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ABSTRACT: The main objective of this text is to discuss the challenges and potential of the relationships between curriculum and decoloniality, highlighting the question: What can curriculums with decolonial perspectives contribute? The discussion involves the analysis of four theoretical categories considered central to studies in this curriculum field, which are: school knowledge, power relations, educational purposes, and production of subjectivities in schooling. Using references from decolonial thinking and pedagogy, in each one of these aspects are highlighted some of the main challenges to overcoming the hegemonic colonial curriculum standard and options for decolonization are indicated. In conclusion, the article affirms that initiatives of curriculum practices from a decolonial perspective are more substantive and have greater potential to occupy new educational spaces when they associate conceptual understanding, collective courage for insurgence and cultural and political engagement with other modes of being, resisting, knowing, occupying and living.


RESUMO: O principal objetivo do trabalho é discutir desafios e potenciais da relação currículo e decolonialidade, com destaque a pergunta: O que podem currículos em perspectivas decoloniais? A discussão é feita tomando-se a análise de quatro categorias teóricas consideradas centrais nos estudos do campo curricular, quais sejam: conhecimento escolar, relações de poder, finalidades formativas e produção de subjetividades na escolarização. Tomando-se como base os referenciais do pensamento e da pedagogia decoloniais, em cada um desses aspectos são destacados alguns dos principais desafios para a superação do hegemônico padrão curricular colonial e apontadas alternativas de descolonização. Como conclusão, afirma-se que as iniciativas de práticas curriculares em perspectiva decolonial são mais substantivas e com maior potencial para ocupação de novos espaços educativos, quando associam compreensão conceitual, coragem coletiva para insurgência e engajamento cultural e político com modos outros de ser, resistir, saber, ocupar e viver.


RESUMEN: El objetivo principal del trabajo es discutir retos y potencialidades de la relación entre currículo y decolonialidad, destacando la pregunta: ¿Qué pueden hacer los currículos en las perspectivas decoloniales? La discusión se basa en el análisis de cuatro categorías teóricas consideradas centrales en los estudios del campo curricular, a saber: conocimiento, relaciones de poder, propósitos de la formación y producción de subjetividades en la escolarización. Tomando-se los referentes del pensamiento y la pedagogía decoloniales, en cada uno de estos aspectos se destacan algunos de los principales retos para la superación del patrón curricular colonial hegemónico y se señalan alternativas para la descolonización. Como conclusión, se afirma que las iniciativas de prácticas curriculares en perspectiva decolonial son más sustantivas y con mayor potencialidad para ocupar nuevos espacios educativos, cuando asocian comprensión conceptual, valentía colectiva para la insurgencia y envolvimiento cultural y político con otras formas de ser, resistir, conocer, ocupar y vivir.

Introduction

The circulating production of works by Latin American researchers made available on networks that disseminate studies involving the theme of decoloniality has revealed its epistemic potential, in addition to its comprehensive and interdisciplinary character. In a recent survey carried out via databases, aiming to support the preparation of this text, we identified a well-marked set of conceptual and political meanings related to this approach, which have been serving as a reference, in education, for the treatment of various research areas, including in the more specific field of curriculum studies.

These are notions and concepts that obviously have their origins in decolonial thinking, whose literature is vast and has anchored many academic works that discuss education issues, generally anchored in the so-called Decolonial Pedagogy (WALSH, 2007, 2012). In this area, decolonial studies have served as a reference for discussion and deepening of important educational topics such as: teacher training, teaching and research methodologies, pedagogical typologies and approaches, issues of didactics, curriculum, composition/selection of school subjects and academic issues, identity issues in school training, epistemologies and educational practices, among many other aspects.

Taking this broad spectrum into account, we are interested in this work in delving into issues more directly related to the relationship between curriculum and decoloniality. The objective is, especially, to highlight challenges and potentialities of this relationship in contexts of theoretical production and curricular practices, whether in Basic or Higher Education. The mobilizing question that arises is: What can curricula do from decolonial perspectives?

We assume the notion of curriculum, in the broadest sense, as a constituent of the production of social life, therefore as a cultural and political artifact inseparable from the processes of human educability. In the scope of schooling, we understand curriculum as a symbolic-material territory of training, a movement through which certain representations of the world, senses of knowledge, truth, values and production of identities and subjectivation are intentionally manifested, projected and constructed. In this same horizon, we place curricula in a decolonial perspective as territories of educational/school propositions and practices supported by epistemic, political and pedagogical conceptions mobilized by researchers and intellectuals who are in favor of other pedagogies - therefore, outside the colonial curricular standard for human education. In the words of Walsh (2012): an educational, political and pedagogical intervention based on the assumptions of decolonial thinking.
It can be seen that in Brazil, currently, although markedly colonial curricular dynamics predominate, supported by rationalities that combine the modern, the white, the masculine, the meritocratic, the Euro-USA-centric (WALSH, 2012) and the indoctrinated (ORTIZ OCAÑA et al., 2018), important theoretical-practical initiatives are launched trying to break with this canonical conception that engendered the current world-system, especially in educational spaces, where groups that have been subordinated and silenced until now can speak, propose and act.

We decolonize the curriculum because we invented it, because we created other things, because we do not admire the colonizer, because we rebel against colonial epistemology. We decolonize because we reject and fight against the abysmal line of knowledge and we are against epistemological fascism. We decolonize because we affirm the existence of epistemological and methodological plurality (SÜSSEKIND; PAVAN, 2019, p. 2, our translation).

In this sense, the proposal of the text is to analyze potential strengths of the decolonial approach in the different aspects that involve the curricular fabric, from its conception as a symbolic-material territory of human education to its development in concrete schooling contexts. Given the wide range of theoretical categories and background issues that make up the field of curriculum, we chose only four aspects that we consider central to our analysis, as their contents are treated in greater depth and appear more frequently in studies that discuss the field. The four points have to do respectively with: school knowledge, power relations, training purposes and production of subjectivities in schooling.

In this way, we propose to deepen them in the axis of the following fundamental questions: i) Taking into account what the canons of the modern world-system count as essential curricular knowledge, what shifts are necessary and/or possible to mobilize curricula in perspectives decolonial? ii) What other meanings are expected in relationships involving power in contexts of decolonial curricular education? iii) Given the character of teleology and expectations present in colonial forms of human education, what can we expect or project in school training using decolonial curricular approaches? iv) What political and epistemic forces indicate that decolonial curricular approaches contribute to the production of subjectivities that escape the interests of colonial ontology?

The questions chosen here, which as a whole involve the four points highlighted above, invite us to think more deeply about the bases of what constituted and still constitute the modern project of schooling and, consequently, of curriculum, and which, in a certain way, they are also points prioritized by researchers in analyzes supported by decolonial pedagogies. We
understand that it is in these aspects of school and academic training that the greatest decolonization challenges posed to educational institutions in their curricular dynamics are found.

What highlights Ortiz Ocaña et al. (2018, p. 209, our translation) is symbolic in this sense:

From the previous [educational model], we can affirm that what we need in Latin American education is not just restructuring (…), (un)disciplining (…), reinventing/renewing (…), unthinking/opening (…) or reconfiguring (…) social sciences; What we need is to decolonize them, to decide, to configure “other” social sciences, to decolonize Euroscience and European pedagogy.

Obviously, in the scope of this work we do not intend to encompass the entire dimension of the debate that involves decolonial perspectives and that currently mobilizes the field of education, school training and the curriculum. It is known that both the concepts of decoloniality and their theoretical derivations or extensions are complex, broad and multidisciplinary. Likewise, it is not our intention to revisit or resume the vast conceptual base already built on decoloniality, work that has been done vigorously by researchers in the human and social sciences who are dedicated to this purpose. The objective is simply to situate elements of this powerful discussion, highlighting, in view of the four points listed above, topics that are of interest to curriculum studies, since production appears diluted in the most diverse areas and academic disciplines. This study, therefore, is configured as research of a theoretical nature, supported by references produced in different scientific environments, education itself and other spaces of knowledge that dialogue with it.

Having established the objectives of the work, we move on to the four points that we indicate as a topic for discussion.

Canons of school knowledge in the modern world-system: necessary shifts to mobilize curricula in decolonial perspectives

It seems to be consensual within the scope of the decolonial debate that the hegemonic episteme of Eurocentric universal reason, which carries with it the defense of a supposed global truth, needs to be problematized, and that the colonization of knowledge proves to be a structuring cause in the relationship with other forms of domination, including power, being, living and occupation.

Walsh (2009) states that, by facing the rationalities that keep the coloniality of knowledge hegemonic, we are creating the conditions to overcome monological universalisms
in the definitions of so-called modern science. This movement can mobilize the creation of other educational systems at all levels and modalities. Different conceptions can challenge the dominant geopolitics of knowledge, pluralizing epistemologies established, configured and imposed since the colonial world-system.

Knowing an “order of knowledge” allows you to approach the educational problem from another perspective. It allows us to go further into educational policies or the curricular proposal and consider how the educational institution has contributed - and continues to contribute - to the colonization of minds, to the notions of “singularity”, “objectivity” and “neutrality” of science, knowledge and epistemology, and that some people are more “apt” to think than others (WALSH, 2009, p. 186, our translation).

For Walsh (2012), this geopolitics is evident, especially in the maintenance of Eurocentrism as the only or, at least, dominant perspective of knowledge. It is a perspective that remains current in universities, colleges and schools, which continues to exalt Euro-American intellectual production as science and as knowledge spread throughout the world as universal, and consequently, making invisible thoughts from the so-called global south, especially epistemologies of ancestral peoples.

As well as Catherine Walsh, intellectuals such as Boaventura de Souza Santos, Walter Mignolo, Aníbal Quijano, Inés Dussel, Arturo Escobar, Nelson Maldonado Ydo Torres, Santiago Castro-Gómez, Ramón Grosfoguel, Immanuel Wallerstein, Frantz Fanon, among many others, have also been marking the human limits of the rationalities that consolidated and maintained hegemonic the knowledge of science and the colonial school, a societal paradigm that Europeans and North Americans disseminate to the world as a liberal ideology of humanity - a model whose social, technological progress and production of Wealth depends fundamentally on the accumulations and repertoires of science, on the legitimized common culture and on the knowledge produced by them.

The previous [Eurocentric model] leads us to problematize the epistemé of universal reason, we must question the idea of a global truth, establishing the bases for the configuration of other rationalities, “other” truths that challenge and confront ecological chaos (environmental, spiritual, human and social) that we experience on a daily basis. This allows us to configure new ways of living in society, diversity and harmony, which make visible cosmovisions, epistemologies, philosophies, practices and ancestral ways of living, which are based on different truths and reasons, in thinking, feeling, knowing, doing and living others (ORTIZ OCAÑA et al., 2018a, p. 208, our translation).

In the more restricted scope of the curricular field, a socio-political and pedagogical construction that has always helped in the architecture of modern school models of colonial
Rationality and that remains hegemonic in the contemporary world, the alignments of its purposes with those of a world-system that continues to be driven by the forces of the education-market-capital relationship.

The curriculum, in this sense, is not limited to fulfilling a pedagogical function and prescribing knowledge content for school training; more than that, it integrates the great gear in the production line of subject profiles that official educational systems assume are capable of dynamizing, further strengthening the production of socially productive models that are notably perverse to human training and development.

The criticism of these modes of production, consolidation and hegemonization of policies and curricula of colonial rationality, even though it remains linked to a Euro-centered epistemology, has been made since the second half of the 20th Century by a large number of intellectuals, especially from the field of philosophy and sociology, added to the work of education researchers and the field of curriculum studies itself. In this context, they continue to serve as a reference in studies that problematize curricular models of conservative, liberal and neoliberal traditions, recognized researchers, such as Pierre Bourdieu, Jean Claude Passeron, Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, Peter McLaren, Jean Claude Forquin, William Pinar, Michael Young, José Gimeno Sacristán, Jurjo Torres Santomé, Ivor Goodson and many others. Here in Brazil, works such as those by Alice Cassimiro Lopes, Tomaz Tadeu da Silva, Antônio Flávio Moreira are recognized as important, just to name a few references.

Regarding the link between theorists and critical perspectives, including the so-called Critical Theory and Revolutionary Pedagogy, Ortiz Ocaña et al. (2018, p. 209, our translation), highlight that

Critical theory (Horkheimer, 1998), in its classic formulation of the Frankfurt School, and critical pedagogy, in its original epistemic postulates, as well as in the repercussions of what McLaren (1997a, 1997b, 1998) calls critical pedagogy “revolutionary”, are Marxist and anthropocentric proposals, western efforts that start from a modern/colonial project, thought and paradigmatic assumptions, through which they give Eurocentric criticism of Eurocentrism.

Although researchers with critical approaches have been problematizing and even denouncing the fabrication of curricular models based on conservative, liberal and neoliberal rationalities; that warn about the power relations and forms of control that operate in curricular formulations; that emphasize the importance of discernment in relation to ideological issues in

---

2 Paulo Freire was not included in the list, as we understand that his production escaped the logic of Euro-centric epistemologies.
the curriculum and school training; that the main interests of dominant groups have been highlighted, which explicitly and covertly move curricular territories, and that have even stimulated movements of contestation and resistance, some of these approaches remain linked to colonial epistemologies, as they defend ideas that include, among others things: existence of powerful curricular knowledge (YOUNG, 2014), relevant scientific knowledge (SAVIANI, 1996) and useful and universally valid knowledge (BOBBITT, 2004).

From a decolonial point of view, critical approaches, even if maintained in a Eurocentric pattern, are necessary, but not sufficiently capable of contributing to changing the geopolitics of curricular knowledge that remains hierarchical in the modern logic of colonial relations of power, knowledge, be and live. Stating this does not imply assuming that the historical accumulation of knowledge is unimportant. What needs to be highlighted, in this sense, are the implications of this metanarrative made universal by the interests of the global north, whose discourses make invisible, silence, delegitimize, oppress, exclude, exploit and even deny another knowledge.

There are many challenges to face when educational and curricular alternatives are sought to shift this rationality towards decolonial perspectives. In many school contexts around the world, for example, the traditional, conservative and technical conceptions of curriculum have not even been overcome; the standard of school knowledge continues to be cognitive, instructional, encyclopedic and pragmatic, for which formal science remains reason that legitimates widely disseminated knowledge/knowledge as universally valid and socially necessary.

Especially in these times when governments and other international organizations act in response to market requirements and demands, we see that official curricular policies in many countries are strongly reinforcing theses that value the school of results, content and objective knowledge, demands these, in general, translated into the paradigm of the so-called skills pedagogy, becoming a true mantra, especially for policy makers on duty.

Another major challenge is confronting conservative ultraliberal forces and fundamentalism, which currently move between the fields of religion, economics, politics and, in particular, the management of public education. For Frigotto and Ferreira (2019), we are at an unprecedented crossroads in our history, which has to be read in terms of the severity of its possible consequences. In Walter Benjamin's terms, according to Löwy (2010), it is about being willing to realize that history must be brushed against the grain. Or as Bray (2018) assesses when he states that the fight against fascism today begins with the ability to recognize it beyond
commonplaces, as taught by the harsh experience of Europe in the period between the two world wars.

We understand that the school curriculum, as a deliberate expression of the social in education, can become a tool of resistance to this wave that forcefully resumes principles and values of the colonizing culture in its worst guise. And, in this sense, significant investment may be associated with the ability to problematize colonial forms of control over what counts or should count as knowledge in schooling.

Even though the challenges are enormous, counter-hegemonic movements are observed in education through curricular reconfigurations from a decolonial perspective. In Brazil, this movement is gradually gaining visibility, whether in the volume of production that is notably expanding, or in experiences developed in school contexts where historically subordinated and silenced groups live.

Regarding the aspects of selection and treatment of knowledge, it is observed that there are, in school initiatives, some shifts in curricular configurations from decolonial perspectives, notably: i) rearticulation of propositions in terms of selection of content to be taught; ii) presentation and discussion, by teachers, of school content from different perspectives, that is, with different approaches from those conventionally attributed by traditional schools; iii) teaching methodologies focused on problematizing supposed regimes of truth considered in the current world-system as universal; iv) use of other teaching materials, especially those produced outside of State controls, therefore in opposition to those of the official system; v) promotion of greater curricular space for local knowledge and local culture, notably those related to ethnic, identity, ancestral peoples, African origin issues, gender issues, interculture; finally, appreciation of other ways of thinking, feeling and living in school education.

They are, in general, curricular propositions that, in their particular ways of configuration, are close to what Whash (2009) calls decolonial pedagogical biopraxis or decolonial political praxis, given that they value human education in its comprehensive entirety. For Ortiz Ocaña et al.,

the vision about the universe, the cosmos, the world in which we live, our own sociocultural practice and our experiences, experiences, understandings and meanings (biopraxis), is not a fragmenting vision that is holistic, integrative and relational, where it integrates, in a harmonious and coherent interweaving, diverse comprehensive configurations: biological-social, emotion-reason, physical-consciousness space, genetic-cultural, internal-external, material-spiritual, mind-body, objective-subjective, human-natural being, subject - object, tangible-intangible, among other relationalities. This intricate complex can be analyzed based on four fundamental principles: relationality,
correspondence, complementarity and reciprocity (ORTIZ OCAÑA et al., 2018, p.81, our translation).

As Whash (2009) emphasizes, the purpose of movements for a decolonial education does not presuppose a mixture or hybridization of forms of knowledge, nor a form of invention of the best of both possible worlds. It does represent the construction of a new epistemological space that incorporates and negotiates indigenous and Western knowledge, that is, the possibility of speaking about an interepistemology as a possible way of referring to this relational field.

Other meanings expected in relationships involving power in contexts of decolonial curricular education.

It seems to be evident in the academic debate that the coloniality of power, established, as Quijano (2007) pointed out, since the European conquests with the consolidation of a social classification of the world population based on the criteria of race, work and gender, has been drenching deeply affect human relations in all societies that are subject to the rationality of the world-system with a colonizing and imperial matrix. For him, power is a type of social relationship built by the permanent and simultaneous presence of domination, exploitation and conflict, and which affects the basic areas of social existence such as work, sexuality, collective and public authority, subjectivity and intersubjectivity. All this due to disputes over the controls of this relationship.

Quijano (2002) understands that the global pattern of power consists of the articulation between various aspects of social life: i) the coloniality of power, that is, the idea of race as a basic social foundation and social domination; ii) in capitalism as a universal pattern of social exploitation; iii) in the State as a central and universal form of control of authority and the nation-state model as its hegemonic variant, and iv) in Eurocentrism, as a hegemonic form of control of subjectivity/intersubjectivity, in particular in the way of producing knowledge.

Education, a structuring activity in the construction of the social, forms part of this engendering, whether due to its political-epistemic alignments with models of hegemonic thought, or due to its capacity for resistance and insurgency against the established.

In order to problematize this matrix, critical curricular studies, carried out especially since the 1960s, have already accentuated the relationship between curriculum and power. It is widely consensual, in the range of works formulated in curricular approaches that are in opposition to traditional/conservative and neoliberal rationalities, the statement that curriculum is, in itself, production, reproduction and representation of power relations, whether they are
manifested in the institutionality of the State and/or other civil society organizations, in speeches, in group interests, in ideologies, and in many other human activities that, in some way, produce and/or impact formal education.

Like other critical or counter-hegemonic curricular approaches, decolonial perspectives also do not ignore the immanence of power relations in what constitutes the social fabric, nor their power in the relationships that establish school training curricula. The proposition of rupture in terms of adherence to colonial epistemologies goes in the direction of struggles and insurgencies, aiming to displace this matrix of power that has remained hegemonic since its establishment with the European conquests. To this end, it problematizes, as we said, the geopolitical origin (Eurocentric - global north) of colonial thought where the production of academic knowledge becomes a universal narrative. It goes, therefore, in the direction of rationalities and other thoughts.

The inspiration for the construction of decolonial paths aiming to break with this colonial/imperial matrix of power involves, among other alternatives, the recognition of intercultural movements, like what indigenous and Andean peoples do; for the idea of a Plurinational State, for the incorporation of an alternative proposal for civilization and organization of society, in short, for the strengthening of other power relations based on the understanding and recognition of cultural/identity differences.

New forms of thought are needed that, transcending the colonial difference, can be built on the frontiers of conflicting cosmologies, whose current articulation is due, considerably, to the coloniality of power on whose pillars the modern/colonial world was built (MIGNOLO apud WHASH, 2019, our translation).

In this sense, decolonial pedagogical approaches focus on curriculum issues because they understand this territory to be one of the most important as a strategy for reconfiguring school education, including in terms of repositioning in the interstices of power relations.

Decolonial expectations for human education: what to project as purposes in school curricula?

The pedagogical premise seems to be consensual, in the debate on the curricular field, that, in terms of global standards, school and academic curricula have been thought of, organized and developed as institutional projects aiming at well-defined ends for schooling. In general, curricula have been institutionally designed in the form of public policies, official guidelines, operational guidelines, school pedagogical proposals or plans for the development
of teaching work. In all its forms, there are at least two invariants: a strong prescription character and a clear definition of training purposes.

In the complex fabric of relationships that involve schooling, the power of selective tradition, which maintains the hegemony of the modern/colonial standard in defining choices regarding training purposes, has historically imprinted the logic that still operates today in different national and local education systems. This aspect seems to constitute one of the most significant elements of legitimization and maintenance of the colonial matrix in the institutional processes of human education. In it, the curriculum became a strategic place to guide (not without resistance) school and academic training towards the interests of groups well positioned in the social and productive layers of the capitalist system, to the point of ensuring that the purposes of school training come closer to coincide with the maintenance and development objectives of that same system.

It can even be said that the consolidation of the capitalist world in its liberal and neoliberal phases has instrumentalized formal education, leading its objectives and ideas towards well-defined ends, which includes, among other expectations: the attainment by students of skills and competencies productive; easier access for graduates to the job market; development of entrepreneurial professional profiles; strengthening the logic of privatization and commodification of formal educational activity. Finally, that schooling becomes a mechanism for qualifying people for a socially useful life.

Like other horizons, movements in decolonial perspectives propose as the purposes of school training, in the foreground, the raising of singular and collective awareness about the conditions in which the models of training and, consequently, of school and curriculum are based. In fact, on this aspect, Paulo Freire was notably decolonial, given that he placed awareness as a condition for liberation, therefore as inseparable educational processes. His understanding was marked by the idea that liberation is produced in history through radically transformative practices. Freire (1984) said that it is necessary to uncover the previous order that structures society; It is essential that each subject learns to identify their social location, so that, from this place, they can understand the logic of domestication that the social system imposes.

Associated with this work of political education and problematization of the foundations that constitute the colonial matrix and, in some way, treated by Paulo Freire, decolonial pedagogies fight in their movements for formative purposes, whose ideas signal the construction of a different social ethic, based especially in fairer and more equitable access to
human goods, whether material or symbolic. When dealing with social movements in relation to the purposes of decolonial schools, Arroyo highlights that,

Social movements bring something more to pedagogy than moralizing advice [...]. They place ethics in the most radical dimensions of human coexistence, in the destiny of socially produced wealth, in the social function of the earth, in denouncing the immorality of inhuman conditions, in misery, in exploitation, in unpunished murders, in disrespect for life, for women, to black people, in the exploitation of childhood, in uprooting, in poverty and injustice (ARROYO, 2013, p. 15, our translation).

Associated with this set of expectations, decolonial pedagogies project ideas that are confused with the very imaginaries of a decolonized world and that, among other aspects, include: i) overcoming the historical denial of the human existence of non-European, non-white, subalternized and from the global south; ii) radical reconstruction of being, power and knowledge based on a decolonial human relationship; iii) reconstruction of societal relations based on interepistemic and intercultural exchanges; iv) expansion and deepening, by subjects, groups and social movements, of what Walsh (2006) calls frontier critical thinking - associated with the idea of critical interculturality. Therefore, decolonial struggles are in defense of another symbolic understanding of the world with more open, horizontal and egalitarian dialogues, involving knowledge, culture, experiences and ways of living of subordinated and invisible peoples, which can be shared with historical constructs of colonial canons.

In the most restricted territories of curricular action, decolonial pedagogies propose that changes be made in the very understanding of what curriculum is, especially concepts that marked and consolidated the pattern of the capitalist/bourgeois school, whose discourses hegemonized ideas that were widespread as universal and necessary, among them, that of having a universally common school culture, a cognitive school of results based on meritocratic conception, a school that disciplines and models human behaviors, habits and attitudes. In other words, a school that maintains the colonial standard, whose curricula serve to ensure materiality and effectiveness of its ideas.

The necessary changes to change the formative purposes of the colonial matrix, proposed by researchers of decoloniality in education, include a different curriculum, which operates with the recognition of difference in its broadest sense, which problematizes school knowledge and its production logics, which interact with subjects from other perspectives, in sensitive listening and dialogue, breaking with racial, gender, belief, sexuality, geographic origin, class, etc. hierarchies. Changes that can alter the meaning of schooling, with the aim of humanizing relationships, valuing the unique production of lives and ways of living of each
people in their communities, that is, enabling the construction of a new social contract, based on the idea of intercultural, interepistemic, pluriversal exchanges and, therefore, of another relational worldview.

**Political and epistemic forces of decolonial curricular approaches in the production of other subjectivities that escape the interests of colonial ontology.**

Just as there is a colonial epistemic difference that allows us to observe the functioning of a coloniality of knowledge, there is a colonial ontological difference that reveals the coloniality of being. This understanding by Maldonado-Torres (2007) presents itself, perhaps, as one of the most representative decolonial arguments to show how subjectivity was/is central in the production of colonial thought, which intentionally and deliberately forged and continues to shape imaginaries, desires, dreams, values, beliefs, ways of thinking, acting, relating, in short, of living.

In the field of curriculum studies, especially in theoretical perspectives that treat the curriculum as cultural policy and, in general, in post-cut approaches, the debate and confrontation of identity issues in school education has been absolutely central. It is possible that it is in this aspect, that is, in the treatment of issues of the curriculum-subjectivity-training relationship, one of the field's greatest contributions, even aiming at openings for decolonial thinking. For Silva (2015), the coloniality of being has a profound relationship with the curriculum, which is understood as an identity territory. The curriculum is the main cultural, political, social, epistemic and pedagogical artifact of the school system for the construction of identities.

Studies that defend curriculum as the production of subjectivities are widely known in the field. They deal with ontogenic issues marked, especially, by identity themes that include feminism, gender, racialization, ethnicity, sexuality, culture, subalternities, generational issues, regionalities, etc. These are, in general, works focused on criticizing and problematizing colonial curricular models, which have been systematically making invisible, silencing or even erasing other identities – those considered outside the hegemonic standard. It is observed, therefore, that the field has been building theoretical and methodological references capable of supporting both academic debate and practices of disobedience to the standards of the colonial curriculum.

Decolonial pedagogies move in a convergent direction when they advocate problematizing the subtly imposing Western/modern forms of subjectivity production. When
they suggest questioning the ways in which colonialism hierarchized the meanings of humanity for their own and others and how coloniality still continues to hegemonize this same pattern of power. When they insist that the erasure and silencing of the voices, cultures, experiences, spirituality and knowledge of non-Euro-USA-centric peoples be widely denounced. When pedagogies are mobilized in struggles for the de-otherization of the social imaginary as a strategy for deconstructing colonial narratives. Finally, when it is emphasized that all speeches and actions that, for some reason align with the policies of crimes and death (necropolitics) are confronted with other arguments, including genocide, ethnocide or ecocide; in addition, of course, to the fight against the control of power strategies in the processes of governance of individuals, a widely known mechanism that Foucault (2000) called biopolitics.

From a pedagogical point of view, decolonial approaches defend curricula that are based on another social imaginary for the schooling of subjects and, consequently, other references for dealing with issues of subjectivation. They assert that the school, repositioned from another teleological, epistemic and political perspective, must assume itself as an open, dialogical, plural and pluriversal territory, so that it can systematically welcome, in training, singularities, experiences and ways of living of people and subsumed groups throughout hundreds of years in the West. Schools whose curricula can ensure the rights to think, speak, propose, feel and act, especially for indigenous peoples.

Final words

What appears markedly evident in works that adopt decolonial thinking as a reference for dealing with issues of education in general and the curriculum in particular, is that decolonial pedagogies are proposing to the world a true educational refoundation. This reconstruction will not advance in schools and universities without, through political and epistemic struggles, other ways of thinking, organizing and developing their curricula being articulated.

For this project of decolonization in human education, structural and profound changes are therefore necessary, which involve, among other aspects, the reconfiguration of the ways in which the colonial standard school has been dealing with cultural issues, especially identity differences within the scope of production of subjectivities. School training is historically subjected to the force of a biopower that has sustained and continues to sustain the maintenance of the current world system.
Educational refoundation that also involves the critical and conscious problematization of modern patterns of knowledge/power responsible for the selection, classification, hierarchization and distribution of knowledge and school knowledge that make up the architectures of traditional curricula, whose rationalities have been transformed into project instrumentalizing strategies training, fundamentally aimed at qualifying subjects for a productively useful life.

Ultimately, it seems evident that the most significant alternatives aimed at expanding the spaces for occupation and dissemination of decolonial thought, whether in schools, universities or other institutions that have the fundamental task of human education, necessarily involve the expansion and socialization of studies academics who defend this conception; by encouraging insurgent educational and curricular practices and, mainly, by supporting movements involved with other ways of being, resisting, knowing, occupying and living.

After all, the education that matters is the one that humanizes!
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