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Reviewing these two works simultaneously places the past, present and future of curriculum discourses inside and outside of historical truth, representation and interpretations of the field. As a reviewer I have to own up to my slippages between the writers, their assumed identities and their audiences. As Patti Lather (2000) writes:

No matter how much we think we are reading voice, we are reading a text. Acts of transcription have taken place. Editorial decisions have been made. The text is never free of the contamination of language. Given this, what is knowledge in the testimony? (p. 155)

The two texts enacted in the space of transnational curriculum inquiry should be made available to the scholarly community. In considering Lixin Luo’s paper I would however like to hear more from the writer, the learner, the discursive readings of curriculum experiences and contexts – teacher, postgraduate student, membership of the community of curriculum scholars. Further I would encourage some more reading against the text, to seek what Lather (2000) describes as to ‘focus on what is “becoming” in the data: discontinuities, ruptures the unexpected, the contingent, the stabilized configurations and the beginnings of the possible...’ (p. 158). After all, our work is to seek a reflexive account of the field even if it is a possibility we have come to embrace. Marylin Low and Pat Palulis’s article provides the deconstructive act through textual form. I am very comfortable as a reader in these spaces, but I find narratives that are smoothed over and seamless more troubling, as curriculum texts have an historical weight much like the curriculum imaginings I have appropriated at left.

I am immediately taken inside Low and Palulis’s text, however I admit my familiarity and preference for reading the visual and text types. Owing up to my past as a secondary visual art teacher, and now preferring to research in this way, I understand how through the electronic revolution our culture is witnessing a shift where the visual medium, traditionally the ‘illustration of text’, is becoming the dominant medium of thought. But this way of knowing is used less often in education and curriculum thinking and, as Gustavo...
Fischman (2001), states: ‘The reliance on words and numbers among educational researchers
and the general tendency of dismissing images is generalised across academic traditions,
thoretical traditions, and research methods’ (p.28). This leads me to consider whether
[chiasm(us)] as the entry point for Low and Palulis’s textwork is sufficient for our readers,
even though we aim in this journal to embody readers in the transnational space. I read and
run with the text, across, up and (in)between. In short, ‘Labourred breathing’ is textwork that I
find very accessible and inspiring, but perhaps others may not.
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