

WHAT CAN A CURRICULUM DO? BRIEF ESSAY ON THE CURRICULUM IN IMMANENCE

O QUE PODE UM CURRÍCULO? BREVE ENSAIO SOBRE O CURRÍCULO EM IMANÊNCIA

¿QUÉ PUEDE HACER UN CURRÍCULO? BREVE ENSAYO SOBRE EL CURRÍCULO EN INMANENCIA.

Dinamara Garcia FELDENS¹
Camilo CATANHEDE²
Luana FUSARO³

ABSTRACT: This paper, written from discussions and readings among the authors, members of the Education, Culture and Subjectivities research group (GPECS/ CNPq/UFS), and developed through the Master's thesis of one of the authors, proposes a reflection on the aspects from the theory of Baruch de Spinoza to compose different ways of educating. The aim is to consider a curriculum that goes beyond traditional models, and that is committed to producing an education enhanced by happy affections. In this sense we ask: what can a curriculum do? To think about this question, we will use the systematized results of a survey of curricular experiments, carried out for almost three years, in a school located in the State of Sergipe. In addition to Spinoza, we will bring in the theoretical framework concepts by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari and the idea of curricular nomadism by Sandra Mara Corazza. With this articulation, we seek to demonstrate some principles and practices that guides to a loving education, composed of happy affections, capable of increasing the power and intensity of thought and learning.

KEYWORDS: Education. Curricular nomadism. Necropolitics. Affections.

RESUMO: *Este artigo, escrito a partir de discussões e leituras entre os autores, membros do grupo de pesquisa Educação, Cultura e Subjetividades (GPECS/CNPq/UFS), e desenvolvido através da dissertação de Mestrado de um dos autores, propõe uma reflexão sobre aspectos da teoria de Baruch de Spinoza para compor diferentes modos de educar. Busca-se considerar um currículo que extrapole os modelos tradicionais, e que esteja comprometido em produzir uma educação potencializada por afetos alegres. Neste sentido perguntamos: o que pode um currículo? Para pensar sobre esta questão, iremos utilizar os resultados*

¹ Federal University of Sergipe (UFS), Aracaju – SE – Brazil. Permanent Professor of the Postgraduate Program in Education. Doctorate in Basic Education (UNISINOS). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-3876>. E-mail: dinag.feldens@gmail.com

² Federal University of Sergipe (UFS), Aracaju – SE – Brazil. Master's Degree from the Postgraduate Program in Education. Member of the Education, Culture and Subjectivities Research Group. GPECS/CNPq/UFS. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9391-8210>. E-mail: camiloemesmo@gmail.com

³ Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (PUC-SP), São Paulo – SP – Brazil. Doctoral student in the Postgraduate Program in Communication and Semiotics. Member of the Education, Culture and Subjectivities Research Group. GPECS/CNPq/UFS. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6481-2935>. E-mail: luafeldens@gmail.com

sistematizados de uma pesquisa de experimentações curriculares, realizada durante quase três anos, em uma escola localizada no estado de Sergipe. Além Spinoza, traremos no referencial teórico conceitos de Gilles Deleuze e Félix Guattari e a ideia de nomadismo curricular de Sandra Mara Corazza. Com essa articulação, buscamos demonstrar alguns princípios e práticas que convergem à uma educação amorosa, composta por afetos alegres, capaz de aumentar a potência e a intensidade do pensamento e da aprendizagem.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Educação. Nomadismo curricular. Necropolítica. Afetos.

RESUMEN: Este artículo, elaborado a partir de discusiones y lecturas entre los autores, miembros del grupo de investigación Educación, Cultura y Subjetividades (GPECS/CNPq/UFS), y desarrollado a través de la tesis de maestría de uno de los autores, propone una reflexión sobre los aspectos de la teoría de Baruch de Spinoza para componer diferentes formas de educar. El objetivo es plantear un currículum que vaya más allá de los modelos tradicionales, y que apueste por producir una educación enriquecida con afectos felices. En este sentido nos preguntamos: ¿qué puede hacer un currículum? Para reflexionar sobre esta cuestión, utilizaremos los resultados sistematizados de una encuesta de experimentos curriculares, realizada durante casi tres años, en una escuela ubicada en el estado de Sergipe. Además de Spinoza, traeremos los conceptos del marco teórico de Gilles Deleuze y Félix Guattari y la idea de nomadismo curricular de Sandra Mara Corazza. Con esta articulación, buscamos demostrar unos principios y prácticas que convergen hacia una educación amorosa, compuesta de afectos alegres, capaces de incrementar el poder y la intensidad del pensamiento y el aprendizaje.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Educación. Nomadismo curricular. Necropolíticas. Afectos.

Introduction - The search for a way to affective education

The reflection proposed in this article begins with a survey with members of the Education, Culture and Subjectivities Research Group, and traced the investigative path of the dissertation of one of the authors of this article, starting from the following question: how the curriculum can help in the transformation of realities in the active search for affections of joy and love? On that occasion, we conceptualized the process of creating and constituting a way of educating that updated the curriculum while we learned to listen and consider the desires, joys, sorrows and curiosities of the student body in the design and organization of teaching relationships and affective learning within and outside the school.

We explain how we left a curriculum centered on information tracing and found a path towards another type of curriculum, which wanders through the worlds of those who live to learn. There are two distinct ways of living the art of education. One that privileges memorizing, reproducing information, repeating preconceived questions, preparing for standardized tests and, finally, standardizing communication between the faculty and their

classes. From another perspective, we have an education that frees thought from the decal into acts of creation filled with desire to learn. A way that curbs the curiosity of the body that learns by living "with": living in family dynamics, living in the neighborhood, with the street, the sun, the rain, the farm, the neighborhood, in short, with the reality in which the school is inserted. Another way that considers what affects the apprentice body and awakens the desire to know and create from the body that lives and learns in a unique way in the collective reality it touches.

We ask what can a curriculum with the aim of finding ways to include the reality experienced by the learning body in the conception and organization of affective, powerful and, why not, immediately useful teaching and learning relationships to the learning body? We have already left that place of a teacher who knows everything, repeats a lot, talks a lot, little listens, little transforms, little creates, little allow to create.

We still seek to explain that leaving the place of decal was only possible when we learned to consider the pedagogical role of desire, joy and sadness in the education we practiced. The paths taken from a new emphasis on the art of educating led us to a way of building together and developing pedagogical projects of short duration in harmony with the student body's desire to learn.

In this sense, we created a small project that transformed a reality of sadness determined by mechanisms of deterioration of human existence into affections and a reality of joy – and which took place outside school. It all started in a conversation circle convened by children and teenagers who directly or indirectly participated in the Ecological Garden workshop, inserted in the curriculum of the school where one of the authors of this article worked.

The mandatory workshop was where we started. After more than two years of walking, we reached the last curricular experiment in a bolder pedagogical project. The project involved the recovery of an abandoned classroom in a village located on the margins of an irregular dump that concentrated most cases of murders of family members of students enrolled in the school. Amidst different ways of promoting the deterioration of human existence in the reality where they lived, the children glimpsed a reality that could be transformed. A happier possible future that involved the conquest of a place to play safely.

The project took place outside the school. The programmed activities took place without obligation, attendance list or any instrument of penalty similar to those used at school – such as a written warning addressed to family members, suspension or expulsion. Once a week, outside the extended hours of integral education, the young collective met to meet the

goals established in the project. With donations and help from villagers, it took us almost three months to recover the room and occupy the space with a simple toy library and library.

The room's revitalization project gave rise to the Second Home, the name given by the children to the space after conquering the place they saw possible: a space where they could play and have fun safely. At the end of the Second Home project, we arrived at a proposal for the affective management of transforming teaching and learning relationships. With this management proposal, together with the principles and practices of project pedagogy - which, roughly speaking, consists of using the theoretical and methodological framework of project management in the art of educating -, the curriculum we practiced was updated in affective pedagogical projects anchored in the different realities experienced by those who learned (CANTANEDE; LIBÓRIO, 2017).

The Second Home collective interventions are planned, carried out and evaluated using four methodologies: participatory planning-PP, evaluation round of the method *Campesino à Campesino*-CaC, pedagogical artistic installation-IAP and graphic systematization-SG. All Methodologies used were chosen for their participatory approach and for encouraging or facilitating moments guided by horizontal dialogue (CANTANHEDE; LIBÓRIO, 2018, p. 02, our translation).

Later, we will describe the role of each tool mentioned above in curriculum updates. For now, it is enough to point out that the integration of the methodological tools above consolidated the proposal of affective management of teaching and learning relationships. In turn, this same proposal made our art of educating capable of mobilizing the student body in the transformation of what was a cause of joy and promoting useful learning in the conquest of possible joys.

A curriculum goes through different processes before finding a way to welcome affections from the learning body and becoming capable of causing joy, love and union through bonds of friendship. We call curriculum in immanence the state in which the educational process tunes what we must teach – BNCC – to the desire to create and learn from the student body. In this state, the student body is mobilized in learning full of meanings and usefulness for itself and, at the same time, the art of educating does not need external stimuli – whether joy or sadness – to the learning body.

If education takes on the challenge of facing different ways of promoting the deterioration of existence, the concept of necropolitics, coined by Cameroonian philosopher and historian Achille Mbembe (2018), can be useful. He defined the concept as the power to

determine who should live, who should be more or less exposed to the risk of death, and, ultimately, who should we let die.

In the book *Necropolítica* (Necropolitics), he explains how this social construction participated in the process of creating mechanisms for regulation and social cohesion of power formations instituted in modern societies. Necropolitics can thus be understood as a singular and collective process that begins with the denial of the human condition and permeates the creation of enemies. It is precisely the creation of one or more enemies that legitimize policies of enmity and/or persecution that support policies of death. They are the ones who give face and color to the body that will die, because we have learned to tolerate its death through indifference.

Although at its origin the concept was limited to certain situations specified in Mbembe's work, today its use has expanded outside the academy and allows us to think about our time in a more complex way. We made use of the concept in explaining the process of creating a curricular base useful in disarming death policies. However, as a result of so many death policies incident on the power lines of education, how to organize thinking and plan the pedagogical effort to provide learning determined by the national curriculum and also confront the necropolitics that we face inside and outside school? How can we make pedagogical work a cause for joy in achieving the desired changes?

How to reconcile the expectations of the family, the child and the social forces that affect the education we can and must offer? What the school and the curriculum can and should teach, propose and desire? How to reconcile so many desires in a pedagogical proposal that intends to transform? What should we prioritize in a process that aims to transform realities that cause sadness into opposite realities that cause joy and contentment?

Faced with so many problems that are aggravating in our time, what can a curriculum and a school community effectively transform? Of all the knowledge already produced and accumulated by humanity, which set of ideas, concepts, theories, principles, practices, technologies should we teach?

How to interact with forces that, without the explicit objective of teaching – for better or for worse – also teach so many things? The family and its habits educate. Television, social networks, the street, the community, the political class, the expectations of society and social groups through which we circulate also affect the educational process.

There are countless issues to be discussed, but we seek to discuss and propose principles and practices that guide us in creating ways of educating capable of teaching bodies – students and teachers – **to think, act and teach according to adequate ideas**. That is,

making good use of reason to increase the potential for individual and collective action in pedagogical proposals capable of transforming causes of sadness and hatred into causes of contrary affection, joy and love.

Propositions for a curriculum in immanence

The propositions presented here are the result of theoretical compositions that reference this text and discussion among the authors. Anchored in the reality of the pedagogical experience described above, the propositions or principles for a curriculum in immanence work as a map of forces to tune the teaching and learning relationships to the students' desires to learn. Without any universalist pretensions, the principles explained below guide us along paths that seek to make the curriculum a tool that mobilizes bodies that learn in useful learning by persevering in existence in times of deterioration in life.

Again, we turn to Spinoza's Ethics, to the theory of lines formulated by Deleuze in partnership with Guattari and to the curricular nomadism of Professor Sandra Mara Corazza. In the researched works we found elements to think about adequate answers to what we want: to postulate principles for the creation of curricula that intend to make education a joyful, loving process capable of promoting the union between bodies through bonds of friendship and; tune the teaching and learning relationships in curiosity, in the desire to know and create of the student bodies who learn by living together and persevering in existence in the intensity zones of their reality.

We know that the curriculum is an inert instrument. Only crossed by the lines of force of a discourse that qualifies, assigns meanings, defines objectives, priorities and forms of education considered adequate to the challenges it poses for itself, will we be able to say what a curriculum is capable of or not.

Because Spinoza does not address the details of education in his works, we find in the curricular nomadism of teacher Sandra Mara Corazza and in reflections developed by Deleuze in partnership with Félix Guattari, principles and practices to create affective ways of educating. Even not treating Education as a central theme in his intellectual production, the pedagogical vocabulary stands out when Spinoza justifies the usefulness of his philosophy in what it can teach us. Furthermore, the propositions and reflections that support Ethics establish a discourse in defense of joy, love and freedom to think according to common notions conceived from adequate ideas.

For the individual, the Spinozan theory of knowledge teaches “to perform only those actions that love and generosity advise us”, and how to lead us in the face of luck, “that is, in front of those things that are not in our power” to learn to “bear with equal courage both sides of fortune” (SPINOZA, 2017, p. 94, our translation). In the social sphere of life, the usefulness of Spinozana's philosophy “teaches us to no one to hate, despise, ridicule, envy, nor to be angry with anyone”; it also teaches “each one to be content with what they have and help others” making proper use of reason “that is, according to what the occasion and circumstances demand” (SPINOZA, 2017, p. 94, our translation).

Contentment was understood here as a vibrational state that each and everybody can – at least potentially – experience, in a unique way: the maximum possible joy in the face of circumstances and social forces that shape the daily life we live. Therefore, it has nothing to do with a submissive or passive position regarding the causes and effects of contemporary death policies.

In politics, the usefulness of the Spinozian philosophy was sustained in the name of its freedom and capacity to teach “how citizens should be governed and directed, not, of course, to become slaves, but to freely do what is better” (SPINOZA, 2017, p. 94, our translation). Even though it is not easy to teach the 17th century philosopher's Ethics, since, as he himself warns, it is an arduous and daily exercise, nevertheless, it can “be found. And it must certainly be arduous what is so rarely found” (SPINOZA, 2017, p. 238, our translation).

How to find such paths? Walking, no doubt. On this journey, our tools are concepts and plans. Let's see what relationship we can establish between them. According to Deleuze and Guattari (1999, p. 52, our translation), we can understand concepts as events and the plane as “the horizon of events, the reservoir, or the reserve of purely conceptual events”.

The concept knows nothing but itself. We can understand the plan “as a desert that concepts populate without sharing. It is the concepts themselves that are the only regions of the plane, but it is the plane that is the only support of the concepts” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1992, p. 52). Concepts are zones of intensity in the plane. But what plan are we talking about? Let us start by talking about the plane of immanence.

[...] when immanence is no longer immanent to anything other than itself, one can speak of a plane of immanence. Such a plan is perhaps a radical empiricism [...]. It only presents events, that is, possible worlds as concepts, and others, as expressions of possible worlds or conceptual characters. The event does not refer the experience to a transcendent subject [...], but rather refers to the immanent overflight of a field without a subject; The Other does not return transcendence to another self but brings every other self to the

immanence of the overflowed field. Empiricism knows nothing but events (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1992, p. 64, our translation).

The event is of the order of what is necessary. It is unique and cannot be repeated. The most potent thing about an event is the now, the current. “The current, the current state or doing, is the point where all the necessary characteristics of the situation converge” (GAUTHIER, 1999, p. 17). In a pedagogical process that aims to transform the reality that produces sadness, past, present and future coexist. It is a characteristic of the philosophical nature of the time of the plane of immanence: it presupposes the coexistence – of ideas, ways of thinking, being, be in the world. This time is the “infinite becoming of philosophy, which crosses its history but is not confused with it”; philosophy as becoming of thought, we do not speak of successive plans, but of plans that coexist, which can “sometimes separate, sometimes reunite - in fact, both for better and worse” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1992, p. 78, our translation).

It is important to understand that, whether we like it or not, every “plan operates a selection of what is right for thought”, this selection being precisely “what varies from one plan to another” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1992, p. 68, our translation). To better illustrate what we mean, let us turn our attention to medieval Europe, whose plane of immanence was predominantly Christian. At that time, the ways of thinking and acting were determined by truths produced and propagated by priests who claimed to know the will and volition of a god conceived in the image and likeness of man.

After a series of historical events disturbed the Catholic plan, the Renaissance, then the Enlightenment, and later the moderns, gave life to a new plan. With it, the defenders of modernized reason disputed with the clerics the control over the regimes of production of truths, until then, deified. After the relative loss of power of the Catholic Church, the friction between the two planes – Christian and modern – was eased and began to form. Added to the dissemination of premises, prejudices, truths, illusions and inadequacies of the new modern reason.

Together, the two plans operated the reconstruction of the notion of God in the image and likeness of the average European, whose way of life was – by themselves – postulated as superior to other ways of persevering the existence of the peoples of the world. The difference inherent to human beings was ranked according to skin color and translated as naivety and natural inferiority. With the illusory idea of the superiority of European culture, the heroic image of the Christian and modern European was ready for export as opposed to the image of the uncivilized and morally corrupted barbarian.

When the great European powers left for the great navigations and piracy “in the name of God, Gold and Glory”, they started a process of destruction of the plans of original populations while plundering natural and human resources based on physical and symbolic violence (ALTIERI *et al.*, 2002, p. 23). Covered with the salvation of barbarian peoples, the colonizing holocaust and the consequent erasure of the epistemes of colonized peoples homogenized the difference in human ways of perceiving and living the world, in a process that can be briefly explained as follows:

1. Modern civilization describes itself as more developed and superior (which means unconsciously holding a Eurocentric position).
2. Superiority obliges us to develop the most primitive, barbaric, rude, as a moral requirement.
3. The path of such an educational process of development must be that followed by Europe (it is, in fact, a unilinear and European-style development which, again unconsciously, determines the “developmental fallacy”).
4. As the barbarian is opposed to the civilizing process, modern praxis must ultimately exert violence, if necessary, to destroy the obstacles to this modernization (colonial just war).
5. This domination produces victims (in many and varied ways), violence that is interpreted as an inevitable act, and with the quasi-ritual sense of sacrifice; the civilizing hero clothes his own victims with the condition of being holocausts of a saving sacrifice (the colonized indian, the African slave, the woman, ecological destruction etc.).
6. For the modern, the barbarian has a “guilt” (for opposing the civilizing process) that allows “Modernity” to present itself not only as innocent but as “emancipator” of this “guilt” of its own victims.
7. Finally, and due to the “civilizing” character of “Modernity”, they interpret as inevitable the sufferings or sacrifices (the costs) of the “modernization” of other “backward” (immature) peoples, of other races possible to enslave, of the other sex by to be fragile, etcetera (DUSSEL, 2000, p. 49, our translation).

The expansion of the Western immanence plan – Christian and modern – throughout the world has suppressed and devalued, if not extinguished, other plans and ways of thinking and acting on reality (GONÇALVES, 2016). Centuries later, when powerful conceptual contributions to think about the causes and effects of the colonizing holocaust affected the contemporary plane of immanence, it was possible, perhaps with more intensity in academia, to perceive and discuss the causes and effects of that historical process of cultural homogenization and lamination of subjectivities.

In light of new concepts, theories and discourses that affected the globalized plane of immanence, the causes and consequences of the violent colonizing holocaust were perceived and denounced in the updating of the same conception of economic development as the European one. Henceforth, the proposition of effective changes in the fight against the death policies reproduced in the updates of the same colonial logic of exploitation of people and natural resources reached a new level.

Due to lack of time and space, we are unable to expose the details that support contemporary necropolitics such as structural racism, misogyny, homophobia, the developmental fallacy etc. On the effects of these new concepts on the educational immanence plan, we recommend reading the book by Tomaz Tadeu da Silva (2010): “Identity documents: an introduction to curriculum theories”. The work provides a historical summary of real and conceptual events that, over time, (re)signified the understanding of what a curriculum is and what it can do when confronted by necropolitics and other processes of deterioration of existence.

Silva (2010) systematized the effects of those theories and discourses of mutilated peoples in the expansion of the modern immanence plan in the curriculum. He presented a catalog containing different perspectives on the use of the idea of curriculum as a pedagogical tool for human formation and the problematization of reality. These are powerful concepts that have driven insurgencies against mechanisms that produce and reproduce policies of death.

By naming those evils that enriched and structure modern societies, the struggle against ways to promote the deterioration of human existence and living nature was subsidized and strengthened. This fight must have:

[...] as the purpose of producing life, overthrowing hierarchies instituted by those who got used to winning without being right, with “absolute violence” having a detoxifying and instituting function in this work. This fight has a triple dimension. It aims to [...] destroy what destroys, amputates, dismembers, blinds and provokes fear and anger – the becoming a thing. Afterwards, its function is to welcome the lament and cry [...] of those who, bereft of themselves, were condemned to abjection; to care for and, eventually, to cure those and those that the power has hurt, raped, tortured, or simply driven mad (MBEMBE, 2018, p. 02, our translation).

In short, our fight is a fight against all forms of perpetuation and propagation of feelings of sadness and hatred. According to Spinoza, it is only with love that hatred can be disarmed, just as it takes joy to curb an affection of sadness. It is a philosophical question. A clash of plans that takes us back to the historical process advertised as the struggle between reason and ignorance, civilization and barbarism, God and the Devil.

Finally, we can see that modern propaganda was not a defense of reason, of science, that is, of a more adequate and dynamic thinking process than the sacred scriptures of explaining the laws of existence – or laws of God, nature, substance creator. We see that the expansion of the scientific and European-centered immanence plan can be understood as "a conflict between the multiplicity of knowledge that opposed each other", in which European

nations exercised "their 'disciplinary power', operating by four basic procedures: disqualification/selection; normalization; hierarchy; pyramidal centralization" (GALLO, 2006, p. 557, our translation).

Note, also, that the:

[...] The impulse that gave rise to modern science is linked, in large part, to the knowledge produced in the context of the interests of economic exploitation of the colonial enterprise. [...]. The epistemological and cultural dimension of the process of colonial domination was not limited, however, to the production of knowledge about the colonized subject and his environment. The domination process, as it went beyond the physical extermination and subjugation phase, needed to assert itself culturally. [...]. The colonial project had, from the beginning, an important educational and pedagogical dimension. It was through this pedagogical and cultural dimension that knowledge was once again linked to the complex of colonial power relations. (SILVA, 2010, p. 128, our translation).

And because we can improve the ways of knowing and teaching according to scientific premises, what would we change in the education we can practice? There is a passage in *Três Ecologias* (Three Ecologies) (2001), by Félix Guattari, which helps us to think about both what we want and can do, and what we should do so that the education of our time can participate in the disarming of the politics of death. We highlight this passage because of the accuracy of the French author in predicting the future. Thirty years ago, he warned us of the imminent dangers we would face today by predicting the escalation of "racism, religious fanaticism, nationalist schisms falling into reactionary closures, those of the exploitation of child labor and the oppression of women [...]" (GUATTARI, 2001, p. 17, our translation).

According to the French author, the escalation of those dangers reflects a crisis of perception that prevents us from adequately understanding the connection and complexity of the problems of our time. The inadequate perception of reality that we inherited from the modern European invaders was not, nor does it show to be, able to solve the nagging paradox where the means to solve the social and ecological problems of our time already exist, however, they run into the collective inability to make these means operational. It comes up against the inability to democratize the scope of social, economic and environmental development. It collides with death policies that produce indifference and reproduce sadness and hatred.

Based on the theoretical framework adopted, we will discuss principles and practices that helped us make the curriculum into a powerful social technology, capable of generating affections of joy and love by acting to transform realities that are cause and effect of sadness

and hate. We cannot reproduce inadequacies in the European plane of immanence that sustain varied necropolitics. Simply because, among thinkers who affected the modern plane of immanence, those inadequacies were already overcome.

We also want a pedagogical plan suited to the complexity of the challenges that the Brazilian reality imposes on educators who struggle against the death policies of our time on various fronts. A plan that is unique in different spaces and contexts. For the elaboration of this plan, we list concepts that allow us to propose curricular principles and practices for the creation of affective curricula, which wander through the reality of those who learn and consider the desire to know the body that suffers, thinks and acts in reality.

Molecular "principles"

We think of four principles of molecularity to guide us in this plan of a curriculum of affections, namely: Education will be Ethics based on the affections of joy and love, perceiving everyone as part of one, N-1; The image of knowledge will be rhizomatic; The curriculum will be nomadic and the thought produced by the proper use of reason will be free; The production of knowledge will be cartographic and cartography will map what the body touches on the plane of immanence.

We then began to understand the lines of forces that affect the educational process. There are lines of force everywhere, in all forms of existence and in all relationships. They act in the effort that makes life persist, persevere in existence. In the third volume of *Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari (2011-c) point out three lines of forces that affect people, social groups, processes and institutions: hard or molar lines; segmentation or molecular line; and abstract or escape line.

In the first there are many lines and conversations, questions or answers, endless explanations, clarifications; the second is made up of silences, allusions, quick understatements, which are offered to interpretation. But if the third will flare, if the line of flight is like a train in motion, it is because it jumps linearly, one can finally speak there "literally" of anything, stalk of grass, catastrophe or sensation, in an acceptance calm of what happens when nothing can be worth something else (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011a, p. 77, our translation).

Although they produce radically different assemblages, these lines are not necessarily separate or in opposition. Rather, they coexist, alternate and mingle all the time. "They make us up, just as they make up our maps. They transform and can even penetrate each other. Rhizome" (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011a, p. 84, our translation).

The lines of segmentarity bring with them the expectations of generic models to exist and behave in the reproduction of these same models in different times, places and societies. From it, stereotyped models are built, whose references form a priori images and ideas of the existing being and, thus, define what is expected of each idealized type. They are the ones who define, for example, the ideal model of child, teenager, student, professional, boyfriend/girlfriend, couple, fathers, mothers, children and grandparents.

Models are modulators, they build patterns that, consequently, become identity delimiters, partially suppressing the subjectivity of real beings. These segments formed by hard lines establish patterns of conduct, norms, explicit and implicit coexistence rules. By these lines and their respective models, norms and rules, individuals and collectivities, we will all be observed, judged and rectified.

It is not possible to escape the hard lines without consequences. These lines always seem to triumph. But we should not categorize these types of lines as bad. They can even hold “a lot of tenderness and love” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011a, p. 74). The standardization established by the hard lines makes life seem predictable, normal, routine, linear, after all, they are lines of guarantee and control of “the identity of each instance, including personal identity”, which establish “a game of well-defined territories, determined, planned. There is a future “that says what is proper to the normality zone and what is deviant.” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011a, p. 73, our translation).

Molecular segmentation lines contain deterritorialization forces that produce more or less tolerable differences from the comparison metrics embedded in the reference models defined by hard lines. Along molecular lines, it is possible to pass flows that make segments and models less evident and locatable, and value judgments more complex.

Radically different from the two previous ones, the line of flight is of a different nature. Unpredictable, it carries different dangers, as it does not “admit any segment, and is, rather, like the explosion of two segmental series”, which can cause partial and absolute deterritorializations (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011a, p. 76, our translation). It also does not support the comparison metrics woven by molar lines and tolerated by molecular lines. Does not accept moral judgments. Forces of life and death, of creation and reproduction, are trapped in the lines of flight.

[...] this would not be entirely personal, the way in which an individual flees, on their own, flees “their responsibilities”, flees the world, takes refuge in the desert or even in art... etc. False impression. [...] As for the lines of escape, these never consist in running away from the world, but rather making it run away (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011a, p. 85, our translation).

To better understand them, we can never look at one or the other in isolation. One refers to the other. The three lines, of different natures, are in composition. They are alive. They create, update and destroy rules of social cohesion and regulation. A game between movement and rest that produces difference and repetition. They create and destroy patterns. They draw existential territories that guide the way we think, we are affected and we constitute ourselves as singular beings.

We use the notion of affect not in the colloquial sense of the word, but in the conceptual sense proposed by Spinoza. He considers that the whole body is affected by three primary affects – desire, joy and sadness – which, in turn, give rise to the other affects that a body is capable of experiencing.

The affections, joy and sadness are passages. The first one is an affection that increases our power to act and think. It corresponds to the passage of any person from a lesser perfection to a lesser perfection. Sadness, an affection contrary to joy, diminishes our doubled power of acting and thinking and, consequently, diminishes the perfection of a living body. Desire comprises “all efforts, all impulses, appetites and volitions of man, which vary according to his variable state” (SPINOZA, 2017, p. 141, our translation).

Sadness refers to those that diminish our potency – to act and think –, while the happy ones deal with affections that increase or stimulate our potency.

We also emphasize that joy, for Spinoza, is associated with appropriate affections, those that are reason or cause of themselves. On the other hand, sad passions, arising from external causes, would be inadequate, as they produce a mind that suffers from action. "I say that we act when something happens in us or outside of us of which we are a suitable cause, that is, when something follows from our nature, in us or outside of us, which can be understood clearly and distinctly by it alone" (SPINOZA, 2009, p. 98, our translation). Based on this understanding, we propose the idea of affective teaching, based on happy stimuli.

In activities inside and outside the school, we coordinated an Environmental Education workshop affected by the agroecological approach, in the municipality of Ribeirópolis, in the interior of the state of Sergipe. In fact, the learning needed to understand the lines of force inherent in a way of educating that is affective and open to differences was followed by tests of methodological tools common to the theoretical and practical framework of Agroecology. Later, over more than two years of activities, that way of educating went through a series of disengagements from the particularities and challenges that the agroecological approach brings with it.

The integration of different methodologies in a curricular proposal had the potential to single out the teaching and learning relationships in pedagogical projects conceived according to what the student bodies wanted to know. Taken by an affective behavior, the curriculum in creation followed a trajectory different from the one expected when Agroecology addresses the problem of the deterioration of existence in the production and distribution of food.

Given the characteristics of the workshop - no tests, grades, mandatory activities - and the profile of a teacher - with little tendency to adopt punitive attitudes (send students to the direction, request warnings, suspensions or expulsion) - we followed our own path: connecting the activities proposals to what aroused desire or curiosity in the student body. We incorporated into the curricular proposal some guidelines and principles of project pedagogy, or project-based learning, in the updates of the Environmental Education workshop affected by Agroecology.

When updating the curricular proposal, we abandon decal books and manuals and put aside your scripts, your ready-made questions and answers. We paid attention to issues of greater relevance and pedagogical power: those that provoked the student bodies. Without, or with minimal interference on our part, people who occupied the teaching position, the intention of the projects followed the lines of affective force of realities where our curriculum wandered.

At the end of one of the pedagogical projects planned and managed based on that incipient curricular proposal, a room abandoned by the government for more than seven years was revitalized and converted into a simple library and toy library where children could study and have fun safely. Named Second Home, that small revitalized room was a cause of joyful affections that, even if momentarily, made the children, young people and their families put aside the sadness inherent to the process of deterioration of existence (CANTANHEDE; LIBÓRIO, 2018).

Among the other projects developed, what we reported above stood out due to the social context that determined its intention and the latest methodological adjustments resulting from the affective opening of the curriculum and the reinvention and singularization of teaching and learning relationships as a strategy for coping with sad realities and hatred. When considering the Brazilian social inequality, the challenges imposed on the people who make up and contribute to the strengthening of school communities are even greater. They demand ways of dealing with the sadness and hatred that, out of carelessness or inability to fight them, we accept as normal.

Because it can be different... research, science and cartography

Pedagogically transforming a reality that we want to be different requires thinking about, proposing and conducting a smaller, localized education. And for that, she must be affectionate. When we talk about minors, we are referring to those ways of educating that are faced with the mechanisms for laminating subjectivity common to Higher Education, regulated and standardized by government bodies.

Asking and answering scientifically places us in a dynamic of social rites that operate the standardization of teaching and learning relationships common to the ways of scientific knowledge. For Maturana and Varela (1995), a critique will be scientific only if it is in line with general norms that comprise at least four constitutive conditions:

- a. Description of the phenomenon(s) to be explained in a manner acceptable to the community of observers.
- b. Proposition of a conceptual system capable of generating the phenomenon to be explained in an acceptable way for the community of observers (explanatory hypothesis).
- c. Deduction, from b, of other phenomena not explicitly considered in the proposition, as well as the description of their observation conditions in the community of observers.
- d. Observation of these other phenomena deduced from b (MATURANA; VARELA, 1995, p. 70, our translation).

The four conditions described above are basic and previously accepted by all ways of knowing in the academy. The specificities common to communities of observers produce a difference by singularizing, qualifying ways of knowing and communicating scientific truths. We can understand science, in its different ways of producing scientific truths, as assemblages. That is, as multiplicities that select their theories, hypotheses, concepts, principles, practices and common notions.

Any way of understanding reality, scientific or not, is composed of “lines of articulation, or segmentarity, strata, territorialities, but also lines of flight, movements of deterritorialization and destratification” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011a, p. 18, our translation). It is these lines and their movements that, good or bad, standardize and make a difference in the communities of observers. The production of difference in science allows us to understand many things, some in different ways, some more adequate, some less so.

Among the adequacies and inadequacies of scientific ideas, theories and discourses, we will understand things, facts and processes adequately and inadequately. The limitations inherent in scientific knowledge do not keep up with the speed of thought and the accelerated production and communication of knowledge today.

By recognizing the adaptations, inadequacies, scope and limitations of scientific knowledge, a dynamic ordering process of complex and chaotic thought is established. The ways of knowing emerging from the explanatory system of science are, therefore, flawed and susceptible to human wills. Recognizing the characteristics and limitations of the place from which we speak is not a demonstration of weakness in this way of knowing. On the contrary, it is your fortress. Doubt precedes certainty. Moving across the plane where concepts reside, the production of knowledge through the proper use of reason is a relentless search for adequate ideas that explain the laws of nature. There is, however, an immanent power to thought that turns ideas into living affection.

Ideas do not die. Not that they survive simply as archaisms. But, at a certain point, they could reach a scientific stage, and then lose it, or else emigrate to other sciences. They can then change their application and status, they can even change their form and content, but they keep something essential in the forwarding, in the displacement, in the allocation of a new domain. Ideas always serve again, because they have always served, but in the most different ways today. [...]. The history of ideas should never be continuous; it should protect itself from similarities, but also from descent or affiliations, to content itself with marking the thresholds that an idea crosses, the journeys it takes, which change its nature or object (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011d, p. 14-15, our translation).

Cartography, understood in the light and shadow of Deleuze and Guattari's ideas, is a clear example of this. Deterritorialized from Geography, it is converted into a methodological bet. We take the risk of understanding it more as an ethics and aesthetics of researching, studying and writing than as an exhaustively detailed scientific method. All scientific work is an act of creation: when inspired by this definition of cartography, we assume another way of being amidst the events and agencies that affect us while we research and explain the lines of force we feel along the written lines we read or write - writing (CORAZZA, 2014).

Although it is possible to notice a certain philosophical distance from the classic Cartesian method when we deny the illusion of scientific neutrality, cartography does not defend the abandonment of the basic norms of the scientific explanatory system. Making use of already consolidated research tools - interviews, field diaries, recorders, transcripts - we decided not to make the observation hostage to illusions, and we moved away from the investigative tracings that "make diversity disappear from perception and, consequently, from the world" (SHIVA, 2003, p. 15, our translation).

When the idea underlying the art of map production migrates to a new status of research and scientific creation, we face other challenges, limits and possibilities. We

privilege the study of collective assemblages of enunciation and machinic assemblages of desire, events, correlations, moments and ways in which we live.

In this sense, writing “has nothing to do with meaning, but surveying, mapping, even if they are regions yet to come” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 19, our translation). This understanding of the world that spreads while forming a community of observers and observers more open to difference “creates a new circulation of affections, exposes the virtual present in the current, generates unexpected knowledge”. The difficulty of this path, continues Guathier (1999, p. 15, our translation), “is that this knowledge passes as flows, they are not identifiable according to academic habits of thought”.

Still together with Gauthier (1999, p. 14, our translation), we assume that cartography is a way of researching, “it is creating becomings, expressing the virtual included in a situation; make use of multiplicities”. As a result of this type of entry into knowledge, we must be aware of the “poiesis of nature and social life, its power of self-creation and the implications of our so-called scientific look in this process of creation” (GAUTHIER, 1999, p. 15, our translation).

For him, “doing science, learning, then teaching, caring”, educating, that is, all the relationships we have with knowledge are multiple plurals; there are, therefore, multiplicities of “entrances into knowledge”, sometimes in composition, sometimes in friction (GAUTHIER, 1999, p. 20). Because we want to support ways of educating that aim to transform sad and hateful realities into joyful and loving realities, we will map lines of force and interrelationships between the past, present and future that an event or agencies entail.

The entry chosen by us in the bet of an affective curriculum, as well as the paths taken and the way of walking, that is, of doing science, will be inseparable from the knowledge produced. Mapping, in the perspective adopted here, is a process. It is to draw, map, build territories in discontinuous malleable lines and, at the same, interconnected in a loom, which does not necessarily know the beginning and the end, but which gains materiality and meaning from the composition planes that it may come to configure. Cartography is making a rhizome. It is an interweaving of concepts extracted from the plane of immanence in the production of something unique.

By adopting the idea of cartography, we seek approximations with the concept of rhizome by Deleuze and Guattari (2011b, p. 23, our translation), which question the traditional and fragmented arboreal notion of thought. This because,

There is always something genealogical about a tree, it is not a popular method. On the contrary, a rhizome-type method is obliged to analyze the language by decentering it on other dimensions and other registers. A language does not close in over itself except in a function of impotence.

A thought never starts from an isolated idea in itself. You never know where it starts, since any and every idea is born linked to the countless experiments, affections and events that went through, and continue to go through, the body that thinks about it. Everything that exists and that is thought is in relation to something, linked to a large and immeasurable set of references wandering in the virtuality of the mind and which, in the construction of a thought, are updated, forming new imagetic understandings, converted, finally, into language. Multiplicity of living languages, slang and *patoás*.

Because it maps flows of events, the production of concept maps escapes any structuring, rigid or hierarchical logic, as it has no value judgment. It is sewing and, as in a weaving, each and every stitch is essential in the composition of threads and ties, in the production of difference.

In a rhizome, [...] each feature does not necessarily refer to a linguistic feature: semiotic chains of all nature are connected there to very different modes of codification, biological, political, economic chains etc., putting into play not only regimes of different signs, but also statutes of states of affairs. [...] A rhizome would not cease to connect semiotic chains, power organizations, occurrences that refer to the arts, sciences, social struggles. A semiotic chain is like a tubercle that brings together very diverse acts, linguistic, but also perceptive, mimic, gestural, cogitative: there is no language in itself, nor universality of language, but a concurrence of dialects, patties, slang, special languages (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 22, our translation).

In other words, language is alive, changeable and unstable, as is rhizomatic thought, which unfolds, redoubles, branches. The tree as a metaphor for thought, composed of an idea-seed from which all knowledge considered valid and scientific would flourish, reinforces the paradigms that involve the idea of truth, no longer universal and absolute, but that which produces value, coordinates actions, behaviors and it establishes and displaces centers of power. Let us remember Foucault when he alerts us that power and knowledge are always intertwined, in the sense that "there is no power relationship without the correlated constitution of a field of knowledge, nor knowledge that does not suppose and does not constitute, at the same time, power relations" (FOUCAULT, 1977, p. 30, our translation). It is from this overlap that the legitimacy reserved for scientific texts and academic research is also used, since in Foucault's logic, power-knowing is more exercised, as a strategy, than more than owning, as a property.

For Deleuze and Guattari, thought works in a rhizomatic way, assembling bodies. Reading a book too. That is why they recommend not asking what a text means or means, but questioning how and "with what it works, in connection with what it conveys or not intensities, in what multiplicities it introduces itself and metamorphoses its own" (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 18, our translation). A reading is always a generator of thought, imagery construction and associations with all the other references of the mind. Reading is always in relation to the multiplicity that constitutes the reader, being, previously, the composition of the singularity of the one who writes it. These are processes that form dense webs of cognitive associations and knowledge assimilations. The same book will always produce singular affections in each reading, because, by experience, we know that "the mind is not capable of thinking, each time, in the same way, about the same object; instead, the mind is the more capable of considering this or that object, the more the body is stimulated by the image of this or that object" (SPINOZA, 2009, p. 101, our translation).

Take as an example the classic of Brazilian literature, "Dom Casmurro", by Machado de Assis (1839-1908), to illustrate what we can understand about a rhizomatic book. The plot between the main characters of the book awakens and maintains a doubt that will manage the bodies that read the book in different ways: would Capitu betray Bentinho? It makes no sense to ask what the author of the book thought while writing his lines. It is a book that provokes different affections. And there, at this point, to produce affections lies the power of the book.

Seeking a possible conclusion: Multiplicity and the potency of affections

All writing, as well as any narrative – whether in a book, a story, a film etc. – produces assemblages, which revert to affects, and the more a body is capable of a plurality of affects, the more capable the mind will be to build multiple cognitions and understand the reality it experiences. The singularity of a body directly depends on its multiplicities, given that it is the elements that differentiate it from other bodies, which increase its capacity for singularity and its power to act. To provoke bodies that travel through their zones of intensity; enable multiple and unique understandings of its lines, writings and strength.

Therefore, the defense that the capture of reality, or better, the double capture of the reality in which one lives, is cartographic. Because it allows us to capture what a body, or several bodies in relation, achieves from the plane of immanence. And the more affections it touches, the greater is the "growth of dimensions in a multiplicity that changes nature as it increases its connections" (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 24, our translation).

Against the arborescent structures that immobilize thought as a synonym for ultimate truth, philosophers bring the immanent difference to multiplicities as a means of expanding the rhizome, by increasing the laws of combination. This is because “every time a multiplicity is attached to a structure, its growth is compensated by a reduction in the combination laws” of thought (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 21, our translation).

As relational beings, who are constituted in relation to the external and to events, our multiplicity is always linked to our capacity to affect and be affected, as well as to our power to act. Let us remember that Spinoza understands that happy affects are those that increase our power of action, while sad affects are those that place us in a passive position. Likewise, “multiplicities are defined from the outside: by the abstract line, a line of flight or deterritorialization according to which they change their nature when they connect to others” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 25, our translation). In a cartographic study, all multiplicity will be defined by the lines, concepts, assemblages and dimensions that it contains in intention (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b).

For the construction of a teaching methodology open to affections and the rhizomatic forces of thought, it is necessary to avoid falling into binary logics that fix dichotomous and hierarchical positions. We must also refute genetic axes, supplementary and transcendent dimensions, models, fixed positions of trees and roots that divide, isolate knowledge into closed and poorly communicating segments and disciplines.

It is necessary to make the multiple, not always adding a superior dimension, but, on the contrary, in a simple way, with the force of sobriety, at the level of dimensions available, always $n-1$ (this is the only way that the one is part of the multiple, being always subtracted from it). Subtract the only one from the multiplicity to be built; write to $n-1$. Such a system could be called a rhizome (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 21, our translation).

Ruptures open the rhizome. Experiments and creations make thought connect to what affects the thinking body, always in a singular, unique and non-repeating way. Proceeding through escapes and reterritorializations, the signifying ruptures make the rhizome “increase its territory through deterritorialization” (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 28). The tracing of ideas, even in cartography, reduces the combination laws of thought. Reduction compensated by the increase in those same laws while cartography provides possible experiments in the production of a rhizomatic map of intensities.

If the map is opposed to the decal, it is because it is entirely focused on an experiment anchored in reality. [...] It is part of the rhizome. The map is open, connectable in all its dimensions, dismountable, reversible, susceptible

to constant changes. It can be torn, reversed, adapted to any type of setup, prepared by an individual, a group, a social formation. It can be drawn on a wall, conceived as a work of art, constructed as a political action or as a meditation (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 30, our translation).

We traced and reproduced ideas when speaking about the curricular movements and agencies experienced in the past. We concatenate ideas to conceptually order the chaotic curricular agency of the mapped pedagogical experience. Without the temporality of physical encounters, the agencies connect with each other, with places, flavors, memories, facts, colors, smells, pains and loves anchored in facts and affections, present and past.

The proposal of a cartographic methodology that embraces thought and difference in all its rhizomatic complexity does not invalidate other methodologies, not even the logic of arboreal thought. There is no opposition between rhizome and tree/root. This binary and dichotomous logic has no place in the plan. The rhizome has multiple entrances, through which we can enter and exit. After all, also:

[...] there are tree or root structures in the rhizomes, but conversely, a tree branch or a root split can start to sprout again in the rhizome. Demarcation does not depend here on theoretical analyzes that imply universals, but on a pragmatics that compose the multiplicities or sets of intensities. In the heart of a tree, in the hollow of a root, or in the armpit of a branch, a new rhizome can form. Or it is a microscopic element of the root tree, a radicle, which incites the production of a rhizome (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 33, our translation).

As with cartography, thought implies the construction of territories and, considering that we are talking here about cartography from the notion of rhizome, it is necessary to be aware of another issue. If we defend that thought is not limited to arboreal logic, that it starts from a single center of determination, but linked to indefinite affective connections, we can understand that it forms a territory, multiple territories. When we have an idea, it occupies a flat place of consistency composed of all the references and affections that, for us, are associated with it. Therefore, in order to propose a curricular change, linked not only to a simple methodological change, but to the futures that involve the teaching and learning processes, it is first necessary to deterritorialize the methods that precede it. We remember that any reterritorialization implies a process of deterritorialization, and there is an abyss in between, a non-empty void, which is the moment of greatest potential for potency. Because it is in the rupture that change can be made and, in it, creation. It is in this abyss that the agency of affections will determine the dimension of the affections, increasing or decreasing the body's degrees of potency.

In Spinoza's theory, a restrained body reduces its power to act, producing sadness, just as a stimulated body has its power increased. The same happens with thinking, because "if something increases or decreases, stimulates or slows down the power of our body to act, the idea of that thing increases or decreases, stimulates or slows down the thinking power of our mind" (SPINOZA, 2009, p. 106, our translation). Based on this, we defend an affective curriculum, in the sense that stimulating happy passions increases the power to act and, consequently, the power to think.

As in the renovation of a property, in which parts of the structure that we want to change are preserved so that there is no absolute collapse, a curriculum reformulation process tends to preserve some existing structures, otherwise we would not be talking about reformulation. The very idea of reterritorialization brings with it the idea of a transformation of some existing territory, and not something new, otherwise it would simply be territorialization. A rhizomatic thought never ignores a body's previous affections, not even if we could erase someone's conscious memory, even so, this person would build their thoughts from other perceptive fields of the body, such as the unconscious, intuition and so many others informational sensors that make up existence.

It is necessary to save enough of the organism so that it recovers with each dawn; small provisions of significance and interpretation, it is also necessary to conserve, even to oppose them to your own system, when circumstances demand it, when things, people, even situations compel us; and small rations of subjectivity, it is necessary to conserve enough to be able to respond to the dominant reality (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 2011b, p. 26, our translation).

The proposal for a curriculum that prioritizes the production of happy affections, stimulating and increasing the power to act is, above all, recognizing difference and multiplicity as life force. It is to produce structures and strata so that the lines of flight explode into creative desires. Creation of differences, singularities, and transformation of meanings and words in the understanding of what is common to us: shared existence and the multiple ways of perceiving and living it.

REFERENCES

ALTIERI, M. *et al.* **Agroecologia**: bases científicas para uma agricultura sustentável. 3. ed. Ver. ampl. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, AS-PTA, 2002. 592 p.

CANTANHEDE, C.; LIBÓRIO, P. Segunda Casa: a construção de uma proposta de educação em agroecologia para crianças. **Cadernos de Agroecologia**, v. 13, n. 1, 2018. ISSN 2236-7934

CORAZZA, S. M. *et al.* Escreleituras: um modo de ler-escrever em meio à vida. **Educação e pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 4, n. 4, p. 1029-1043, 2014. Available: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ep/a/9shzjMpKnNGtLwdS3V9Z54L/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Access: 18 June 2018.

DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. **O que é a filosofia?** Trad. Bento Prado Jr. e Alberto Alonso Muñoz. 1. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Editora 34, 1992.

DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. **Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia**. Vol. 1. Trad. Ana Lúcia de Oliveira, Aurélio Guerra Neto e Celia Pinto Costa. 2 ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2011b.

DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. **Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia**. Vol. 3. Trad. Aurélio Guerra Neto, Ana Lúcia de Oliveira, Lúcia Cláudia Leão e Suely Rolnik. 2 ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2012a.

DELEUZE, G.; GUATTARI, F. **Mil platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia**. Vol. 4. Trad. Suely Rolnik. 2 ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2012b.

DUSSEL, E. Europa, modernidade e eurocentrismo. *In*: LANDER, E. (org.). **A colonialidade do saber: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais, perspectivas latino-americanas**. Buenos Aires: Clacso, Conselho Latinoamericano de Ciências Sociais, 2005. Available: <https://ufrb.edu.br/educacaodocampocfp/images/Edgardo-Lander-org-A-Colonialidade-do-Saber-eurocentrismo-e-ciC3AAncias-sociais-perspectivas-latinoamericanas-LIVRO.pdf>. Access: 25 Oct. 2019.

FOUCAULT, M. **Vigiar e Punir**. Trad. Raquel Ramallete. 20. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1997.

GALLO, S. Modernidade/pós-modernidade: tensões e repercussões na produção de conhecimento em educação. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 32, n. 3, p. 551-565, 2006.

GAUTHIER, C. Esquizoanálise do currículo. **Educação & Realidade**, Porto Alegre, v. 27, n. 2, p. 143-155, 2002.

GAUTHIER, J. O que é pesquisar-entre Deleuze-Guattari e o candomblé, pensando mito, ciência, arte e culturas de resistência. **Educação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 20, p. 13-33, 1999.

GONÇÁLVES, R. A superioridade racial em Imanuel Kant: as justificações da dominação europeia e as suas implicações na América Latina. **Kínesis**, Marília, v. 7, n. 13, 2015.

GUATTARI, F. **As três ecologias**. São Paulo: Ed. Campinas & Papirus, 2001.

MATURANA, H.; VARELA, F. **A árvore do conhecimento**. 1. ed. Campinas: Editorial Psy II, 1995.

MBEMBE, A. **Necropolítica**: Biopoder, soberania, estado de exceção, política da morte. Trad. Renata Santini. 1. ed. São Paulo: Edições, 2018. 80 p.

SHIVA, V. **Monoculturas da mente**: perspectivas da biodiversidade e da biotecnologia. 1. ed. São Paulo: Gaia, 2003. 240 p.

SILVA, T. **Documentos de identidade**: uma introdução às teorias do currículo. 2. ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2010. 156 p.

SPINOZA, B. **Ética**. Trad. Tomaz Tadeu. 2. ed. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2017.

How to reference this article

FELDENS, D. G.; CATANHEDE, C.; FUSARO, L. What can a curriculum do? Brief essay on the curriculum in immanence. **Revista Ibero-Americana de Estudos em Educação**, Araraquara, v. 16, n. 4, p. 2806-2830, Oct./Dec. 2021. e-ISSN: 1982-5587. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21723/riaee.v16i4.15689>

Submitted: 01/08/2021

Required revisions: 25/09/2021

Approved: 01/10/2021

Published: 21/10/2021