Check it out, what if it was fiction?

Vem cá, e se fosse ficção?

¿Oye, y si fuese ficción?

Thiago Ranniery*

Abstract: In this paper, my starting point is the trajectory of a Doctoral dissertation in curriculum and queer studies in which I explore the paths of research. In this case it is not so much an exercise of producing empirical elements or data but more of a creative and expansive critique. The question is: what happens if the research is nothing more than fiction? Therefore, I suggest that it is time to risk the foundations of curriculum research in relation to what has not always been dealt with: the resources and artifacts of qualitative investigation being less methodological, and more about a set of ethical-political issues, as in ontological investigation. In this way, I point out how fiction emerges from the performative relation between language and reference, and puts in place a written policy. Thus, the text of curriculum research is seen as a policy of alliance and relationality, showing how otherness can seriously transform political and theoretical concepts and assumptions.
Keywords: Fiction. Curriculum. Ontology.

982

Resumo: Neste artigo, parto dos percursos de uma tese de Doutorado em currículo e estudos *queers* a fim de explorar os caminhos de pesquisa menos como um exercício de produzir empiria ou dados e mais como uma crítica criadora e expansiva. Pergunto: o que acontece se a pesquisa não passar de ficção? Sugiro, desse modo, que é o momento de arriscar os fundamentos da pesquisa em currículo diante daquilo que nem sempre se encarou de frente: os recursos e os artefatos de investigação qualitativa menos como algo metodológico e mais como um novelo de questões ético-políticas e, portanto, ontológicas. Nessa direção, indico como a ficção emerge do esgarçamento da relação performativa entre linguagem e referência e coloca uma política da escrita. O texto da pesquisa em um currículo figura, portanto, uma política de aliança e relacionalidade, levando a sério como a alteridade pode transformar conceitos e pressupostos políticos e teóricos.
Palavras-chave: Ficção. Currículo. Ontologia.

* Professor of the Postgraduate Program in Education and the Department of Didactics of the Faculty of Education of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. Researcher at the Center for Studies, Research and Extension in Curriculum (LaNEC/FE/UFRJ) and the research group Curriculum, Culture and Difference (Proped/UERJ).
E-mail: <t.ranniery@gmail.com>.

Resumen: En este artículo, parto de las tramas de una tesis de doctorado en currículo y estudios *queers* para explorar los caminos de investigación no tanto como un ejercicio de producir información empírica o datos, sino más como una crítica creadora y expansiva. Pregunto: ¿qué ocurre si la investigación no pasa de ficción? Sugiero, de ese modo, que es el momento de arriesgar los fundamentos de la investigación en currículo ante aquello que no siempre se ha enfrentado: los recursos y los artefactos de investigación cualitativa menos como algo metodológico, y más como un ovillo de cuestiones ético-políticas y, por lo tanto, ontológicas. En esta dirección, indico cómo la ficción emerge del desprendimiento de la relación performativa entre lenguaje y referencia y plantea una política de escritura. El texto de la investigación en currículo figura, por lo tanto, una política de relacionalidad, tomando en serio cómo la alteridad puede transformar conceptos y presupuestos políticos y teóricos.
Palabras-clave: Ficción. Currículo. Ontología.

Like a wrecking ball

Rio de Janeiro, 2013. I had started, amid the cries of *tomorrow will be greater*, what would be my doctoral dissertation[1]. For its accomplishment, I moved from my hometown, Aracaju, Sergipe, Brazil, to a bucolic neighborhood in the south of Rio, the residence of a former resident, who was once called a wizard. As I hear Lady Gaga play on my cell phone, I walk the streets of Cosme Velho, enraptured by Carlos Drummond de Andrade' words about Machado de Assis (the wizard): '*mas onde a dúvida/apalpa o mármore da verdade, a descobrir/a fenda necessária;/onde o diabo joga dama com o destino, /estás sempre aí, bruxo alusivo e zombeteiro*'[2] (Andrade, 1992, p. 287). The music accompanied an uneasiness about the resonances of queer studies in the curricular field more accustomed to caressing truths about school and sewing clefts. I identified a tendency of what Butler (1994) called the self-object syndrome, permeated by a paradoxical feeling of anxiety, numbness and promise of liberation. My impression was to listen in the texts produced in the interface between curriculum, gender and sexuality the dialogue about the end times between Ahasverus and Prometheus in *Viver!*, Machado's short story, which Drummond refers to: facing 'a feeling of boredom, *tedium vitae*' (Assis, 1994, p. 51) and a 'deep displeasure of existence' (Assis, 1994, 51), yearns for the promise that 'the wanderer will land' (Assis, 1994, p. 53) and that 'the despised of men shall rule over men' (Assis, 1994, p. 53). There, 'where one life has spewed mud, another life will put a halo' (Assis, 1994, p. 54). At the 'threshold of eternity' (Assis, 1994, p. 51), the promise of liberation comes to sated, in delirium, the forerunner certainty that everything has come to an end. Or what, today, would be more for prophecy, in another song in the playlist: *shine bright like a diamond (…) a vision of ecstasy.*[3]

When following the school trajectories of young gay men, music, video clips with their ardent choreography and frenetic and erotic imagery also began to rock my body. I found myself faced with challenges for which I had no ability. I had to literally learn to dance! The performances presented at school parties jumped in front of me as I was dragged into environments that suspended any sense of being in a classifiable place. They could be a sports court or a schoolyard,

---

[2] Possible translation: 'but where the doubt/touches the marble of truth, to discover/the necessary crevice;/ where the devil plays checkers with fate, / you're always there, allusive and mocking wizard'.

[3] Excerpt from *Diamonds*, Rihanna' song. Eventually, I will use musical pieces during the writing as part of the interlocution with the songs that I began to hear during the Doctoral dissertation, after getting a pen-drive with a playlist as a gift from friends. I suggest the reader to go to YouTube to check out the video clips.

but they were not less theater or nightclub and a little of it all together. In addition to the festive atmosphere, the practice of dance, the bodies rehearsing for months passed through me. I realized an unequivocal quality of mobilization of ordinary life, of the demands of the pedagogical discourse, the global circulation of pop music, the inscribed history of the city - a political work of staging, offering a contribution to what Hage (2015) called alter-politics. I began excitedly to socialize impressions with classmates and professors, still groping, for sure, to think of curriculum as an ethical relationship. I was struck by mistrust. Even in the year when the main avenues of the country trembled, in which the announcement was to be prepared, because now *era hora do show das poderosas*[4] (it was time for the show of the powerful girls), where *living in a world, and it's on fire, feeling the catastrophe*,[5] as *garotas vieram para ficar* (the girls are here to stay) the surprising reaction marked a repeated impossibility of the accounts that they provided. They were just fiction!

I was young - although this is no excuse - but the fact is that I took the research a little too seriously to deal with the frequency of being asked to confess the truthfulness of what I was writing. Feeling uncomfortable, I decided not to deny any suspicions and took the fictional condition that was imputed to me as an improper way of not avoiding the debate. I resorted to two insights, one on fiction and truth, by Foucault (1980), and another on fantasy, by Butler (2004a), to assert that the enforced impossibility, that demanded a confessed truth, gave rise to an impropriety by virtue of those ways of life to harass the boundaries of what was recognizable as real lives by the research in curriculum, gender, and sexuality, which, in turn, ended up pushing so many lives and stories into the realm of fantasy. It is not that today I disagree with that. Although I am tempted to resume it, I realize that the vigorous strength of the struts - fiction as a political work to bring forth what does not yet exist and fantasy as harassment to the limits of reality – was subsumed into a somewhat timid criticism of the framework of intelligibility of the field of research with which I dealt, even in the face of the growing popularity of the queer forms of criticism inspired by Foucault and Butler. At that point I contented myself with the formulation of a plausible way out, by acting more like a smokescreen for the subsequent, almost logical step of using a theoretical framework to 'analyze' what was played on the track and on the stage.

I was facing a genre problem! - of the research genre, no doubt. This theoretical-analytic purification seemed to contain a tendency to politically annihilate the lives of the many friends I made through the progressive 'sloganization' - a term that I borrowed from Said (2003) - that some concepts such as performativity, abjection, norm, just to keep a few examples, started to acquire in curriculum research (Ranniery, 2017a). Everything loomed before a certain Salvationist position that survived with force in education, subscribing that the lives, described insistently as abject, different, whatever the name is, *will never be royals*[6], either through the tutelage of pedagogical salvationism, or through the no subtle form of political discrimination. At that point, a double suspicion haunted me. I wondered if curriculum research would be willing to question the fundamentals and safe categories that underlie their evaluative and analytical frameworks, as Butler (2013) advocated for the exercise of criticism. In other words, the effort to say anything would run the risk that the curriculum research would be used as a feeder for the science war machine, in Stengers's (2010) terms, as a means to justify its imaginative authority founded on an ontology which draws its difference from what the sciences establish (or not) as life. An inflection was in play: curriculum research, at least that one interested in difference, could not demonstrate whatever it was without falling into a form of epistemological realism.

984

---

[4] Reference to the song *Prepara*, by Anitta.

[5] Reference to the song *Girl on fire*, by Alicia Keys.

[6] Reference to the song *Royals*, by Lorde.

I do not resume my - if such property exists - trajectory because I now have some kind of better interpretive position; but rather, it allows me to situate my argument without offering some kind of great amorphic response. In this paper I explore the ways of research less as an empirical support to say something, an object called curriculum and/or difference, and more as an experimental imaginative critique. I make this move since I recognize that a common introduction to curriculum queer studies has been to assume that gender and sexuality are accessible cultural practices and hence understandable by definition. This formulation, when configuring a field that can be objectified, is aligned with the scientific pretension of 'aspiring the condition of simple purification, the elimination of parasites, practical staging of categories according to which it is convenient to interrogate the object' (Stengers, 2002, p. 201); against which it has been trying, not very successfully, to focus on. The vision of a world composed of self-sufficient and independent objects that can be accessed by some sort of resource or research procedure continues almost always to be shared. When the ontological issue silences, the research continues to harbor the belief in a logistical version of science that provides something other than fiction. The progressive flag ends up conforming gender and sexuality to the liberal humanist agenda[7] because it is based on the idea that there is a truth to be said, accessed by the intellectual effort of the researcher and his/her theoretical and methodological apparatus made 'so transparent, natural, and real that we've forgotten they're fictions' (ST. PIERRE, 2011, p. 623).

Hence the title: *Check it out, what if it was fiction?* What would be then the difference if my PhD dissertation were all of the order of fiction? St. Pierre (2013) has been suggesting that research in human and social sciences dependent on the idea of 'data' or 'experience' is no longer possible due to its realistic appearance in relation to naturalistic empiricism and positivism phantasmagorically impregnated in the methodologies of inquiry. Although I agree with the diagnosis, I follow a different path, suggesting that the ontological turn provides a political activation of relationality in writing about curriculum research. With this, my desire is to not properly affirm that the text becomes the place of the failures of representation and of disturbing the demands of representation itself, as Lather (2007) suggests. I get closer to Lather (2007) and St. Pierre's (2013) concerns reading, however, in another way, almost upside down, Spivak (1988) and Alexander and Mohanty's (1997) criticisms on subsumption of difference to a singular monolithic unit that Lather and St. Pierre mobilize. This atonement of representation ends up justifying the colonial legacy when making such a concession coincide with the indication that beneath alterity it would only be possible to contemplate our 'own' grounds.

The problem that resonates in this text is both conceptual and practical about how Macedo's (2017, p. 550) provocation can be put into operation, that is, '[...] the task of a curricular theory committed to alterity [is that of] calling into question its own grounds'. I venture to suggest that an input to this contribution is to replace the text as a space-time of imagination experiment, an assembly field. Fiction allows me to assume the non-transparency of writing without, however, dispensing with alterity either by the risk of self-encapsulation or by scratching the landscape the various ways in which difference distorts, displaces, derives and constitutes the writing of the research. Not only does research writing constitute the 'Other' as objectified data, but alterity is more properly invoked through writing. I hope, therefore, to point out that fiction is a way of facing the frameworks pointed out by St. Pierre (2013) in curriculum research, keeping on the horizon the concern not to function as an ontological *wrecking ball*.[8] Thus, I explore the possibility of being allied with the modes of existence, if it means to be involved with what they are doing to echo them in the curricular thinking, having as background Viveiros de Castro's (2002) indication

---

[7] I explore this reverberation more deeply in Ranniery (2017a).

[8] Reference to *Wrecking Ball*, by Miley Cyrus.

that taking alterity seriously is opening up an opportunity to offer a different image of ourselves, an image in which we do not recognize ourselves.

Such an operation implies, as I shall argue, to reorganize research practices into 'a new "between" bodies' (Butler, 2015a, p.89), not reducible to the scale of individuals, in a 'space of durable and liveable material environments and of interdependence' (Butler, 2015a, p. 89). It is a space of interaction, or even of intra-action, to write with Barad (2003), in order to recognize the composition of research from the interlacing, of a *becoming*, in Haraway's (2008) words, that is also a *thinking intertwined to*. So, as St. Pierre (2011, p. 623) stresses, if we live 'a call for a philosophically informed inquiry accomplished by inquirers who have read and studied philosophy', this call begins depending on an alliance with a *stylized philosophy in the flesh*, in the terms through which Butler (2003) described acts of genre, or *carnality of philosophy* with sufficient force to transform concepts, political and theoretical presuppositions. While we are centered on the rectification of a curricular imagery marked by atrophy and its colonial dream attached to notions as truth, subject and knowledge, ways of life *estão rebolando bem na nossa cara*[9] (are shaking the hips right in our faces), indicating that we need another *corpo sensual*[10] (sensual body) of ideas. Regarding this, they are already out there singing: *vai malandra*[11] (Go ahead trickster)!

Twerk: shaking of thinking

> The sententious critique makes me slumber; I would like a review made with sparks of imagination. It would not be sovereign, nor dressed in red. It would bring with it the lightning bolts of possible storms (FOUCAULT, 1989, s/p).

At this point, the beginning of this text should be another. Everything that glitters between its lines only came to me when I was crossed by performances driven by 'a ferocious urgency of the now' to reminisce the speech *I have a dream*, by Martin Luther King. It was when arms of so many others were around my waist in challenge to put my hips to *work, work, work*[12], which came the desire to continue without being moved by the force of romantic and narcissistic heroism to reduce heterogeneous components to an identity or modality that is visibly, audibly, legibly, or tangibly evident' (Puar, 2005, p. 128). The grip on my body triggered a desire to offer something on curriculum that could 'look to other foundational categories that are less abstract and more tactile, such as life and death' (Mbembe, 2003, p. 14). The balance, which moved me to an aesthetic-political dimension of curriculum theory, entwined an ethical-political reconfiguration of research in response to the fact that 'queer times require even queerer modalities of thought, analysis, creativity, and expression' (Puar, 2005, p. 121). I approached the twerk, as if the friends I made were partners in a kind of shaking the hips improvisation of thinking, making room for their solos, letting me be touched due to their strength. I refer to the dance style with revolving and provocative movements of the buttock and hips, emerged in the music scene of New Orleans in the United States in the 1990s, learned among my friends in the city of Aracaju, Sergipe, Brazil, when it got flooded in 2013 with video clips of pop singers, such as Rihanna, Miley Cyrus, Nicki Minaj, Iggy Azalea, Sia and Beyoncé.

---

[9] Reference to the song *Sua Cara*, by Major Lazer, with Anitta and Pablo Vittar.

[10] Reference to the song *Corpo Sensual*, by Pablo Vittar.

[11] Reference to the song *Vai Malandra*, by Anitta.

[12] Reference to the song *Work*, by Rihanna.

Twerk has a history of multiple meanings that slip between various puns. I use here those that slip into the verb *to twist*, *to jerk*, but also to the noun *jerk* and the slang *to work*, used in stripper clubs to describe the sensual movements of prostitutes for customers. [13] *If you say you're an idiot, remember, you're a whore, a street queen, my love!* – one of those boys told me when I confessed a certain embarrassment to go on. In this transoceanic intersection, the conjunctions between image, sexuality, media and music have created conditions for sociality, survival and experimentation ties of existence at the heart of technological reconfigurations, consumption and capitalism. It was as if a verse from *Applause* by Lady Gaga was echoing, *Now art's in pop culture, in me*, in a more complex magnetization than the common vulgate usually reveals. There is some experimentation of thought in this invitation to put the body to shake that it is not far from Dostoevsky's idiot resumed by de Stengers (2005, p. 14), an interstitial character who demands 'that we do not consider ourselves authorized to believe that we have the meaning of what we know' or Clarice Lispector's fool borrowed by Paraíso (2016), with his earning a living with unpretentious joy, with a non-transcendental knowledge. Could curriculum research turn their areas provocatively? A twist that is about accepting to lose the consistency of anything that is of its own when transmuting into the apparatus of inquiry that 'ontology refers to a being that is always given over to others' (Butler, 2015b, p. 15). Those bodily manifestations would not contain the conceptual force enough to be unfolded in one interlocution when witnessing that 'something that delineates the ties we have to others, that show us that these ties constitute [what] we are' (Butler, 2004b, p. 48)?

My education in gender and sexuality took place in research centers that accompanied, in power and extension, the effects of post-structural matrices, even if they were often hybridized, in the Brazilian curricular field. The queer attracted me – I believe just as several classmates who graduated with me – as the name of 'a younger generation who wanted to resist to more institutionalized and reformist politics' (Butler, 2008, p. 321). For us - with an excuse, I will use the first-person plural - the dialogue with the queer studies was marked by the cultural and linguistic turn. It was a contagion of inspiration, above all, as it acted as a kind of lever of our self-esteem. In a scenario in which gender and sexuality were objects of investigation despised in the epistemological ranking of curriculum research - they were territories of silence, we said - we rejoiced with the centrality of language and culture. Every curriculum, we learned, worked as a 'genderalized' and sexualized cultural text, suggested Louro (2004), in a work that none of us passed unharmed. The sensation was of being able to see and bring about gender and sexuality in any place. We were able to find strange the essentialist illusion of identities, to suspend the pretensions of fixity of heteronormativity, to criticize the representation of certain subjects and groups; to dismantle any discursive operations of naturalization of gender and sexuality. In short, to show the games of truth and power and dethrone the force of speech. It was not easy, but it was - and still is - seductive as it puts us in a position of epistemological superiority that paradoxically appears an ontological colonization.

An unresolved lesson has led us to face this disarray: language is, as we were told, performative rather than merely descriptive or expressive. We used, with some ease, the statement that language is not external means or instrument in which I lay an 'I' and where I see a reflection of it (Butler, 2003), thus identity é *performatively* constituted by the very expressions taken as their results (Butler, 2003). However, anything was made up of language, except, of course, the procedures and research resources, which were suddenly immune, resorting to the old 'God trick of seeing everything from nothing' (Haraway, 1998, p. 581). The common assumption was that 'difference' and 'identity' were constructed by curricula and preceded research with independent and unaltered forms. However, if this were the case, the research work, which does not happen

---

[13] Part of this journey of meanings is scattered on websites. However, I am using here what was presented to me by the interlocutors when they taught me to dance.

without language, would be doomed to produce the 'object' that presupposes to grasp the discourse that underlies it. By assuming, somewhere, the transparency that it was supposed to unveil, our investigation procedures were kept intact when adopting 'a meta-position in relation to its object, a gesture that seems compatible with the instrumentalism of scientific methodologies and claims to objectivity' (Kirby, 2011, p. 14). It is difficult to determine, for sure, whether imprisonment in this tautology is a desperate response because we realized that the 'research object' could not be recovered or whether, in the face of frustration, we tend to elevate our assumptions to the ultimate incarnation of determining principles.

The merits were undoubtedly many. However, the legacy of the queer studies - I know I may be exaggerating - was a reduction of curricular thinking to an anesthetic and hypochondriac skepticism, to what Sedgwick (2003) characterized as paranoid reading, discovering and seeking to cushion the discovery, of normativity everywhere. In the turbulent waters of the queer studies, I made use, not always legibly, ok some directions for a methodological composition in curriculum research (Ranniery, 2016b). I vaguely followed Sedgwick's (1990) formulation of knowledge and subject and his refusal to reduce *queer* to an anti-homophobic agenda in favor of a more expansive definition of political life. In all of this expansion, I am suspicious of the adjectival use of 'queer' that I have served myself, which should now be read with some caution. It is more an expression of an uncomfortable feeling when reading research on gender and sexuality that, when running into curriculum, it was reduced to a grid of immutable or changeable power relations only from a mystifying adoption of alterity as an obvious identity. This was a kind of work that disturbed me by eliding the curricular landscape of ways of living and living the curriculum, or even by assuming a triumphalist and voluntarist brand, whether it was normativity, which brought us to the brink of the end times, or it was the liberation of it , which launched us into the humanist promise of a new world.

In recent years, the questioning of the fundamentals that I have felt obliged to establish has allowed me to reconfigure the research experience from Foucault's (1989) suggestion in the epigraph of this session which, subtly, I left in abeyance. Offered by a friend, the quote is a trigger not to describe as my research sought a 'real' life that existed beyond or beyond what could be recognized, monumentalizing the experience lived in schools. From it, I can reinstate the writing of the research in the face of the insistence that language, as Sedgwick (1993) has correctly noted, does not go astray, that any interrogation is from now on *interrogation*[14]. If 'it's only by being shameless about risking the obvious that we happen into the vicinity of the transformative' (Sedgwick, 1990, p. 22), this transformation is, however, more than risking transparency; requires risking the ontological truism of the fundamentals it assumes. I was suspicious, but, at that moment, I lacked words to describe that, as Kirby (1993) pointed out, any claim of authenticity is, inevitably, an act of power that makes an object knowable. I was facing 'a reverberation of a metaphysics that assumes an inherent difference between (…) subject and object' (Barad, 2003, p. 829), marked in the ways of composing curriculum research that is aggravated when they could be inflated by a denouncing and reformist spirit.

As I was concerned, I began to realize that curriculum research witnesses and is produced in the very process of differentiation, while it is, at the same time, a theoretical articulation; or, as we learn from Haraway (1998), the production of situated knowledge. Something that has never been about taking a fixed and unique position or performing a closed entity in itself, but about exploring the 'contact zone of an entangled relationship' (Haraway, 2008, p. 227), of relationality as an experimental practice of investigative transversality. Even 'a particular point of view is never

---

[14] Note of translation: The author makes a pun in Portuguese with the prefix 'inter' and the verb '*rogar*' (that means solicit, request)– *inter*-rogação – not possible to be maintained in English.

a simple unit', Kirby (1997, p. 161) suggests; any perspective, the author continues, is always and necessarily different from itself, shifting and distancing the own property from a point of view (Kirby, 1997, p. 161). This perspectivism implies going beyond the simple game of silencing promulgated by normativity or, as an expurgatory response, the production of alternative narratives. It is a resounding of alterity, collecting signals, gestures, vibrations with sensitivity without taking great meanings from them. It is also to deprive the moralistic orientation of curriculum research, which, instead of referring to static procedures, sweeping up alterity, echoes, as we have learned to affirm, the unstable force of repetition. In the effervescent queer atmosphere, I thought it was strange that this path was reduced to deception or flattery, unless they came to the same conspiratorial conclusions, that 'they too find violence where there had appeared to be possibility' (Sedgwick, 2003, p. 123).

This hermeneutic of suspicion is somewhat dismissive as it is incapable of hearing signs of life for its relentless attention to the structures of truth, power, and knowledge that obscure the '[...] surprising and enlivening texture of [...] community' (Sedgwick, 2003, p. 17). Sedgwick (2003) proposed a reparative return to the ontological and the intersubjective. From this suggestion, I approached the so-called ontological turn[15] and its bets on endorsing 'the incalculable, the messy, and the responsibilities of not knowing' (Lather, 2016, p. 5). I know that the word 'ontology' may sound preposterous for a field that in Brazil has a strong sociological tradition. However, the term has gained some weight in what St. Pierre (2011) described as post-qualitative research, working 'within and against the truths of humanist, conventional, and interpretive forms of inquiry and analysis that have centered and dominated qualitative research texts and practices' (Jackson, & Mazzei, 2017, p. 707). Perhaps, by now, it would be easier to engage in the use of a matrix inspired by Gilles Deleuze which, according to the syntheses of international literature, especially American[16], would offer the possibility of grasping 'what is on the horizon in terms of new analytics and practices of inquiry' (Lather, 2007, p. 1). However, I want to maintain the dialogue with the queer studies from which I have been building some trajectory of research and recognize the strength they have acquired in shaping the issues of gender and sexuality in the Brazilian curricular field.

I find company in very different[17] projects that, taking the risk of summarizing, constitute 'not only a resistance to social norms or a denial of existing values, but rather a positive and creative construction of different ways of life' (Halperin, 1995, p. 65). Such construction gains weight in the conduct of a research that requires 'unbounded forms of speculation, modes of thinking that ally not with rigor and order but with inspiration and unpredictability' (Halberstam, 2011, p. 10). In fact, the 'promises of monsters' (Haraway, 1992, p. 300) were already an invitation to the 'exploration of possible worlds' (Haraway, 1992, p. 300) that are on the horizon in diffraction rather than reflection (Haraway, 1992); a 'mapping of interference, not of replication (…) or reproduction', which is not about 'where differences appear, but *rather maps where the effects of difference appear*' (Haraway, 1992, p. 300, emphasis added). As I was very ignorant about what this multiform

---

[15] In part, I must say, in order to be fair, that I was approached, like that in the genitive case, because it appeared to me more as a provocation of my doctoral mentor when she gave me a book on the theme. I thank her for the availability.

[16] I refer, in particular, to the work of Liza Mazzei, Alicia Jackson, Patti Lather, Janet Miller, Nathan Snaza and Elizabeth St. Pierre, some of whom are mentioned in this paper and with whom I have been establishing dialogue.

[17] I would extrapolate to the limits of what I can accomplish, by now, offer an exhaustive mapping of these projects. I am happy to indicate, without intending to exhaust or represent some of the names, whose productions appeared scattered or swallowed in this text, but which have inspired me, such as: Jack Halberstam, José Esteban Munõz, Marcia Ochoa, Sara Ahmed, Claire Colebrook, Jasbir Puar, Lauren Berlant, Nikki Sullivan, Elizabeth Povinelli, Elizabeth Freeman. In Brazil, I highlight the work of Pedro Paulo Pereira and Denilson Lopes. For an overview of ontological turn and queer studies, despite circumscribed from a geopolitical point of view, see O'Rourke (2016).

practice accomplished, I came late to what Haraway (2013) called speculative fabulation. Neither because it encourages me to see the curriculum differently, nor because it offers the courage to handle difference; but rather because it shows that 'an otherwise shaped world is possible' (O'Rourke, 2006, 135) - a world that is not beyond or below any curriculum, but which is already included in it.

It is not difficult to perceive the reasons for so many difficulties in situations that derive from the assumption that 'the reality that has been produced is capable of giving a reliable testimony' (Stengers, 2002, p. 201). When it comes to curriculum, it is not uncommon for research to become, with a certain instantaneous presentism, epic dreams of a technical-political solution in which curriculum gains an almost unbreakable truism, a consensual way of presenting situations and mobilizing thought and action little accustomed to mocking, humor, and joke that we all know have inflated queer studies. Stengers (2005) has insisted on the limitations of denouncing the world in the name of an ideal or the quest for transcendental peace to create a space of hesitation. As much as the paths seem morally attractive, they do not entail less violence by succumbing to scarecrow ontologies of a project of pacification and social harmony. I highlight, then, that I am not advocating how we should yield to the celebratory task of embracing and conceding difference or reporting how I perceived that power relations can be eclipsed in the name of what Britzman (2000) called advantage of the other. My concern is about the suspension of the 'limits of the historical scheme of things, the epistemological and ontological horizon within which subjects can arise' (Butler, 2013, p. 13), a task in which we have been educated well, depends on a relationship with alterity.

With certain dependence, I want to affirm that the task of altering ourselves, as a twist, is about taking the 'I as another' (Derrida, 2010, p. 33), then to indicate that alterity is not something substantial and invariably different and separated from 'us', whoever this 'we' is, but which is constitutive of this 'we', it is contained in it. This 'we' is more about interlacings and tangles; that 'we do not have to invent ourselves radically different from what we are, because we are already very different from what we believe to be' (Stengers, 2002, p. 200). Feminist, postcolonial, and queer contributions and their crossings, although widely divergent, have long been signaling to how the ubiquitous way of becoming another is not shaped by a pre-established structure. Not without reason, the growing spread of ontology emerges 'at the moment the ontological foundations of our civilisation — and the unquestioned cultural supremacy of the peoples who founded it — are seen as starting to crumble' (Viveiros de Castro, 2014, p. 10). Alterity does not say, therefore, of an additive or opposing difference, but predicative of how the social world is always crossed by cracks. Difference does not exist ready to be accessed in the order of things, as it is 'to defer as discernibility, distinction, withdrawal, diastema' (Derrida, 1991, p. 91). Difference is the introduction of a variation – 'deferring as deviance, delay, reserve' (Derrida, 1991, p. 91) - which cannot be 'shown', since it has no reference or comparison – what we can call difference [is] this 'active' discord, in motion, of different forces and differences of forces' (Derrida, 1991, p. 91).

How to continue researching curriculum when one is thrown into this constant, oblique and dissonant opening, in that unstable fabric that 'does not hold anything in its entirety, but it becomes itself a sort of perpetual break' (Butler, 2015b, p. 26)? At the same time, what can curriculum research be when this perpetual shift implies a rotation, not from the perspective of who researches on something as its object, but from the categories he/she uses, a twerk of thought? Today, when I return to the texts through which I was initiated to the queer studies, I would not say that possible answers were unknown. At the heart of the lesson with which I began this session, we had learned that language cannot be self-contained; the meaning of its addressing is out of control (Butler, 1997) since it is inhabited by an excess that breaks it, 'effect of prior and future invocations that constitute and escape the instance of utterance' (Butler, 1997, p. 3). Language

990

does not designate a given and existing reference, but it supplements it by creating a spectral referential that it cannot contain. The subsequent critique undertaken by Butler (1997, 2015b) has led us to realize that material modalities are neither entirely discursive nor pre-discursive. To a certain extent, if research artifacts are taken to constitute the object they refer to, something happens in the middle of the path; something excessive emerges from the fraying of the language when pointing 'towards a referent that cannot capture it, because the referent is not completely constructed in language, it is not the same as the linguistic effect' (Prins, & Meijer, 2002, p. 160).

This was the performative condition: the opening to what cannot be delimited or predicted linguistically, because it is nothing other than exposure to an obsessive alterity that inhabits us, a 'contact with what is outside of me , the vehicle for an ex-tactical relationality and the scene in which one language encounters another and something new happens' (Butler, 2017, p. 21). Far from exhausted, the strange lesson of performativity is not about raising an ontological foundation to the ultimate explanation of existence; it 'is, in fact, a contestation of the unexamined habits of mind that grant language and other forms of representation more power in determining our ontologies than they deserve' (Barad, 2003, p. 802). Fiction emerges from this stripping, that there is no inescapable or verifiable reference because it is a field of *alteration*[18]; that, finally, 'fiction becomes a vector of becoming' (Stengers, 2002, p. 203). To justify the suspicion of my classmates and professors, I write *as if it were true*, because *being fiction*, the issue is not to debate against or about the power games that constitute what may be true, but to enjoy this clash in order to 'demand that truth and power be unlinked and intertwined truths and becomings' (Stengers, 2002, p. 203). Therefore, fiction does not distort an accessible reality; it is the condition for our research practices to take place without the writing sewing the 'ontological encounter (…) - between current and possible, existing and non-existent - in which they mutually redefine each other' (Nodari, 2015, p. 82-83). The question is how curriculum research figures and keeps that encounter alive; in how it is possible to reverberate the dermal 'impregnance' of the relationality of any research; that alterity is entangled in what, I believe, we may call thinking, replacing practices of knowledge in terms of topological and dynamic entanglements.

991

With some risk, it is possible to indicate the following axes:

1. Take advantage of the world: if language is a labyrinth of infinite differentiation (Kirby, 2011), research is not limited to using instruments by which one can access a study object taken in its immediacy and transparency. Its resources are not valid for the transcription of verbal expressions supposedly accessed/or registered. The enclosure in the transposition of a thing, of the object of research as 'a crafted version of condensed presence that takes the form of a process' (Law, 2012, p.162), which would exist as such, is only possible due to the claustrophobic correlation of difference; of alterity neither being recognizable nor manifestly absent, but a constitutive condition to render the object present. This folding point to the impossibility of closing 'the ongoing intra-activity in the iterative reconfiguring of the apparatus of bodily production' (Barad, 2003, p. 816). Pursuant to the terms we are interested in, research practices are, whether they like it or not, practices that cannot be closed. Structures, boundaries and properties - of whatever they are - are not simply stabilized and destabilized in space and time that research could access, but they coexist in the creation of the research space-time itself. The best that can be done is to take advantage of this inevitable entanglement which, by not providing simple access to the world, opens up an inescapable non-coincidence of inquiry with itself. It is a question of not separating the different territories that we inhabit, glimpsing how research and world become consubstances, actively interfere in the 'sheer wonder of the spacetime entanglement at work' (Kirby, 2011, p. 77). In

---

[18] Note of translation: The author makes a pun in Portuguese 'alter' and 'action' – forming the word '*alteração*' - *alter-ação* – not possible to be maintained in English.

progress, suspension of the presumption of definitive rupture that separates once and for all and forever what research does of what the world does, between the production of knowledge and the production of existence, between subject and object, the 'I' and the 'other' as if they were segregated instances.

2. *Se joga pintosa!*[19] To take advantage of whatever is to let the research spread through a distension and dispersion that can take diverse material modalities, as if it were spreading itself by different supports, in multiple forms, as well as making use of a disposition to deal with the most trivial materials. It does not matter *a priori* space-time delimitation, the criterion of selection justifying what will be used or left aside; 'what ideas we use to think other ideas (with)' (Strathern, 1988, p. 10). It is not possible to delimit *a priori* what are the interfaces that can foster an imaginative policy, since it is a special taste for the work of mixing and testing dispersed and disparate materials, putting them in the same conceptual plan, crossing them and waiting to see what you can get from them. It is a delicate work that develops in all directions, approaching Hayward's (2010, p. 580), expression, in order to 'name the synesthetic quality of the materialized sensation'; of a distended research that, spreading by unexpected elements, '*enjoys* the many flavors of details, offerings, passions, languages, things' (King, 2011, p. 18). Far from dismissing incursions from the circuits I have been, it intensifies the task of *throwing yourself* in bonds *with others*, even though they may live on different material platforms, in everyday coexistence, in imagery and musical landscapes, in dreams. The contrast with the ongoing transformations in curriculum landscapes shows an ontologically uncertain and vivid, overflowing and disturbing excess, whose conversion into an overt object, as Scott (1992) asserts, already serves as a touchstone to end the debate. It is in this contrast and in the contamination that knowledge can be produced. It is a *se joga pintosa* between people and ties, between things and their links, which make materials used in research indistinct due to the effect that can generate

3. *Vamos abrir a roda! Enlarguecer!*[20] It is as if the elements that research assumes were companions of a dance that allow to create interlocution in order to intensify transformations in what Pinar (2004) called a complicated conversation about curriculum, extending it beyond the presumed borders of the field. Any research appears in a land populated by the 'ontologizing energy' (Kirby, 2010, p. 208) of difference, a zone of contact that is already acting on the localized field of impressionability that we may call research for which the distinction between passivity (object) and activity (subject) is not stable and cannot be. The 'research object', if we want to maintain the use of the term, is 'an active agent participating in the very process of materialization' (Barad, 2003, p. 821), acting in the absence of any individual or authorial possession, in which differences are produced not by means of distinctions, but of the very entanglement of the world in its differential movement. Research with a relentless commitment to alterity, perhaps it is another name for curricular thinking to produce knowledge both entangled in relationships and using the relationships themselves. That is, to be intertwined in them 'supposes, however, that one takes the risk of seeing his/her project of knowledge fall apart. Because if the project of knowledge is omnipresent, nothing happens' (Favret-Saada, 2005, p. 160).

I take the liberty of approaching the figure of the drag-queen curriculum researcher, because there is something of a montage in the research that has also to do with 'improvisation within a scene of constraint' (BUTLER, 2004a, p. 1). If there is something of its own in the drag-queen, it is a self-assembling how to derive oneself. As Noë (2015, p. 7) puts, '*it is our nature to acquire second natures*'. What I am advocating is a curriculum research that, entangled, leaves the option of

992

---

[19] Note of translation: Reference to the song *Se joga pintosa!*, by Léo Aquilla. It could be translated as Throw yourself, hottie!

[20] Reference to the song *A roda*, by Sarajane. It could be translated as Let's open the circle! Enlarge it!

transmuting in its own written body, if I can express myself this way, the indistinctive way between theatricalization and politics of which Butler (2008) has already spoken about the term queer. I know the questions may sound crazy, but I think they are worth asking: can curriculum theory *assemble itself*? That is, acquire another nature, in other words, another ontology and not simply recognize another culture? A long time ago, my Master's thesis (Ranniery, 2012) had already flirted with theater. Comes and goes, this flirtation follows me. It was, however, in the encounter with performances that I could realize the reason of my fascination. I was able to perceive the task of research as the 'substitution of all history or narration of a "gestus" as a logic of postures and positions' (Deleuze, 2010, p. 90) in order to find an alternative to the acknowledged sociological approach of curriculum, realizing that the critical essay is a theater piece' (Deleuze & Bene, 1979). Thus, I will close this session resuming the critical task of curriculum research in order to suspend the distinction between the questions on how to do research on its texture and its conditions of possibility.

There, when we started reading Butler, even without understanding much, we learned about the exercise of criticism by taking advantage of the weakness of normative schemes through which life can remain afloat. Perhaps, this movement depends, now, on a parallel exercise of (re)constitution of unexplored ways of existence where the full and pure efficacy of schemes of intelligibility were judged. The commitment of curricular theory to alterity is not strictly contained in interrogating the terms themselves from them, but interrogating entangled to alterity 'with its power to deform' (Butler, 2008, p. 322). Ways of inhabiting curricula are not even 'things' that one can talk about. Neither that they come to the surface as soon as they are described, nor because one can discover something new that would be waiting to be revealed, perhaps by taking the research as a well-finished production to give some form to something that, otherwise, would not exist. If the tangled life of difference is always being (un)done, it is written in an echoing and derivative zone. This ontology of the gerund (Butler, 1988) is an opportunity for ontological transfiguration, to risk openings, and not existential rooting. It is reasonable to ask, therefore, not to confuse this 'theatricalization with self-discovery and self-creation' (Butler, 2008, p. 326). In order to be able to produce something viable, any research, in fact, 'resumes and cites' (Butler, 2008, p. 322) the difference in an assembly that explicitly 'imitates and makes it hyperbolic' (Butler, 2008, p. 322).

The research is assembled, exacerbating the fissure, to twist the vocabulary by which it is led to speak and risks its intelligibility, indulging in disassembly to reconstitute itself, assembling from the constitutive bonding, of how the difference is part of the texture of the conceptual and scriptural relations it launches. The exercise carried out by the queer studies that one cannot speak of the difference due to its tempting exercise of speaking on its behalf was never about the impossibility of the heterogeneous harassment. Seeing the cloak of the promise of taking over the position of the other falls remains unresolved if it is imprisoned in the rhetoric of appropriation and simplification of difference - it is 'another kind of work that happens at the level of a philosophical imaginary' (Prins & Meijer, 2002, p. 158). In order to follow Mol (1999), the ontological concern is not a policy of who (can know or speak), but a policy of which realities take shape and how these realities are woven and created; it has to do how with how to value contrasting versions of reality and how they permit to live. It has to do with how reality is creation! It has to do, therefore, with fiction!

Fiction begins when it brings to the surface modes of the 'subject- and object-shaping dance of encounters' (Haraway, 2008, p. 4) when conducting research. It goes through a way of amplifying this encounter marked by diffraction and dispersion rather than by articulation and suturing. In its drift, it opens a space for dismantling the codes of legitimacy of curricular thinking from or even dependent on a '(un)*becoming with* as co-constitutive, heterogeneous, multiple and ongoing'

(Haraway, 2008, p. 3), removing from this entanglement an attention to burning themes that haunt our time and, of course, the life and death of so many people around the world. This is what might be called an ethical-political implication if, by implication, it is tangible to engage with the world, a different involvement has to do with *sentar, quicar e descer de uma vez*[21] (sitting down, bouncing and going down at once), asking what happens to curriculum research when it is detached from great concepts and categories invariably applicable to any situations and subjects classifiable to be unfolded, shifted to the open space between words and things[22]. Finally, I would like a critique *that is a burst, that goes on fire, that beats, that gleams, and throws itself with delicacy and malice* - in a purposeful paraphrase of my encounter, of the body of my writing, with the song *Bumbum de ouro*, by Gloria Groove Gold. The starting point, to be kept in the vocabulary of the manuals, is to twist and assemble, or as I was asked: *this work of yours, of thinking, being intellectual, can you do a twerk, can't you? The head is also on the waist, fag!*

F(r)iction: speculative writing

Rio de Janeiro, January 2018. Five years later, PhD was over, the doctoral dissertation had been defended, and looks of suspicion, to some extent, dissipated. I could calm down, except to see 'the possibility of suspending and interrogating the ontological claim itself, of reviewing its own productions, as it were, and contesting their claim to the real' (Butler, 1990, p. 107), so invested in performances presented at school sport courts, in order to 'imagine ourselves and others otherwise; it establishes what is the possible in excess of the real' (Butler, 2004a, p. 29) fade away along with my peacefulness of seeing the work of research ceasing to be fiction. It was before some sterilizing risk that the title-question was put. The interrogation reveals the place of the text and the work immersed in words, of the 'material rearrangements of signs and images, of the relations between what is seen and what is said, between what is done and what can be done' (Rancière, 2009, p. 60). I make this return to what has disturbed me not as one who debates about what is real and what is fantasy, what is true and what is false. I now realize that, in writing, research materializes in doing/being performative (Barad, 2003) by putting into operation a work of fiction 'within the truth, (…) and in some way to make discourse arouse, "fabricate", something which does not yet exist, thus to fiction something' (Foucault, 1980, p. 75); a work of speculative fabulation that would lose much if it were reducible to a text that would show, point, or reflect a supposedly given reference.

Although somewhat anachronistic, my concern is crossed by the formulation of Saer (2009). When discussing the non-fiction genre, Saer (2009, p.9) defines, shamelessly, 'fiction as a speculative anthropology', in which he does not only recognize the impossibility of extirpating any vestige of fiction, but he also points out:

> fictions are not written to dodge immaturity or irresponsibility from the rigors that the treatment of 'truth' demands, but precisely to highlight the complex nature of the situation, a complex character that treatment limited to verifiable implies an abusive reduction and impoverishment. When taking the leap toward the unverifiable, fiction multiplies the possibilities of treatment to infinity. It does not turn its back on a supposed objective reality: on the contrary, it plunges into its turbulence, disdaining the naïve attitude which consists in wanting to know in advance how this reality is. It is not a

994

---

[21] Reference to the song *Envolvimento*, by MC Loma, a hit at Carnival 2018.

[22] The pun is purposeful! It refers both to Foucault's work, *Words and things*, and to John Austin's work *How to do things with words*, since we have learned that language when naming constitutes things, it does not mean, in turn, that the things being constituted figure as the image and likeness of words; they count more on drifting and overlapping, proliferation and diversion.

lameness before such ethics of truth, but a search for a somewhat less rudimentary one. (Saer, 2009, p. 2).

I could wrap up here. The fiction of the genres is not expunged, like the academic texts, which intend to be non-fictional because writing, if it involves diving and drifting, contains something of a multiplier. Hence the formula in which literature shares 'with anthropology absolute deferral (the principle of contradiction, not being-identical-to-being) as an ontological condition of possibility' (Nodari, 2015, p. 81).However, there is a differential mark, since what 'literature maps are non-existent worlds, being a cosmography compared to extra-mundane perspectives' (Nodari, 2015, 81), whereas 'anthropology maps out possible worlds, constituting a comparative cosmography of the perspectives of anthropos' (Nodari, 2015, p. 81). If I dare to distract this formulation into the text of curriculum research it is not by emulating literature or anthropology. My suggestion is simpler. Curriculum research is close at hand and at the same time takes some distance from both as fiction becomes a powerful philosophical tool for curriculum research writing to entangle with alterity. If Butler's questions (2004b, p. 33) - What is real? Whose lives are real? How might reality be remade?' - pursue the curricular thinking impacted by 'queer studies, they do not force us to have a straightforward, linear, transparent and simple answer since 'real needs to be fictionalized to be thought of' (Rancière, 2009, p. 58). Therefore, perhaps, what I did was to write as if speculating: *what if these lives were real? What if these lives were taken as livable?* Such speculation, *what if?*, seems to me the condition of echoing to alterity in the curricular thinking instead of wiping it off the map.

To fiction is the condition of curriculum research to impart alterity to that animate force that moves through and moves bodies and objects. If curriculum research is nothing more than assemblage, it is written by returning to the lives that circulate and interweave in the curricula the strange turbulence of existing, its 'characteristic of being "unreal", of being a montage of words and images appropriate for reconfiguring the territory of the visible, the thinkable, and the possible' (Rancière, 2009, p. 62). I conclude - a certainly reckless conclusion - indicating that the queer exercise and the response to alterity finally converge. There, where words literally give way to the suspension of the foundations of curricular thinking, is by drifting, by the swinging of writing, that research can be and do something else, say something else. Not because it's going to change the world, but because, like the fiery choreographies at school parties, it can make us change the world. Fiction is about how life can permeate the curricular imagination by being the body of a writing that is the transfiguration of worlds. This statement is a reference to a certain anthropology which, according to Ingold (1992, p. 696), a quotation used by Viveiros de Castro (2002), finds how 'anthropology is philosophy with people included' that could well be expanded to curriculum theory. At this point, I would like to suggest that theory and curriculum research is philosophy with life and also death reverberating in us, with the texture of the interrelationships animating it.

Finally, queer studies in curricular thinking are not exhausted in the analytic of normativity, but they show interest, or emerge from an interlace, by possible worlds traced in historical assemblages of concepts, materials, and forces as capable of leaving unusual vestiges in the body of the curricular thinking; an interest in echoing the 'traces, remains, things that are left hanging in the air like a rumor' (Muñoz, 2009, p. 65) in the conceptual and imaginative force that launches; an interest in the creation of incompatible worlds that are already being shaped by so many ways of life by virtue of corrosion and suffocation, for whom tomorrow was never a certainty. If there is, therefore, any ontological turn point in course, it is not exhausted in the version of philosophy suggested by St. Pierre (2011). It would sound somewhat paradoxical if this philosophically informed inquiry did not undertake as a counterpart the decolonization of this philosophy, for lack of a more appropriate word, as the name for 'a special form of directionality of the living which has the potential to transcend its own substrate of origin and take place where there is thinking'

995

(Romandini, 2010, p. 225). Or, there, where the performances make thinking into flesh to live another world!

The gender problem of curriculum research - our gender trouble, so to speak - lies in allying itself with this philosophy made of flesh in the conceptual imagination of curriculum. This alliance is what can create the conditions for curriculum theory to produce 'an active and intransitive set of interrelationships' (Butler, 2015b, p. 210), a policy in which research marks 'the limits of self-sufficiency and that establishes us [researchers as well] as relational and interdependent beings' (Butler & Athanasiou, 2013, p. 91). The dismantling of the foundations to 'reactivate the new, the difference blocked' (Macedo, 2017, p. 581) therefore, involves making the curriculum itself strange from what emerges from the interweaving, that is, dependent upon taking the lives with which it engages as materializing a kind of philosophy in which the *body does all the work*[23] and in which 'the space of the living is explored on a completely new basis' (Romandini, 2010, p. 225). If one of the striking characteristics of the queer was a temptation to what is outcast, perhaps it must be admitted that marginality in curricular thinking could be found not in people, but in the perspective one can launch, displacing points taken as core of the curriculum theory.

Writing becomes the ground for the exploration of this interrelation, that is, of what the relation can reverberate in the curricular imagination. A piece of writing that is not about imagining a pedagogical experience, of how the curriculum, *if it were 'how'* - nothing closer to the dreams of pacification of education as a project that would take imagination as prescription -, 'but to experience imagination' (Viveiros de Castro, 2012, p. 155). Experiencing imagination of curricular thinking is what would happen to the curriculum if it collided and was rubbed against other ideas and bodies, if it responded to the invitation to *dance like it were making love*[24]. The doctoral dissertation that began by focusing on the experiences of gender and sexuality of young gay men in school, soon turned to the relations maintained by young gay men with the school or as something that I called in another moment of delicate work of creation the livable life (Ranniery, 2017b, 2017c) reflected on curriculum. I realized an additional step that consisted in a critique of curricular thinking itself, constantly navigating on a kind of environment constituted by encounters and relationships that they established with me, the world and the school. Fiction became to me the echo of alterity at the edge of curriculum theory by giving body, through words, to what emerges from that intertwining.

To suspend the frontier between fiction and the writing of curriculum research is, finally, to deny to methodological resources the illusory privilege that denaturation, as we have learned, has claimed for itself. On the other hand, fiction is the name for a writing policy in an impregnating approach, in which ways of life can finally provincialize the omnipresent curricular imagination and place it in symmetry and ethical-political alliance with the work of making life livable. Any response from curriculum theory to alterity involves questioning our ontological claims - a work of friction - from the opening to the unimaginable which is already being experienced and is underway by so many ways of life - a work of fiction that is not only a discursive or conceptual trope, but is, without modesty, an experimental and imaginative critique of other possible worlds. Fri(c)tion: to produce curriculum research, as that one who slashes bodies, blurring the boundaries between the 'I' and the other, between any territory called 'self' and the alterity that inhabits him/her and seeks to cover him/her up.

A final paragraph

[23] Reference to the song *Work from home*, by Fifth Harmony.

[24] Reference to the song *Dance like we're making love*, by Ciara.

996

I have written this text only to say that I am increasingly suspicious and averse to presenting curriculum as disenchanted. Would we be so immersed in the colonial milieu that the only possibility is to take our writing as a denouncer descriptor of what makes the ways of inhabiting curricula overwhelming or as revealing redemption of what would be hidden underground? Acknowledging the colonial fantasy underlying research practices are crucial in order for queer studies in curriculum thinking to challenge both habitual suspects and acknowledged allies and bring to the core the no longer new queer lesson in the research apparatus: stylized repetition of acts have been about intensifying and expanding life in the very configuration of thinking and politics, since the theorizing, bodily practices, and habitat of life are inseparable. Being fiction, the political work of writing curriculum research is nothing more than embodying in the texts unexpected points of view about the complex interrelations whereby a curriculum never corresponds to a closed hermetic ontological field, but it revolts a blurred zone of inter-relations and movements, a more aberrant space-time than we would like, left or right of the political spectrum, so to speak. And wasn't the theme of the opening chapter of Louro's (2004) book, now a classic, the journey and the boundary? There will be no ontological turn in curriculum thinking without challenging the boundary by which curriculum belief is instituted as the ground of the oneness of existence. The question that remains is whether and how much we are willing to write more precariously, as one might say: *olha a explosão! Quando ela desce com o bumbum no chão!*[25] (Look at the explosion! When she comes down with her bottom on the floor!). Perhaps this means stopping from doing research to doing something else that neither do we know what it will be and nor will it be necessary to know.

References

Alexander, J., & Mohanty, C. (1997). Introduction. In J. Alexander & C. Mohanty (Eds.), *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures* (pp. 13-43). New York: Routledge.

Andrade, C. D. (1992). *Poesia e prosa.* Rio de Janeiro: Nova Aguilar.

Assis, M. de. (1994). *Obra completa.* Rio de Janeiro: Nova Aguilar.

Barad, K. (2003). The Posthumanist performativity: toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(3), 801-831. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/345321

Britzman, D. (2000). If the story cannot end: deferred action, ambivalence, and difficult knowledge. In R. Simon et al. (Eds.). *Between hope and despair* (pp. 27-57). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: an essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. *Theatre Journal*, 40(4), 519-531. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3207893

Butler, J. (1990). The force of fantasy: mapplethorpe, feminism, and discursives excess. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 2(2), 105-125.

Butler, J. (1994). Against proper objects. *Differences*, 6(2-3), 1-26.

---

[25] Reference to the song *Olha a explosão*, by MC Kevinho.

Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech*. Nova York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2003). *Problemas de gênero*. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira.

Butler, J. (2004a). *Undoing gender*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2004b). *Precarious life: the power of mourning and violence*. New York: Verso.

Butler, J. (2008). *Cuerpos que importan*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.

Butler, J. (2013). O que é a crítica? Um ensaio sobre a virtude em Foucault. *Cadernos de Ética e Filosofia Política*, 22, 159-179.

Butler, J. (2015a). *Notes toward a performative theory of assembly*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Butler, J. (2015b). *Quadros de guerra*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

Butler, J. (2017). *Caminhos divergentes*. São Paulo: Boitempo Editorial.

Butler, J., & Athanasiou, A. (2013). *Dispossession: the performative in the political*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Deleuze, G. (2010). *Sobre o teatro*. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.

Deleuze, G., & Bene, C. (1979). *Superpositions*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.

Derrida, J. (1991). *Margens da filosofia*. São Paulo: Papirus.

Derrida, J. (2010). *Força de lei*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Favret-Saada, J. (2005). Ser Afetado. *Cadernos de Campo*, 13(13), 155-161. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.11606/issn.2316-9133.v13i13p155-161

Foucault, M. (1980). Interview with Lucette Finas. In M. Morris & P. Patton (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: power, truth and strategy* (pp. 67-75). Sidney: Federal Publications.

Foucault, M. (1989). O filósofo mascarado (entrevista a C. Delacampagne). *Le Monde*, 10945. Retrieved January 5, 2018 from http://www.lite.fe.unicamp.br/papet/2002/fe190d/texto08.htm

Hage, G. (2015). *Alter-Politics*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Halberstam, J. (2011). *The queer art of failure*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Halperin, D. (1995). *Saint Foucault*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Haraway, D. (1992). The promises of monsters: a regenerative politics for inappropriate/d others In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson & P. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural Studies* (pp. 295-337). New York: Routledge.

Haraway, D. (1998). Saberes localizados: a questão da ciência para o feminismo e o privilégio da perspectiva parcial. *Cadernos Pagu*, 5, 7-42.

Haraway, D. (2008). *When species meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Haraway, D. (2013). SF: Science fiction, speculative fabulation, string figures, so far. *Ada: A Journal of Gender, New Media and Technology*, 3, 2013. Retrieved January 5, 2018 from http://adanewmedia.org/blog/2013/11/03/issue3-haraway/#footnote-2

Hayward, E. (2010). Fingeryeyes: impressions of cup corals. *Cultural Anthropology*, 25(4), 577-599. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1360.2010.01070.x

Hemmings, C. (2005). Invoking affect: cultural theory and the ontological turn. *Cultural Studies*, 19(5), 548-567. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09502380500365473

Ingold, T. (1992). Editorial. *Man*, 27(1), 694-697.

Jackson, A., & Mazzei, L. (2017). Thinking with theory: a new analytic for qualitative inquiry. In N. K. Dezin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 717-737). Los Angeles: Sage.

King, K. (2011). *Networked reenactments*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kirby, V. (1993). Feminisms and Postmodernisms: Anthropology and the management of difference. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 66(3), 127-33. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3317516

Kirby, V. (1997). *Telling flesh: The substance of the corporeal*. London: Routledge.

Kirby, V. (2010). Original Science: Nature deconstructing itself. *Derrida Today*, 3(2), 201-220. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.3366/drt.2010.0204

Kirby, V. (2011). *Quantum antropologies: life at large*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Lather, P. (2007). *Getting lost: Feminist Efforts toward a Double(d) Science*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Lather, P. (2016). Top ten+ list: (Re) thinking ontology in (post) qualitative research. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies*, 16(2), 125-131. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1532708616634734

Law, J. (2012). *After method: mess in Social Science Research*. Londres: Routledge.

Louro, G. (2004). *Um corpo estranho*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica.

999

Macedo, E. (2017). Mas a escola não tem que ensinar? Conhecimento, reconhecimento e alteridade na teoria do currículo. *Currículo sem Fronteiras*, 17(3), 539-554.

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture,* 15(1), 11-40. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1215/08992363-15-1-11

Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics: a word and some questions. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor Network Theory and After* (pp. 74-89). Londres: Blackwell.

Muñoz, J. E. (2009). *Cruising utopia: the then and there of queer futurity*. New York: New York University Press.

Nodari, A. (2015). A literatura como antropologia especulativa. *Revista da Anpoll*, 1(38), 75-85. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.18309/anp.v1i38.836

Noë, A. (2015). *Strange tools: art and human nature*. Nova York: Hill and Wang.

O'Rourke, M. (2006). Que há de tão queer na teoria queer-por-vir? *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais*, 76, 127-140. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4000/rccs.870

O'Rourke, M. (2016). 'Girls Welcome!!!': Speculative realism, object oriented Ontology and Queer Theory. In K. Kolozova, & E. Joy (Eds.), *After the 'Speculative Turn': realism, philosophy, and feminism* (pp. 157-197). Milky Way: Punctum Books.

Paraíso, M. (2016). Currículo e relações de gênero: entre o que se ensina e o que se pode aprender. *Revista Linhas*, 17(33), 206-237. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5965/1984723817332016206

Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?*. Mahwah: Laurence Erlbaum.

Prins, B., & Meijer, I. C. (2002). Como os corpos se tornam matéria: entrevista com Judith Butler. *Revista Estudos Feministas*, 10(1), 155-167. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0104-026x2002000100009

Puar, J. K. (2005). Queer times, queer assemblages. *Social Text*, 23(3-4), 121-39. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1215/01642472-23-3-4_84-85-121

Rancière, J. (2009). *A partilha do sensível: estética e política*. São Paulo: 34.

Ranniery, T. (2012). *Currículo-teatro: uma cartografia com Antonin Artaud*. UFMG, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, , Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil.

Ranniery, T. (2016a). O impossível, o improvável, o impróprio: apontamentos para pensar transjuventudes, cultura e educação. In A. P. Uziel & F. Guilhon (Eds.), *Transdiversidades* (pp. 245-264). Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ.

Ranniery, T. (2016b). No meio do mundo, aquendar a metodologia: notas para queerizar a pesquisa em currículo. *Práxis Educativa*, 11(2), 1-20. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.5212/praxeduc.v.11i2.0002

1000

Ranniery, T. (2017a). No balanço da teoria queer em educação: silêncios, tensões e desafios. *Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad*, 25, 19-49. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1984-6487.sess.2017.25.02.a

Ranniery, T. (2017b). Currículo, normatividade e políticas de reconhecimento a partir de trajetórias escolares de 'meninos gays'. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 25(51), 1-32. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.2835

Ranniery, T. (2017c). Currículo, socialidade queer e políticas da imaginação. *Teias*, 18(51), 51-67. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.12957/teias.2017.30593

Romandini, F. L. (2010). *La comunidad de los espectros I*. Buenos Aires: Mino y D'Avila.

Saer, J. J. (2009). O conceito de ficção. *Sopro*, 15, 1-4.

Said, E. (2003). *Cultura e política*. São Paulo: Boitempo.

Scott, J. (1992). The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry*, 17(4), 773-797. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1086/448612

Sedgwick, E. K. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Sedgwick, E. (1993). Queer performativity: Henry James's The Art of Novel. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 1, 1-16.

Sedgwick, E. K. (2003). *Touching feeling*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Spivak, G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak?. In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271-313). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

St. Pierre, E. A. S. (2011). Post qualitative research: The critique and the coming after. In N. K. Dezin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 611-635). Los Angeles: Sage.

St. Pierre, E. A. S. (2013). The appearance of data. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies*, 13(4), 223-227. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1532708613487862

Stengers, I. (2002). *A invenção das Ciências Modernas*. São Paulo: 34.

Stengers, I. (2005). The cosmopolitical proposal. In B. Latour & P. Weibel (Eds.), *Making things public: atmospheres of democracy* (pp. 994-1003). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Stengers, I. (2010). *Cosmopolitics I*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stengers, I. (2017). Reativar o animismo. *Cadernos de Leitura*, 62, 1-15. Retrieved June 11, 2018 from http://chaodafeira.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/caderno-62-reativar-ok.pdf>

Strathern, M. (1988). *The gender of the gift*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Viveiros de Castro, E. (2002). O nativo relativo. *Mana*, 8(1), 113-148. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0104-93132002000100005

Viveiros de Castro, E. (2012). "Transformação" na antropologia, transformação da "antropologia". *Mana*, 18(1), 151-171. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/s0104-93132012000100006

Viveiros de Castro, E. (2014). Who is afraid of the ontological wolf? Some comments on an ongoing anthropological debate. Paper presented at the *Annual Marilyn Strathern Lecture*. Retrieved December 20, 2017 from https://sisu.ut.ee/sites/default/files/biosemio/files/cusas_strathern_lecture_2014.pdf

1002