Internationalization is the decisive claim for progress within educational discourse. As a precondition, we need to understand our own traditions, our own languages. That is why the history of any discipline is so important.

Daniel Tröhler (2003, 778)

Internationalization is, then, also a series of localizations, as it requires its practitioners to devise genealogies of present circumstances both internal and external to our fields of study and expertise. Among the questions to ask are the following: What are our key concepts and from where do they originate? How have we redefined them to connote contextually specific meanings, situations structured by the legacies of the past, the problems of the present, and our aspirations for the future? To discern the historicity and emplacement of the present requires attunement to our articulations of these circumstances, as we ourselves comprise the means by which to discern what is “there.” It is, then, the subject—simultaneously in the sense of both the human subject and the academic discipline—in which and through which internationalization occurs. We can glimpse these trajectories in this collection, as these seven scholars in Brazil grapple with local legacies and present situations through concepts imported from Europe as well as from North America and elsewhere in South America. Migrating concepts are at work in understanding curriculum not only in Brazil; these same if now locally inflected concepts stimulate understanding of curricular concerns in places far from Brazil, as international panel members from Finland, the United States, and South Africa question those very concepts, their genealogies, and the situations they depict. I underline the significance of subjectivity in this dialogical process of internationalization by introducing the Brazilian participants through summaries taken from my online interviews with each.
Localization is no first step to a future of universalization, as internationalization (in my sense) institutionalizes the endless effort to communicate across difference. Moreover, despite its primacy in my own intellectual formation (Pinar 2009a), I have no romance with the particular; uncritically coinciding with it affirms provincialism. But the route to cosmopolitanism lies through threading the needle of the particular, as it is the immanence of historical reality that enables its reconstruction. Such cosmopolitanism is subjective and social, always situational, indeed worldly, never an instantiation of a “new partisan universal” (Sekyi-Otu 1996, 118). Although “identity”—including national identity—is prominent in the internationalization’s conceptualization, it is no unchanging foundation but, rather, an ever-shifting site of subjective experience and social meaning.

The Project

This is not the first time that readers of English have encountered curriculum studies in Brazil. In the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*, we enjoyed opportunities to study the genesis of the field and the first decades of its development (Moreira 2003), including an explanation of its shifts during the 1990s (Lopes and Macedo 2003) as well as a glimpse of the 1990s federal curriculum reform (Moraes 2003). In this present volume students can extend this knowledge into the decade just concluded by glimpsing the ongoing work of Nilda Alves, Antonio Carlos Amorim, Elba Siqueira de Sá Barretto, Carlos Eduardo Ferraco, Alice Casimiro Lopes, Elizabeth Macedo, and Inês Barbosa de Oliveira. Although each of these project participants would acknowledge that curriculum studies in Brazil is too vast for any one individual to convey, each scholar provides compelling compositions of curriculum studies in Brazil. These are made even more vivid by exchanges with the international panel: Tero Autio, Bernadette Baker, and Ursula Hoadley.

Spanning the theoretic to the practical, the field of *curriculum studies* is the only academic specialization within education that develops as it labors to understand curriculum within and across the school subjects. Not confined to single subjects such as “science” or to single topics such as “teaching” or “learning,” curriculum studies is, in simple terms, the “big picture” field, concerned with the panorama of educational experience, especially as it is represented in and/or associated with the curriculum. Educational experience cannot be understood unless we appreciate the relations between curriculum and subjectivity, society, history, and