogenization for which McDonald's and Hilton Hotels are emblematic.

The literature that I then found most useful in thinking about globalization and inter-nationalization in relation to local knowledge production was, broadly speaking, that which Sandra Harding (1998) calls post-Kuhnian and postcolonial science and technology studies, and more particularly the work of David Turnbull (1994, 1997, 2000). Turnbull argues that all knowledge traditions are spatial in that they link people, sites, and skills. His approach is thus to recognize knowledge systems (including Western science) as sets of local practices so that it becomes possible to "decenter" them and develop a framework within which different knowledge traditions can be equitably compared rather than absorbed into an imperialist archive. The purpose of Turnbull's emphasis on analyzing knowledge systems comparatively in terms of spatiality and performance is to find ways in which diverse knowledge traditions can coexist rather than one displacing others. He argues that nourishing such diversity is dependent on the creation of "a third space, an interstitial space" in which local knowledge traditions can be "reframed, decentred and the social organisation of trust can be negotiated." The production of such a space is "crucially dependent" on "the re-inclusion of the performative side of knowledge":

> Knowledge, in so far as it is portrayed as essentially a form of representation, will tend towards universal homogenous information at the expense of local knowledge traditions. If knowledge is recognised as both representational and performative it will be possible to create a space in which knowledge traditions can be performed together (Turnbull, 1997, pp. 560–61).

I still have no quarrel with Turnbull's analysis and I continue to resist the homogenizing effects of globalization and internationalization in the field of curriculum studies by emphasizing the performative rather than the representational aspects of curriculum inquiry. That is, I still understand the "internationalization" of curriculum studies as a process of creat-ing transnational "spaces" in which local knowledge traditions in curriculum inquiry can be performed together, rather than an attempt to translate local representations of curriculum into a universalized discourse. In the past decade, those of us who have been explicitly engaged in

---

[17]   I was, in fact, responsible for this particular form of words, first incorporating them into the supplementary notes I prepared for authors in the Australian region shortly after I assumed the Australian editorship of *JCS* in 1986; however, I acknowledge that this characterization of the journal's "internationalism" paraphrases advice provided in a personal communication from the then general editor, William Reid.

[18]   For a discussion of the distinctions that may be made between globalization and internationalism see Jones (2000).

projects of internationalizing curriculum inquiry have addressed questions of *how* local knowledge traditions in curriculum inquiry can be performed together in a variety of ways.

For example, Pinar (2005) formulates his guiding question as follows: how do we provide opportunities for 'complicated conversation' and 'intellectual breakthrough' in the internationalization of curriculum studies? Pinar (2005) explores this question through three concepts that structure Charles David Axelrod's (1979) sociological study of intellectual breakthrough, namely, *thinking*, *individuality* and *community*, and has conducted inquiries in Mexico, Brazil, South Africa and the United States of America (Pinar, 2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2013) that use these concepts to structure planned sequences of transnational curriculum conversations. However, my personal experiences of research, consultancy, and teaching in various nations/regions—including Australia, China, Europe, Iran, New Zealand, and southern Africa[19]— during the past decade and more have served to deepen my conviction that the "complicated conversation" to which Pinar refers is not yet complicated enough in the disciplines within which I work (principally curriculum studies, research methodology, environmental education, and science education). The international discourses of these disciplines are "complicated", complex, and diverse only within Western registers of difference in the sign systems of disciplined inquiry, principally because they remain dominated by scholars who work in Eurocentric scholarly traditions.

I have found Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) "geophilosophy"— a new critical language for analyzing thinking as flows or movements across space—particularly helpful in thinking about the unavoidable concept of *difference* (within and between nations/regions/cultures) and the opportunities and dilemmas for curriculum scholars that difference produces. Pinar (2005, pp. 13-14)) alludes to the productivity of difference in his description of one of the phases of his research on the internationalization of curriculum studies:

> One potential function of 'internationalization'—being called by a foreigner to reflect upon one's own nationally and/or regionally-distinctive field, including one's own situatedness within it—is the dislocation of the native scholar-participant from his or her embeddedness in his or her local or domestic field. This opportunity for dislocation is occasioned by the call to study one's locality in conversation with foreigners in a foreign setting. Such dislocation functions to interpellate the individual scholar as a "stranger," certainly to foreigners and, to a lesser and relative extent, to one's fellow citizens.

Here the concept of difference is marked by other concepts such as "native" and "foreigner", and I will now demonstrate how Deleuze and Guattari's approach differs from that of analytical philosophers by focusing more sharply on the concept of "foreigner". For Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 5), the philosopher's task is not to construe the concept of "foreigner" as an object of "contemplation, reflection and communication" but, rather, to ask how the concept of "foreigner" is (or can be) created. However, before I outline (my interpretation of) Deleuze and Guattari's response to this question, I suggest that their philosophy of concept creation might be more intelligible if we can first imagine some possible circumstances in which the concept of "foreigner" is *not* (and perhaps *cannot* be) created.

Ursula Le Guin (2000) imagines such circumstances in *The Telling*, a novel in her series of so-called 'Hainish' stories. The common background for this series supposes that, at least half a million years ago, intelligent humanoids from the planet Hain spread across the galaxy and settled on nearly a hundred habitable worlds, including Terra (Earth), that were then left

---

[19]   The experiences to which I refer are both direct (such as teaching or conducting research in these nations/regions) and vicarious (such as supervising or examining research conducted by doctoral students in these nations/regions).

alone for many millennia. Le Guin's stories imagine that communication and travel between the worlds has resumed and that a loose interplanetary federation, the Ekumen, coordinates the exchange of goods and knowledge among the myriad of diverse cultures, religions, philosophies, sciences and forms of governance that have evolved separately on the various planets. Representatives of the Ekumen travel to each planet when it is rediscovered and invite peoples of Hainish descent to participate in the federation, if they wish.

In *The Telling*, Sutty is a Terran Observer for the Ekumen, a language and literature specialist who travels to the planet Aka to continue studies initiated by the first Observers to make contact with the Akan people some seventy years earlier. Aka is a world with only one continent, so all of its peoples live on just one landmass. In the following passage, Sutty meditates on the significance of this difference from Terra—and its implications for the politics of identity—and, related to this, her conviction that traditional Akan spirituality is not a 'religion':

> religion as an institution demanding belief and claiming authority, religion as a community shaped by a knowledge of foreign deities or competing institutions, had never existed on Aka. Until, perhaps, the present time.
>
> Aka's habitable lands were a single huge continent with an immensely long archipelago of its eastern coast … Undivided by oceans, the Akans were physically all of one type with slight local variations. All the Observers had remarked on this, all had pointed out the ethnic homogeneity … but none of them had quite realised that among Akans *there were no foreigners*. There had never been any foreigners, until the ships from the Ekumen landed.
>
> It was a simple fact, but one remarkably difficult for the Terran mind to comprehend. No aliens. No others, in the deadly sense of otherness that existed on Terra, the implacable division between tribes, the arbitrary and impassable borders, the ethnic hatreds cherished over centuries and millennia. 'The people' here meant not *my* people, but people—everybody, humanity. 'Barbarian' didn't mean an incomprehensible outlander, but an uneducated person. On Aka, all competition was familial. All wars were civil wars (Le Guin, 2000, pp. 98-9).

We hardly need to be reminded of just how deadly our sense of otherness can be. The breadth of new antiterrorist legislation in nations such as Australia and the US—coupled in Australia with the federal government's paranoid approach to "border protection" and treatment of asylum seekers that amounts to institutionalized racism—is eroding the foundations of respect for human rights in these countries and worldwide. *The Telling* is testimony to the *possibility* of thinking what many humans think is unthinkable, such as imagining a world without "foreigners". What would social and educational policy look like if we too assumed that "the people" meant "everybody, humanity"? Le Guin demonstrates that it is possible to think differently about identity and community, and related questions of inclusion and exclusion, without ever underestimating the immense difficulty of doing so, and the even greater difficulty of bringing new imaginaries into effect. Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 33) show us how to perform philosophy in ways that can produce similar effects to Le Guin's storytelling arts, that is, to create a perspective through which the world takes on a new significance: "The task of philosophy when it creates concepts… is always to extract an event from things and beings, always to give them a new event: space, time, matter, thought, the possible as events".

For Deleuze and Guattari (1994, pp. 35-6), *doing* philosophy means creating concepts on planes of immanence: "Philosophy is a constructivism, and constructivism has two qualitatively different aspects: the creation of concepts and the laying out of a plane". Every concept is a finite multiplicity. For example, our concept of "foreigner" involves many other

concepts, such as ethnic/racial difference and territorial divisibility. Neither singular nor universal concepts are possible because every concept has a "history" and a "becoming"—a history of its traversal of previous constellations of concepts, and a becoming as it joins with other concepts within similar or contiguous fields of problems.

As I interpret Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 37), the proposition that every concept has a history and a becoming is not only a matter of concepts developing within various and changing social and historical contexts but also recognizes that concepts have *acontextual* and *atemporal* features. Every concept inaugurates the plane of immanence of the concept, which is "neither a concept nor the concept of all concepts" but, rather, is a preconceptual field presupposed within the concept, "not in the way that one concept may refer to others but in the way that concepts themselves refer to nonconceptual understanding" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994, p. 40). Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 37; my emphasis) argue that the "plane of immanence is not a concept that is or can be thought but rather *the image thought gives itself of what it means to think, to make use of thought, to find ones bearings in thought*". For example: "in Descartes [the plane of immanence] is a matter of a subjective understanding implicitly presupposed by the 'I think' as first concept; in Plato it is the virtual image of an already-thought that doubles every actual concept" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1994, pp. 40-41). The plane of immanence is inaugurated within the concept (that which is created) but it is clearly distinct from the concept (because it expresses the uncreated, that which "thought just does"). The plane of immanence thus expresses the nonconceptual that is *both* internal to *and* "outside" the concept. Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 36) characterize this complex and paradoxical relationship as follows: "concepts are events, but the plane is the horizon of events, the reservoir or reserve of purely conceptual events". By way of example, Iain MacKenzie (1996, p. 1236) suggests:

> "the present happens" because there is a "past-becoming-future horizon" presupposed within it. Without a presupposed limitless expanse of time we could not talk of the present. In the same way, without the presupposed plane of immanence concepts would never "happen". Moreover, as the present would never change without the existence of an "eternal horizon" presupposed within it, without the institution of the plane—that which thought "just does"—concepts would never change. The fact that concepts institute this "unthinkable" plane at their core engenders the movement of concepts; their history and becoming.

In a similar way, we could say that the concept of "foreigner" happens for us because there is an "us-becoming-other" horizon presupposed within it. Neither the concept nor the preconceptual field happened for the Akans until they created it to make sense of the existence of the Ekumen.

Deleuze and Guattari's geophilosophy enlarges the field of concepts and signs that we can deploy to account for difference, which in turn multiplies the possibilities for analyses, critiques, and interventions. Such a broadening of our repertoires of representation and performance might be particularly useful when we encounter *remarkable* difference (difference that puzzles, provokes, surprises or shocks us)—as we almost certainly will as transnational curriculum conversations become more widespread, inclusive, and complicated/complex. Alma Gottlieb (2002) provides one example of such remarkable difference in her ethnographic study of the Beng villagers in Africa's Ivory Coast. She focuses on the Beng belief that children are reincarnated souls from whom their parents must learn lessons of the afterlife. Mediated by local seers, Beng parents understand education to be a listening process through which they discover their child's hidden knowledge and capture the essence and destiny of his or her soul. Parents assume that their children are

maximally multilingual at birth, because they knew all languages in the afterlife, but that they lose this multilingual capacity around the age of three. If we can say that the Beng people have a concept of "language education", then (in our terms) it is a reactualization process of selecting the "right" channels that will be useful for communicating with others in this new life; it is a process of *forgetting* many languages, not "learning" one.

How should we (the "we" who belong to international organizations such as IAACS or who otherwise work transnationally) respond to such a remarkable difference between concepts of education? Some might seek to "explain" the difference in terms of social and historical contexts. Some will invoke cultural relativism. I must admit that my first response was to welcome the Beng as a resource for teaching in my curriculum studies courses, using their understanding of learning-as-forgetting as a defamiliarization strategy. Defamiliarization (often rendered as 'to make the familiar strange, and the strange familiar'[20]) assumes that the tactic of surprise may serve to diminish distortions and help us to recognize our own preconceptions, and it is a recurrent feature of artistic manifestos and of creative brainstorming sessions in many fields (that is, defamiliarization is potentially a tool for intellectual breakthrough).

But these sorts of responses do nothing in this world for Beng children. One of the apparent consequences of Beng parents' belief that children are reincarnated souls is that they pay scant attention to their children's material needs (the Beng do not fear the afterlife) and infant mortality rates are horrendous even by African norms: fewer than 20% of Beng children survive beyond the age of 5 years.

Deleuze and Guattari's geophilosophy cannot tell us precisely how we might resolve the dilemmas produced by this encounter with difference, but I am prepared to argue that they offer a more ethically defensible approach to seeking such a resolution than conventional Western philosophies that repress difference in the name of what is "right" (and righteous). For Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 82): "Philosophy does not consist in knowing and is not inspired by truth. Rather, it is categories like Interesting, Remarkable, or Important that determine its success or failure". Their philosophy is a creative and hopeful practice whose purpose is not to be "right" in an abstract or universal sense but to contribute to the quality of "real" lives. Deleuze (1994, p. xx) insists that concepts "should intervene to resolve local situations" and consistently argues that (Western) philosophy has been aligned too closely with dominant interests in promoting identity and sameness and marginalizing difference:

> The history of philosophy has always been the agent of power in philosophy, and even in thought. It has played the repressor's role… Philosophy is shot through with the project of becoming the official language of a Pure State. The exercise of thought thus conforms to the goals of the real State, to the dominant meanings and to the requirements of the established order (Gilles Deleuze & Claire Parnet, 1987, p. 13).

Thus, if philosophy is to succeed in doing important things (such as reducing infant mortality rates), it must also seek to do interesting and remarkable things by creating novelty and difference. If we think it is important *both* to save Beng children's lives *and* to conserve Beng cultural traditions, we need to invent ways in which our different knowledge traditions can coexist rather than displacing "theirs" by "ours". Imagining that the Beng, too, create concepts on planes of immanence respects our differences and offers us an ethically

---

[20]   This phrase has been attributed to the German poet Novalis (1772-1801, aka Friedrich von Hardenberg). The concept of defamiliarization is found among other Romantic theorists such as Wordsworth and Coleridge and is also closely associated with Surrealism. Russian formalist Victor Shklovsky (1917/1965) introduced the concept of *ostraneniye* (literally "making strange") to literary theory.

defensible repertoire of dispositions and conceptual tools that we might be able to use in building a space created through the process that David Turnbull (2000, p. 228) describes as "negotiation between spaces, where contrasting rationalities can work together but without the notion of a single transcendent reality" (p. 228). Elsewhere, Turnbull (1997, p. 560) refers to the space he envisages as "a third space, an interstitial space"[21] In Deleuze's (1987, p. 8) thought, the dynamics of becoming are such that any given multiplicity, such as the constellation of concepts that structure the Beng view of learning, "changes in nature as it expands its connections". This gives me hope that a new multiplicity, created in a "third space" in which Beng people negotiate with others, might include (say) a concept of children as reincarnated souls that is *not* incommensurate with caring for their health.

The idea of a presupposed plane of immanence generates many other new questions and possibilities for complicated conversation around concepts such as "intellectual breakthrough" in the internationalization of curriculum studies, and the many other concepts that constitute its multiplicity, including those that Axelrod (1979) identifies: "thinking", "individuality" and "community"*,* We can ask questions such as: what preconceptual fields are presupposed within the concept of intellectual breakthrough in different nations/cultures? What are the acontextual and atemporal features of intellectual breakthrough in different nations/cultures? What presupposed horizon of events permits concepts such as "thinking", "individuality" and "community" to "happen" when and where they do?

Jakub Zdebik(2003, p. 142) offers a way to think metaphorically about the relationship between concepts and planes that might be useful for some purposes:

> In order to describe the plane of immanence, Deleuze and Guattari must simultaneously describe the concept. The plane of immanence and the concept mutually define each other. It is as if the plane of immanence is an invisible mental landscape that can only be seen through the concepts occupying it. It is a place that becomes noticeable through the objects that occupy this space. It is like cities that appear to an airplane flying over dark continents when, after night has fallen, the lights come on.
>
> From the height of this plane we can map out the geography of the plane of immanence, because geography [quoting Deleuze and Guattari,1994, p. 96] "is not merely physical and human but mental, like a landscape".

What other generative metaphors might help us to reveal the "invisible mental landscapes" of curriculum studies and stories in various nations/regions? What "invisible mental landscapes" do (or might) curriculum scholars and/or environmental educators and/or philosophers of education who work transnationally share? These are significant questions because, as Deleuze and Guattari (1994) argue, modes of intellectual inquiry need to account for the planes of immanence upon which they operate. Following this line of argument, Ned Curthoys (2001, n.p.) suggests that "conceptual thinking needs to retain a multifarious 'sense' of what it is doing, the kinds of problems it addresses and the cultural context it seeks to influence and is influenced by". Curthoys' perspective is particularly useful for my purposes because he deploys terms and tropes that resonate with IAACS's mission to support complicated scholarly conversations across national and regional borders:

> The plane of immanence is the complex ongoing conversation, the dilemma, the received history of fraught questions that one intuitively recognises as a formative background for one's own critical enunciations. In other words, the plane of immanence is the admission

---

[21] For a more detailed exploration of the significance of Turnbull's research for transnational curriculum inquiry see Gough (2003).

that thought is not simply a contemplative relation to a secure object of knowledge, nor a solution to a problem, but rather an affirmation of all that is problematic and historically negotiated. As an historically inflected thinking, the plane of immanence turns one's focus towards the cultural competency required for addressing a set of issues and the historically productive conditions of transformative thinking.[22]

The preamble to the IAACS Constitution states that: "at this historical moment and for the foreseeable future, curriculum inquiry occurs within national borders, often informed by governmental policies and priorities, responsive to national situations. Curriculum study is, therefore, nationally distinctive"[23]. If we restate this assertion in Deleuze and Guattari's terms, we could say that curriculum inquiry presently operates on numerous nationally distinctive "planes of immanence" (or, in Zdebik's terms, "invisible mental landscapes"). If we also agree with the founders of the IAACS who "do not dream of a worldwide field of curriculum studies mirroring the standardization and uniformity the larger phenomenon of globalization threatens"[24], then it follows that the internationalization of curriculum studies should not create concepts that inaugurate a single transnational plane of immanence (or posit a single "invisible mental landscape" in which transnational curriculum inquiry takes place) but, rather, will be a continuous process enacted by curriculum scholars worldwide who have the capacities and competencies to *change planes*. In this context, "changing planes" refers both to movements between one plane of immanence and another, and/or to transformations of one's own plane.[25]

NOT A CONCLUSION

I share Susanne Kappeler's (1986: 212) perspective on concluding an essay:

I do not really wish to conclude and sum up, rounding of the argument so as to dump it in a nutshell on the reader. A lot more could be said about any of the topics I have touched upon… I have meant to ask the questions, to break the frame… The point is not a set of answers, but making possible a different practice.

Accordingly, I ask only that readers contemplate the different practices for transnational curriculum inquiry that the imaginaries performed above might generate.

REFERENCES

Anonymous. (2003). Coping with peer rejection [Editorial]. *Nature, 425*(6959), 645.
Axelrod, Charles David. (1979). *Studies in Intellectual Breakthrough*. Amherst MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

---

[22] Seeking the 'productive conditions of transformative thinking' clearly resonates with Pinar's (2005) question of how to provide opportunities for 'intellectual breakthrough' in the internationalization of curriculum studies

[23] http://iaacs.ca

[24] http://iaacs.ca

[25] For a more detailed elaboration of the generativity of the "changing planes" metaphor for transnational curriculum inquiry see Gough (2007, 2009)

Biesta, Gert. (2006). *Beyond Learning. Democratic Education for a Human Future*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Curthoys, Ned. (2001). Future directions for rhetoric - invention and ethos in public critique. *Australian Humanities Review,* (April). Retrieved 25 October 2005, from http://www.lib.latrobe.edu.au/AHR/archive/Issue-April-2001/curthoys.html

Davis, Brent, & Phelps, Renata. (2005). Exploring the common spaces of education and complexity: transphenomenality, transdisciplinarity, and interdiscursivity. *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education, 2*(1), 1-4.

Deleuze, Gilles. (1994). *Difference and Repetition* (Paul Patton, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, & Guattari, Félix. (1977). *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Robert Hurley, Mark Seem & Helen R. Lane, Trans.). New York: The Viking Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, & Guattari, Félix. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Brian Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, Gilles, & Guattari, Félix. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* (G. Burchell & H. Tomlinson, Trans.). London: Verso.

Deleuze, Gilles, & Parnet, Claire. (1987). *Dialogues* (Hugh Tomlinson & Barbara Habberjam, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Galloway, Michelle Rotchford. (2002). Rape in schools a substantial public health problem in South Africa. *Medical Research Council of South Africa AIDS Bulletin, 11*(1).

Gleick, James. (1987). *Chaos: The Making of a New Science*. New York: Viking.

Gottlieb, Alma. (2002). Deconstructing the notion of education: a view from West Africa. In Liora Bresler & Alexander Ardichvili (Eds.), *Research in International Education: Experience, Theory, and Practice* (pp. 83-101). New York: Peter Lang.

Gough, Annette, & Gough, Noel. (2004). Environmental education research in southern Africa: dilemmas of interpretation. *Environmental Education Research, 10*(3), 409-424.

Gough, Noel. (1991). Curriculum journalism for a postmodern society. Paper presented at the Australian Curriculum Studies Association Conference: *Liberating the Curriculum*, Adelaide, South Australia, 11-14 July.

Gough, Noel. (2000). Globalization and curriculum inquiry: locating, representing, and performing a transnational imaginary. In Nelly P. Stromquist & Karen Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation across Cultures* (pp. 77-98). Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Gough, Noel. (2001). Learning from *Disgrace*: a troubling narrative for South African curriculum work. *Perspectives in Education, 19*(1), 107-126.

Gough, Noel. (2003). Thinking globally in environmental education: implications for internationalizing curriculum inquiry. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (pp. 53-72). Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gough, Noel. (2007). Changing planes: rhizosemiotic play in transnational curriculum inquiry. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 26*(3), 279-294.

Gough, Noel. (2008). Narrative experiments and imaginative inquiry. *South African Journal of Education, 28*(3), 335-349.

Gough, Noel. (2009). Becoming transnational: rhizosemiosis, complicated conversation, and curriculum inquiry. In Marcia McKenzie, Heesoon Bai, Paul Hart & Bob Jickling (Eds.), *Fields of Green: Restorying Culture, Environment, and Education* (pp. 67-83). Cresskill NJ: Hampton Press.

Gough, Noel. (2012). W(h)ither gatekeeping? Academic publishing and peer review in complex networked systems. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural & Policy Studies, 31*(1), 35-41.

Greenwood, David A. (2008). A critical pedagogy of place: from gridlock to parallax. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 336-348.

Harding, Sandra. (1998). Multiculturalism, postcolonialism, feminism: do they require new research epistemologies? *Australian Educational Researcher, 25*(1), 37-51.

Henry, Miriam, & Taylor, Sandra. (1997). Globalisation and national schooling policy in Australia. In Bob Lingard & Paige Porter (Eds.), *A National Approach to Schooling in Australia? Essays on the Development of National Policies in Schools Education* (pp. 45-59). Canberra: Australian College of Education.

Jones, Phillop W. (2000). Globalization and Internationalism: democratic prospects for world education. In Nelly P. Stromquist & Karen Monkman (Eds.), *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation across Cultures* (pp. 27-42). Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Kappeler, Susanne. (1986). *The Pornography of Representation*. Cambridge MA: Polity Press.

Le Guin, Ursula K. (2000). *The Telling*. New York: Harcourt.

Lesmoir-Gordon, Nigel. (2010, 17 October). Benoît Mandelbrot obituary. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 21 Juluy 2012 from http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2010/oct/17/benoit-mandelbrot-obituary

Levi, Robin S. (2003). South Africa: peace starts at home.   Retrieved 13 April, 2003, from http://endabuse.org/programs/display.php3?DocID=108

Luke, Allan. (2011). Generalizing across borders: policy and the limits of educational science. *Educational Researcher, 40*(8), 367-377.

MacKenzie, Iain. (1996). Deleuze and Guattari's poststructuralist philosophy. In Patrick Dunleavy & James Stanyer (Eds.), *Contemporary Political Studies 1996* (pp. 1234-1241). Exeter: Political Studies Association.

Manske, Paul R. (1997). A review of peer review. *Journal of Hand Surgery, 22*(5), 767-771.

Meier, Eileen. (2002). Child rape in South Africa. *Pediatric Nursing, 28*(5), 532-535.

Osberg, Deborah, Doll, William E., & Trueit, Donna. (2008). Gatekeepers of a complex field? *Complicity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education, 5*(1), iii-ix.

Pinar, William F. (2005). Complicated conversation: occasions for 'intellectual breakthrough' in the internationalization of curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies [Taiwan], 1*(1), 1-26.

Pinar, William F. (Ed.). (1975). *Curriculum Theorizing: the Reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Pinar, William F. (Ed.). (2003). *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pinar, William F. (Ed.). (2010). *Curriculum Studies in South Africa: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. (Ed.). (2011a). *Curriculum Studies in Brazil: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. (Ed.). (2011b). *Curriculum Studies in Mexico: Intellectual Histories, Present Circumstances*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F. (Ed.). (2013). *Curriculum Studies in the United States: Present Circumstances, Intellectual Histories*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pinar, William F., Reynolds, William M., Slattery, Patrick, & Taubman, Peter. (1995). *Understanding Curriculum: An Introduction to the Study of Historical and Contemporary Curriculum Discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.

Rowland, Fytton. (2002). The peer-review process. *Learned Publishing, 15*(4), 247–258.

Sameshima, Pauline, & Irwin, Rita L. (2008). Rendering dimensions of liminal *currere*. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 5*(2), 1-15. Retrieved 1 November 2008, from http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci

Schwab, Joseph J. (1969). The practical: a language for curriculum. *School Review, 78*(1), 1-23.

Schwab, Joseph J. (1971). The practical: arts of eclectic. *School Review, 79*(4), 493-454.

Schwab, Joseph J. (1973). The practical 3: translation into curriculum. *School Review, 81*(4), 501-522.

Sellers, Warren, & Sellers, Marg. (2008). Responding to Pauline Sameshima and Rita Irwin's 'Rendering dimensions of liminal *currere*'. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry, 5*(2), 69-73. Retrieved 1 November 2008, from http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci

Shklovsky, Victor. (1917/1965). Art as technique (Lee T. Lemon & Marion J. Reis, Trans.). In Lee T. Lemon & Marion J. Reis (Eds.), *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays* (pp. 3-24). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Trueit, Donna, Doll, William E., Wang, Hongyu, & Pinar, William F. (Eds.). (2003). *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies: Selected Proceedings from the LSU [Louisiana State University] Conference 2000*. New York: Peter Lang.

Turnbull, David. (1994). Local knowledge and comparative scientific traditions. *Knowledge and Policy, 6*(3/4), 29-54.

Turnbull, David. (1997). Reframing science and other local knowledge traditions. *Futures, 29*(6), 551-562.

Turnbull, David. (2000). *Masons, Tricksters and Cartographers: Comparative Studies in the Sociology of Scientific and Indigenous Knowledge*. Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Weld, Charles R. (1848). *A History of the Royal Society, With Memoirs of the Presidents* (Vol. 1). London: J.W. Parker.

Weller, Ann C. (2001). *Editorial Peer Review: Its Strengths and Weaknesses*. Medford NJ: Information Today Inc.

Wilson, Rob, & Dissanayake, Wimal (Eds.). (1996). *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Yates, Lyn, & Grumet, Madeleine (Eds.). (2011). *World Yearbook of Education 2011 – Curriculum in Today's World: Configuring Knowledge, Identities, Work and Politics*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Zdebik, Jakub. (2003). The archipelago and the diagram. *Journal for the Arts, Sciences, and Technology, 1*(2), 141-146.

Zuckerman, Harriet, & Merton, Robert K. (1971). Patterns of evaluation in science: Institutionalisation, structure and functions of the referee system. *Minerva, 9*(1), 66-100.

Bionote

Noel Gough is Foundation Professor of Outdoor and Environmental Education in the Faculty of Education, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia. Previously he held senior academic appointments at the University of Canberra and Deakin University, and has also held visiting fellowships at universities in Canada, South Africa, and the UK. His teaching, scholarship and publications focus on educational philosophy and theory, curriculum inquiry, and poststructuralist research methodologies, with particular reference to environmental education, science education, internationalization and globalization. Contact: n.gough@latrobe.edu.au