

The Internationalization  
of Curriculum Studies

William F. Pinar  
Louisiana State University  
Email: [wpinar@lsu.edu](mailto:wpinar@lsu.edu)

*Introduction*

Globalization, of course, is not one thing, and the multiple processes that we recognize as globalization are not unified or univocal.

Our political task ... is not simply to resist these processes but to recognize them and redirect them toward new ends.

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000, xv)

Nonhierarchical contacts among individuals  
are proliferating anarchically.

Pierre Lévy (2001, xii)

My thanks to members of the Council for inviting me to speak with you today. Permit me to take this opportunity to describe an organizational and intellectual movement underway which I shall call “the internationalization of curriculum studies.” While this movement accompanies and is no doubt stimulated by larger forces of “globalization” (see Held, et al., 1999), within curriculum studies it is generally suspicious of the phenomenon. Both structured by and suspicious of globalization, then, a worldwide field of curriculum studies is now emerging, supported by the inauguration in 2001 of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies ([www.iaacs.org](http://www.iaacs.org)). (1)

The Curriculum Theory Project at Louisiana State University – of which I am co-director with Professor William Doll – sponsored a conference on “The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies,” held April 27-30, 2000, on the LSU campus. Participants came from every continent and the following nations: Argentina, Australia, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, China, Columbia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, India, Israel, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, the

Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey, South Africa, and (of course) the United States. The partial proceedings of that conference were published this year by Peter Lang (see Trueit et al. 2003).

In my opening night address to the participants, I suggested that we meet again, on the final morning of the conference, to decide whether or not the experience of the weekend was worthwhile, worthwhile enough to take a next step: constitute ourselves as a “Committee of 100” to explore the possibility of an international association of curriculum studies. I posed the following questions:

- Why should anyone be interested in such a possibility?
- Are there not already too many conferences, too many organizations?
- Are we not already overwhelmed by the demands of our local situations?
- Is this project simply another U.S. effort to expand its market for intellectual property, in this instance the global market for its conceptual products in education?
- Even if this “call for conversation” – the title of the conference (and the published proceedings) - is sincere, given the cultural and linguistic complexity of the “global village,” how can democratic dialogue possibly proceed without the dry formalism of those diplomatic exchanges associated with, say, representatives to the United Nations, or with the more nakedly political manipulations associated with cultural and economic imperialism?

While it was I who raised these questions that opening night of the 2000 conference, it would be those present at that April 2000 conference who must answer them for himself or herself, most immediately over the course of the weekend. We may well decide, I acknowledged, not to meet again, may decide not to pursue the possibilities of a worldwide field with an international association of curriculum scholars. More than other fields perhaps, curriculum studies tend to be explicitly situated within the national borders in which they are conducted. This fact is why I chose the word “internationalization” for the conference – rather than, say “globalization” or simply “worldwide” – even though, as Professor Anthony Whitson of the University of Delaware (USA) pointed out at the 1999 meeting (focused on the intersections between curriculum studies and philosophy of education worldwide; also held at LSU), the term for some may imply endorsement of the notion of nationalism, at the least a problematical historical and political phenomenon.

Certainly I share Professor Whitson's worry over nationalism, but that seems to me to be work for another day. What I meant by the term in the conference title was the simple acknowledgment that for most of us our work is very much situated within, linked to, sometimes even dictated by the political and educational (overlapping terms to be sure) issues that preoccupy the nations in which we do our work. That is evident in the essays the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (Pinar 2003).

Given the national character of much curriculum work, what can be the benefit of meeting with others whose work is so focused? I take this question to be an ongoing one. One may decide that it may not be worthwhile at this time, despite the hype about "one world" and "globalization," a complex economic, cultural, and political phenomenon which is hardly to be greeted uncritically. It is a question each of us must answer for her and himself. It is a question contextualized in our national cultures, in the political present, in cultural questions institutionalized in academic disciplines and educational institutions. It is question that calls upon us to critique our own national cultures.

One of my motives for participating in "internationalization" is to contest the narcissism of U.S. curriculum studies. Probably it's not a special fault of those who work in the field; it seems to come with U.S. citizenship. One way we in the U.S. can work through that narcissism is to become more aware, in fact regard it as part of our professional responsibility, to read regularly what others interested in the concept of curriculum (or its equivalent) are doing around the world. The curriculum field as we Americans know it is a rather American affair, although I doubt few Americans have spent much time dwelling on that fact. An international conversation – a worldwide field – could contribute, however modestly, to Americans' realization that our own field is profoundly international and multicultural. (2)

Allow me to emphasize that when I propose a worldwide field of curriculum studies, I do not mean uniform, nor do I expect that it would resemble the American field. To repeat, I acknowledge – and not as a problem to overcome – that at this stage of things and for the foreseeable future, curriculum inquiry occurs within national borders, often informed by governmental policies and priorities (as well as national cultures), and is thereby nationally distinctive. I do not secretly dream of a worldwide field of curriculum studies mirroring the standardization and uniformity the larger phenomenon of globalization threatens. Certainly I am not looking – allow me to repeat – for new "markets"

for American conceptual products. More than anything else, I recognize, it is the fact of American economic and cultural aggression that leaves many scholars suspicious about the larger project of internationalization. It is this fact that makes problematical U.S. scholars taking leadership in the formation of a worldwide field, and this is why that I may seem to be belaboring this issue, why I decline to set an agenda aside from the democratic idea of “conversation,” why I insist each of us must pose questions and answer them, together and separately, in disciplined and complicated conversation.

*The Pressure Upon Us:  
Comments on the U.S. Scene*

[T]he fundamental issue goes unnoticed:  
the abandonment of the historic mission of American education,  
the democratization of liberal culture.

Christopher Lasch (1995, 177)

Of course, there is no way for me to escape being an American, and my definition of curriculum as a “complicated conversation” (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, Taubman 1995, 848) is thoroughly (although hardly exclusively) an American idea. In the “paradigm shift” that occurred in American curriculum studies almost thirty years ago, we left a more narrowly institutional (some would say bureaucratic) conception of our work as “curriculum development” to a more scholarly effort to understand curriculum (see Pinar et al, 1995, chapters 4 and 15).

By enlarging and complicating our conception of curriculum – yes, it still includes objectives, course syllabi, etc. but it is now as well a highly symbolic concept in which curriculum debates are understood, for instance, as debates over the identity of the nation – we hope to protect, at least conceptually, American teachers’ still shrinking space of intellectual freedom, professional autonomy, and personal creativity, and, in so doing, support the intellectual freedom and creativity of the students they teach.

The discursive reformulation of our work as curriculum scholars from “curriculum development” to “understanding curriculum” represents, in part, a sober acknowledgement of the triumph in U.S. schools of “business thinking” –

an insistence that educational achievement be quantified and that all engaged in the process of education must focus on the “bottom line,” i.e. test scores. (I will discuss the history of this state of affairs momentarily.) In the university, we are left trying to protect and create spaces of intellectual freedom and professional autonomy “behind enemy lines,” as it were. In another sense, the U.S. curriculum field – in general, there is hardly a consensus - represents an effort to revitalize the old Progressive project associated with Dewey, Counts, Kilpatrick, and others who struggled to make the public school a laboratory for democracy (see Pinar et al. 1995, chapters 2 and 3). Like their struggle, ours is a “rear-guard” action, compensatory, partial, and no doubt doomed, but it is an action we are ethically and professionally obligated to take.

The pressure upon us is enormous. Students, teachers, administrators, and yes education professors are pressed to work harder, to achieve more, to raise those test scores. By test scores schools will be compared; those which fail are threatened with closure. What is operative today in the politics of American school reform is an accountant’s concept of education, higher figures (i.e. higher test scores) indicating the accumulation of knowledge, which presumably translates into increased gross national product.

That the school reform movement in the United States is dominated by business thinking and is thereby obsessed with the “bottom line” comes as no surprise to any serious student of U.S. curriculum history. Despite progressive fantasies of the school as a laboratory for democracy, the truth is that the American public schools were established to make immigrants into “Americans” and to prepare all citizens for jobs in an industrial economy. The private sector did not want to pay for this job preparation and so it persuaded the public sector to pay. On this issue, little has changed in the last 100 years. The schools are still assumed to exist for the sake of job preparation, despite continuing if largely empty rhetoric linking education with democracy and a politically-engaged citizenry.

While the point of the U.S. public schools has not changed much, the economy they were designed to support has. The consensus view is that the American economy is less and less industrial and more and more “service oriented,” strongly “information based,” increasingly organized around technological developments, including the internet. It is said to be international or global in character. Rather than the assembly line of the early automobile factory, the major mode of economic production today is semiotic (i.e. production of signs,

symbols, and other information), and it occurs not in factories but in committees and in front of computer screens in corporate offices. Most American schools, however, still tend to be modeled after the assembly-line factory. Modeling schools after contemporary corporations *would* represent an improvement. So-called “smart schools” tend to be versions of the corporate model (Fiske, 1991). Even in this corporate model, however, the economic function of schools remains unchallenged, and the modes of cognition appropriate to even corporate schools are fewer and narrower than intelligence more broadly understood.

Because the organization and culture of the school are linked to the economy and dominated by “business thinking,” the school and the U.S. curriculum field have traveled different paths over the past thirty years. For the foreseeable future, teachers will be trained as “social engineers,” directed to “manage” learning that is modeled loosely after corporate work stations. Certainly some segment of the U.S. curriculum field will devote itself to assist in the design and implementation of this corporate school curriculum. However, those of us who labored to reconceptualize the atheoretical, ahistorical field we found in 1970 have always seen a more complex calling for the field. The theoretical wing of the reconceived field aspires to ground itself not in the pressured everyday world of the corporate classroom but in worlds not present in the schools today, in ideas marginal to the maximization of profits, and in imaginative and lived experience that is not exclusively instrumental and calculative.

In its press for efficiency and standardization, the factory model tends to reduce teachers to automata. In designing and teaching the curriculum in units that presumably “add up” to a logical even disciplinary “whole” (like products on an assembly line), the factory-model school achieves social control at the cost of intelligence, intelligence broadly understood as including problem solving, critical thinking, and creativity as well as memorization and calculation. Those students who tolerate the routinized, repetitious nature of instruction that is only teacher and textbook centered and relies upon recitation and memorization sometimes are able to perform reasonably well on similar tasks, although the “transferability” of these task-specific skills has remained a problem for the factory model.

The corporate model accepts learning the “basics” as the goal of the school. However, this model permits a variety of instructional strategies to be employed in its attainment. Peer teaching, small-group work, other forms of so-called cooperative learning, even minor curriculum changes are permitted to allow

students and teachers to find their own ways to learn what is demanded of them. Moreover, the corporate model tends to acknowledge that intelligence is multiple in nature and function and includes aesthetic, intuitive, and sensory elements as well as linear, logical, narrowly cognitive ones. The social character of intelligence is also acknowledged as corporate classroom organization often permits the use of dyadic and small-group activities. The teacher in this scheme is a manager or, in TheodoreSizer's (1984) image, a "coach." These images are considerably less authoritarian than those associated with the teacher in the factory school.

Even in the corporate model, the goal of instruction -- the acquisition of that knowledge and the cultivation of those skills deemed necessary for productivity in a post-industrial economy -- is not in question. Intelligence is viewed as a means to an end, the acquisition of skills, knowledge and attitudes utilizable in the corporate sector. The maximization of profits remains the "bottom line" of the corporation as well as that of its earlier version, the factory. I am not suggesting that schools should have no relationship to the economy. Capitalism does require forms of knowledge and intelligence the corporate model of schooling is more likely than the factory model to produce. Nor am I suggesting that we could have publicly-supported schools in the United States that might have non-economic goals, at least for the imaginable future.

What I do want to point out is that for intelligence to be cultivated in fundamental ways, it must be set free of even corporate goals. Such an idea hardly excludes instrumental reason, calculation, and problem-solving as major modes of cognition. Intellectual freedom must allow, however, for meditative, contemplative modes of cognition, and for exploring subjects -- those associated, for instance, with progressive forms of the arts, humanities, and social sciences -- that have no immediate practical pay-off and might not be evaluated by standardized examinations.

Intelligence is made narrow, and thus undermined, when it is reduced to answers to other people's questions, when it is only a means to achieve a preordained goal. This instrumental and calculative concept of intelligence, while useful to the present form of economic organization -- the corporation -- is less helpful in investigations of more fundamental questions of human experience, experience that might not lead directly to economic development and increased productivity. To study these questions is to "ride" intelligence to destinations perhaps not listed in the present economic and political agenda. Such a view of curriculum inquiry and research is akin to what in the natural sciences would be

termed basic research, wherein destinations are not necessarily known in advance. For us, it might be theoretical research freed of the taken-for-granted demands of everyday problems in schools.

That is not to say that such research is an elitist form of intellectualism insulated from daily life in schools. To illustrate, allow me to discuss very briefly an emergent category in American curriculum theory. This category -- identity -- emerged in debates over multiculturalism, but it promises to take us other places as well, including investigations of what it means educationally to be conceived by others (see Pinar, 1994; 1998; 2003).

### *Identity*

The category of identity organizes educational investigations of political, racialized, and gendered experience around questions of self. This “self” is not the bourgeois individual decried by the various Marxisms and embraced by conservatives but rather the vortex of psychosocial and discursive relations theorized by Lacan, Freud, and Foucault. The study of identity enables us to portray how the politics we had thought were located “out there,” in society, are lived through “in here,” in our bodies, our minds, our everyday speech and conduct. The political status quo is not simply “reproduced,” of course. Even when we resist social trends and political directives, we are reconstructing ourselves in terms of those trends and debates and our resistance to them. In studying the politics of identity, we find that who we are is invariably related to who others are, as well as to whom we have been and want to become.

Currently, the U.S. teacher’s identity is being reconceived from factory supervisor to corporate manager. It is a promotion. However, if loyal to the cultivation of intelligence and the democratic project of education, teachers still face the challenge to become more than they have been conceived and conditioned to be. If we are submerged in identities conceived by others, the cultivation of intelligence is necessarily restricted and undermined. Of course, we teachers must meet contractual obligations regarding curriculum and instruction. However, we need not necessarily believe them or uncritically accept them. Curriculum theorists might assist teachers to avoid the disappearance of their ideals into the maelstrom of daily classroom demands. We might support teachers’ identities apart from those constructed by corporatism by proclaiming the existence of other ways of conceiving education, non-instrumental ways of speaking and being with children.



Understood from a social psychoanalytic perspective, we teachers are conceived by others, by the expectations and fantasies of our students and by the demands of parents, administrators, policymakers, and politicians, to all of whom we are sometimes the “other.” We are formed as well by their and our own internalized life histories. These various spheres or levels of self-constitution require investigation. Locating the process of knowing in the politics of identity suggests escaping the swirling waters created by the demands and pressures of others. The capacity to stand calmly in a maelstrom can come only with knowledge of other worlds, with living in other realities, not split off or dissociated from the world of work. “Separate but connected” permits us to enter the work world larger, more complex, than the roles prescribed for us, making less likely that we will collapse upon the social surface, reduced to what others make of us.

Americans might then model to their children how we can live in U.S. society without succumbing to it, without giving up our dreams and aspirations for education. Teachers can become witnesses to the notion that intelligence and learning can lead to other worlds, not just the successful exploitation of this one. Knowledge need not be regarded as a sacred text as in fundamentalist religions or an inviolate procedure as on the assembly line; nor is it only the more complex, sometimes even creative means to an end as it is in the corporate model. Rather, knowledge and intelligence as free exploration become wings by which we take flight, visit other worlds, returning to this one to call others, especially our children, to futures more life affirmative and just than the world we inhabit now. When we sink, submerged in those roles conceived by others, we become aborted possibilities, unable to realize in everyday life, in our relations with others, the politics of our individual and civic identities, the educational dynamics of creation and birth.

*A Brief History of the Present*

Fellow educators – are we not lost?

Do we know where we are,  
remember where we have been,  
or foresee where we are going?

Dwayne E. Huebner (1999, 231)

The school in the U.S. has become a skill-and-knowledge factory (or corporation); the education professoriate is being reduced to the status of supervisory personnel. As the great curriculum theorist Dwayne E. Huebner recognized over twenty-five years ago, we educators are lost in roles created by others. As his sentence quoted above suggests, many of us seem to have forgotten the past, and we are unable to imagine the future. This submergence in the present is not unique to educators; historian Christopher Lasch argued that Americans generally have become “presentistic,” so self-involved in surviving the present that, for us: “To live for the moment is the prevailing passion – to live for yourself, not for our predecessors or posterity” (Lasch 1978, 5).

While Lasch’s (1978) portrait of what he termed “the culture of narcissism” is overdrawn it is, in my judgment, largely accurate. Retreating from a public sphere that no longer seems meaningful and worthy of their investment, Americans retreat into the apparent safety of private life where, they discover, there is no safety either. “On the contrary,” Lasch (1978, 27) notes, “private life takes on the very qualities of the anarchic social order from which it supposed to provide a refuge.”

With no place to hide, Americans retreat into – and, Lasch argues, become lost in – themselves. The psychoanalytic term for this personality disturbance is “narcissism,” not to be confused with egoism or selfishness (see Lasch 1984, 18). Recoiling from meaningful engagement in the world, the privatized self atrophies – Lasch (1984) uses the term “minimal” to denote that contraction of the self narcissism necessitates – and becomes unable to distinguish between self and other, let alone participate meaningfully in the public sphere. The past and future disappear in individualistic obsession with psychic survival in the present. As Lasch (1978, xvi) suggests, “The narcissist has no interest in the future because, in part, he has so little interest in the past.”

Because the public sphere – in our case, the classroom – has become so unpleasant for so many, not a few teachers have retreated into the (apparent) safety of their own subjectivities. But in so doing, they have abdicated their professional authority and ethical responsibility for the curriculum they teach. They have been *forced* to abdicate this authority by the bureaucratic protocols that presumably hold them “accountable,” but which, in fact, render them unable to teach. (Instead, they are supposed to “manage learning.”) As a field, traditional curriculum studies in the U.S. – in the past too often a support system for the school bureaucracy – was complicit with this presentistic capitulation to the

“reform” *du jour*. As the distinguished curriculum historian Herbert Kliebard (1970) made clear, the ahistorical and atheoretical character of traditional curriculum studies disabled teachers from understanding the history of their present circumstances.

My work in curriculum theory has emphasized the significance of subjectivity to teaching, to study, to the process of education. The significance of subjectivity is not as a solipsistic retreat from the public sphere. As Lasch (1978, 9) points out, subjectivity can be no refuge in an era when “[t]he possibility of genuine privacy recedes.” The significance of subjectivity is that it is inseparable from the social; it only when we – together and in solitude – reconstruct the relation between the two can we begin to restore our “shattered faith in the regeneration of life” (Lasch 1978, 207) and cultivate the “moral discipline ... indispensable to the task of building a new order” (Lasch 1978, 235-236). Today, our pedagogical work is, I am suggesting, simultaneously autobiographical and political.

To undertake this project of social and subjective reconstruction, we in the U.S. must remember the past and imagine the future, however unpleasant this labor may be. Not only intellectually but in our character structure we must become “temporal,” living simultaneously in the past, present and future. In the autobiographical method I have devised, returning to the past (the “regressive”) and imagining the future (the “progressive”) must be understood (the “analytic”) for the self to become “expanded” (in contrast to being made “minimal” in Lasch’s schema) and complicated, then, finally, mobilized (in the “synthetical” moment). Such an autobiographical sequence of ourselves as individuals and as educators might enable us to awaken from the nightmare we are living in the present.

The first step we can take toward changing our reality in the U.S. – waking up from the nightmare that is the present state of public miseducation – is acknowledging that we are indeed living a nightmare. The nightmare that is the present – in which educators have little control over the curriculum, the very organizational and intellectual center of schooling – has several markers, prominent among them “accountability,” an apparently commonsensical idea that makes teachers, rather than students and their parents, responsible for students’ educational accomplishment. Is it not obvious that education is an opportunity offered, not a service rendered?

To help us understand the nightmare that is the present, I invoke the psychoanalytic notion of “deferred action” (*Nachtraglichkeit*), a term Freud

employed to explain how the experience of trauma is deferred – and, I would add, displaced - into other subjective and social spheres, where it is often no longer readily recognizable. I argue that the “trauma” of the Cold War in the 1950s and the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision to desegregate the public schools (coupled with the primacy of students in 1960s civil rights struggles) was “displaced and deferred” onto public education. In the aftermath of these “trauma,” public education was racialized and gendered in the American popular imagination. Bluntly stated, we can understand the nightmare that is our subjugation in the present only if we appreciate that we are the victims of displaced and deferred misogyny and racism.

In arguing that racism and misogyny have been “deferred and displaced” into public education in the United States, I am not suggesting that they have been *absorbed* there. Racism and misogyny remain pervasive in America today, and while teachers also suffer from “deferred and displaced” versions of them, white racism remains corrosive and endemic, especially (but not only) in the South, now the political epicenter of American presidential politics (Black and Black 1992). Indeed, my argument here regarding the “deferred and displaced action” of racism and misogyny underlines how these forms of social hatred and prejudice intensify as they mutate.

Nor am I arguing that the subjugation of U.S. public school teachers is *only* racialized and gendered. It is classed as well. In contrast to elite professions such as medicine and, less so, law, public school teaching has long been associated with the lower-middle class, and not only in salary. Public-school teaching has historically required a shorter and less rigorous credentialing period. Moreover, many teachers have been – in the popular imagination if not always in fact - the first members of their families to complete higher education. (One hundred years ago, public-school teaching rarely required a college degree.) The political problems of public education are, in part, class-based, but they are, I suggest, straightforwardly so. There is little that is “deferred and displaced” about the class-based character of the political subjugation of the teaching profession.

Moreover, the nightmarish quality of teachers’ present subjugation – its peculiar intensity and irrationality – cannot be grasped by class analysis alone. While class conflict in the United States has produced strong right-wing reaction, it has not tended to produce the vicious contempt teachers and *their* teachers – the education professoriate – have encountered. To grasp this “overdetermined” reaction, one must invoke models of racial prejudice and misogyny, wherein

complex and convoluted psychological structures and processes intensify emotion well beyond rhyme or reason. We must move to the sphere of psychopathology to grasp the history of the present of public education in the United States.

We can glimpse this phenomenon of “deferral and displacement” in the Kennedy’s Administration’s educational response to the Cold War (intensifying with the Sputnik satellite launch in 1957 and the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962), specifically its embrace of physical fitness in 1960 and 1961 and, during this same period, its initiation of a National Curriculum Movement. This National Curriculum Reform Movement was dedicated to aligning the secondary school subjects with the academic disciplines as they existed at the university and, in so doing, establish academic – to parallel physical - “rigor” in the schools. To accomplish this curricular alignment, the control of curriculum had to be taken from teachers. The continuing legacies of Cold War curriculum politics structures the deplorable situation in which we teachers find ourselves today. Starting in the early 1960s, then, we educators began to lose all control over the curriculum, including the means by which students’ study of it is assessed.

While 1960s curriculum reform was gendered, it was profoundly racialized as well. It was 1954 when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that public schools must be desegregated, but in the South this did not occur until the late 1960s and early 1970s. (Desegregation has never occurred in the North, as primarily white suburban school districts ring primarily black urban ones.) As schools became racial battlegrounds and the pretext for white flight, and as college students fought to desegregate other public spaces (perhaps most famously lunch counters and public transportation), racial anxiety began to intensify among European Americans, an anxiety right-wing Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater worked to exploit in his 1964 campaign against Democratic President Lyndon B. Johnson. It is the same white racism Alabama Governor George Wallace tried to exploit in his 1968 and 1972 presidential campaigns (Black and Black 1992). While this pervasive and intensifying (white) anxiety – not limited to the South - was focused upon the public schools, it echoed through the culture at large, as broader issues of racial justice and, indeed, of the American identity itself (was this still, or even primarily, an European-identified nation?) were stimulated by the desegregation of the nation’s schools. Public education – in the North especially in the urban centers, in the South everywhere – became racialized.

The political problem of U.S. teachers today – our scapegoating by politicians and by uninformed parents, our loss of academic freedom (the very prerequisite for our professional practice) - cannot be understood apart from right-wing politicians' manipulation of public education as a political issue. This political manipulation was first successfully employed in the 1960 Kennedy presidential campaign. In subsequent campaigns, the tactic was appropriated by the right, enabled all along by white reactionaries in the Deep South (Black and Black 1992).

From this evocation of the past in the present, permit me to focus for a moment on futuristic conceptions of education. These are primarily technological. In fantasies of the future, screens – television, film, and, especially, computer screens – seem everywhere, prosthetic extensions of our en fleshed bodies, dispersing our subjectivities outward, far from our concrete everyday communities into abstract cyberspace and a “global village.” In this prosthetic extension of the everyday ego we took ourselves to be, the self seems to evaporate. Subjectivity itself mutates, and the “self” autobiography purports to identify and express distends into hypertextual personae, ever-changing cyborg identities. New forms of subjectivity and sexuality appear as the natural world threatens to become “virtual.” In today’s politics of public miseducation, the computer becomes the latest technological fantasy of educational utopia, a fantasy of “teacher-proof” curriculum, a fantasy of going where “no man has gone before.”

As curriculum theorists have long appreciated, the exchange and acquisition of information is not education. Being informed is not equivalent to erudition. Information must be tempered with intellectual judgement, critical thinking, ethics, and self-reflexivity. The complicated conversation that is the curriculum requires interdisciplinary intellectuality, erudition and self-reflexivity. This is not a recipe for high test scores, but a common faith in the possibility of self-realization and democratization, twin projects of social and subjective reconstruction.

After considering for a moment the future in the present, I turn to an analytic moment. In this phase we face the facts comprising the present, namely the profoundly anti-intellectual conditions of our professional labor in the United States. These are conditions both internal and external to the schools and to the university-based academic fields of curriculum studies and teacher education. The challenge of education in this profoundly anti-intellectual historical moment is made, contrary to expectation, *more* difficult by our situation in the university,

where our arts and sciences “colleagues” –as we term them more hopefully than accurately - too often mistake academic vocationalism and their own budgetary self-interest for interdisciplinary, socially critical, subjectively-engaged education.

Due to the anti-intellectualism of American culture generally, due to the deferral and displacement of racism and misogyny onto public education more specifically, and due to the anti-intellectual character of (white) southern culture and history now politically hegemonic in the United States, the field of education has (understandably) remained underdeveloped intellectually. But there are reasons internal to the field, reasons for which we *are* responsible, that we suffer our subjugation today. We cannot begin to respond to the displaced and deferred racism and misogyny we suffer today until we face the internalized consequences of our decades-long subjugation, namely a pervasive and crippling anti-intellectualism.

Whatever our fate – given our betrayal by government the future is not bright – we must carry on, our dignity intact. We must renew our commitment to the intellectual character of our professional labor. We can do so, first, by engaging in frank and sustained self-criticism. There is, in the U.S., a deep-seated and pervasive anti-intellectualism in the field of education, obvious in teacher education, and expressed in the anti-theoretical vocationalism found not only in that field. The problem we face is hardly helped by the anti-intellectual hostility of some arts and sciences colleagues and it is only intensified by the scapegoating of public schools and the education professoriate by politicians. Despite these assaults on the profession, we cannot retreat into a defensive posture that keeps us from facing frankly the anti-intellectualism built into the field, and from taking steps, both individually and as a professional collectivity, to correct it.

Accompanying frank and ongoing self-criticism must be the reinvigoration of our professional commitment to engage in “complicated conversation” (see Pinar et al., 1995, 848) with our academic subjects, our students, and ourselves. Such “complicated conversation” requires the academic – intellectual – freedom to devise the courses we teach, the means by which we teach them, *and* the means by which we assess students’ study of them. We must fight for that freedom as individuals in classrooms and as a profession: at both “sites” we under assault by government (especially by the Bush Administration) and by at least two of the professional organizations pretending to representing us, the American

Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

After the moments of reflection and self-understanding that analysis invites, they are to be followed by a synthetic moment, a moment during which we mobilize ourselves, both as individuals and as a profession. After the “shattering” (or “evaporation”) of the ego that regression to the past and contemplation of the future invites, we return to the present, mobilized for pedagogical engagement in the reconstruction of the private and public spheres in curriculum and teaching, what James B. Macdonald (1995) termed the study of how to have a world. Public education structures self-formation and social reconstruction while, in many of its present forms, it blocks both. Teachers ought not be only school-subject specialists; I suggest that they become private-and-public intellectuals who understand that self-reflexivity, intellectuality, interdisciplinarity and erudition are as inseparable as are the subjective and the social spheres themselves.

In the U.S., it is long past time for us to “talk back” to those politicians, parents, and school and university administrators who misunderstand the education of the public as a “business.” Mobilized, we must enter “into the arena” and teach our fellow citizens – including uncomprehending colleagues and self-aggrandizing administrators - what is at stake in the education of children, an education in which creativity and individuality, not test-taking skills, are primary. In our time, to be intellectual requires political activism.

Within our profession, we must repudiate those legislative actions by government – such as the Bush Administration’s “Leave No Child Behind” legislation - that destroy the very possibility of education by misconstruing it as a “business.” While we struggle as intellectuals reconstructing the private and public spheres of curriculum and teaching in schools, we must, especially among ourselves, keep hope alive. We can recapture the curriculum, someday. Without reclaiming our academic – intellectual freedom – we cannot teach. Without intellectual freedom, education ends; students are indoctrinated, forced to learn what the test-makers declare to be important.

### *Organizational, Administrative, and Intellectual Next Steps*

After a new theory of value, then, a new theory of subjectivity  
must be formulated that operates primarily



through knowledge, communication, and language.  
 Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000, 29)

That is a brief history of the current situation in the U.S. Of course, other scholars regard the situation differently. I offer this brief commentary on the American scene to suggest one way an international conversation might begin, one value it might have. In explaining to colleagues outside our specific national situations, we are encouraged to distance ourselves from our situations, enabling us to more critically reflect upon them and what they demand of us. Links among various curriculum inquiries in various national settings might be elaborated; differences clarified and explored. These are evident in the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*, about which I will comment now, concluding with what I perceive to be “next steps” in the “internationalization” of curriculum studies.

Several points became clarified during the editing of the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*. As I suspected, the curriculum field is very much embedded in national cultures and regional settings. Much curriculum work – research and curriculum development initiatives - functions in the service of school reform, stimulated and sometimes stipulated by governmental policy initiatives, including legislation. As Angel Diaz Barriga (2003, 443) notes in his review of curriculum studies in Mexico, “the field of curriculum is an outstandingly practical domain.” Like elementary, middle, and secondary-school teachers, the education professoriate is under intense pressure to improve the quality of educational experience, documented by student performance on standardized examinations.

Considerable curriculum scholarship worldwide is critical of this “business” rhetoric of school reform; from this fact we can conclude that the field is not merely a conceptual extension of the state’s political and bureaucratic apparatus. There is a relative intellectual independence in most but not all countries. This last point is heartening to those of us committed to an intellectually autonomous, vibrant, scholarly field of curriculum studies worldwide. However, it cannot be taken for granted, as politicians’ manipulation of the political rhetoric of school reform represents an ongoing threat to the relative intellectual autonomy and academic freedom of curriculum scholars, not to mention of public school teachers.

The tension between intellectual freedom and service to the state cannot be grasped without attention to the problem of infrastructure, the material conditions in which we work. Frida Díaz Barriga, (2003, 467) points to this problem in her review of curriculum research in Mexico, estimating that university-based curriculum faculty are able to dedicate only “10 hours a week” to conduct research, and that “the largest part of the research work they report is centered on the establishment or evaluation of curriculum projects or on the analysis of their graduate students’ performance in the labor world.” Mexican scholars are hardly alone in this regard, of course; in the United States, for instance, faculty who teach in regional universities (in contrast to research universities) face the same limited opportunity to conduct research. And the institutional pressures upon us to conduct “practical” research means our field does not enjoy support for what in the natural sciences gets termed as “basic” research. This is creative intellectual inquiry freed from institutional demands to produce practical results, and its institutionalization in our field is a prerequisite, in my judgement, for the field to advance.

It is also clear from studying the *Handbook* that, to a considerable extent, the internationalization of curriculum studies has already occurred, except perhaps, in the United States. Intellectual influences from the U.S. and the U.K., especially in the area of “critical” curriculum thought (related to the “new” sociology of education), are evident in a number of non-North American fields. These influences do not seem to have been imported, in general, uncritically, but, rather, adopted somewhat self-consciously, and for specific and local purposes (although this may not have been the case with earlier waves of conceptual imports, especially U.S. “empirical” research). Indeed, in his review of Brazilian curriculum studies, Antonio Moreira (2003, 171) concludes that the importation of “foreign material” involves “interactions and resistances, whose intensity and whose potential ‘subversiveness’ vary according to international and local circumstances.” In the case of Canadian scholarship in phenomenology and hermeneutics (see Chambers, 2003), it is the U.S. which has been the importing nation (see Pinar et. al. 1995, chapter 8). With the establishment of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies and the publication of several international collections, including the handbook, the internationalization of the field will no doubt continue, perhaps at an accelerated rate. This possibility asks scholars worldwide to become knowledgeable, more

critical, more self-conscious and selective regarding the appropriation of scholarship from sources outside one's homeland.

What would constitute the "advancement" of the field of curriculum studies worldwide? Each of us is obligated to answer that question for ourselves, as individuals and together, as a field. To contribute to the conversation, permit me now to speculate about next steps, limited, no doubt, by my own national contextualization. That limitation acknowledged, and given the portrait of the worldwide field discernible in the handbook, I suggest the following might constitute "next steps" we might take in order to "advance" the field worldwide.

As Bill Green (2003, 137) observes in his essay on Australian curriculum studies, "understanding curriculum inquiry both as an international ("global") phenomenon and as a local, situated practice is a complex undertaking and a constant challenge." I wish to emphasize here that the project of understanding is *both* "international" *and* "local," and that each of our national and regional fields might be well advised to support – through our teaching, our scholarship as well as through the establishment and maintenance of scholarly journals, associations and other forms of "infrastructure" – sustained and critical attention to intellectual developments both globally as well as locally.

Attention to the "local" means, I emphasize, not only attention to current, often politically instigated, waves of school reform. As noted a moment ago, in order to resist the danger of submergence in political rhetoric and over-zealous governmental participation in the intellectual and psycho-social life of schools, curriculum studies as a field must labor to remain, and/or become, more intellectually independent. As Mariano Palamidessi and Daniel Feldman (2003, 119) point out in their essay on curriculum studies in Argentina, there can be an "little distinction between the intellectual field ... and the activities of official agencies." To advance the field, I submit, such "distinction" must be cultivated. Indeed, vigorous debate and differences in point of view – not only among ourselves but from politicians and government officials - must be articulated and supported. Curriculum scholars, I suggest, must become "intellectuals" (and, on occasion, public intellectuals) as well as technical specialists with bureaucratic expertise governments and their agencies can employ (Said 1996; Pinar 2001, 19-34). A sophisticated field of curriculum studies would occupy, it seems to me, a broad spectrum of scholarship and professional activity, from the theoretical to the institutional, from the global to the local, from the university to the school.

We might think of our scholarly effort to understand curriculum locally as well as globally as supporting the “horizontalness” of the field. But it is clear to me, from the studies published in the handbook, for the field to “advance” or “mature” (to employ Antonio Moreira’s [2003, 171] formulation), the field must support “verticality” as well. That is to say, in each nation or region, as well as worldwide, the field needs historical studies and, as well, future-oriented studies, the latter evident, for instance, in Urve Laanemets’ “Learning for the Future in Estonia,” in Naama Sabar’s and Yehoshua Mathias’ (2003) reflection on the future of education in Israel, in Shigeru Asanuma’s study of Japanese curriculum reform, and in Cynthia Chambers’ (2003) report on curriculum studies in Canada. These orders of inquiry support, I am suggesting, the “autonomy” Moreira (2003, 171) identifies as key to the field’s maturity, that is, the autonomy that is a prerequisite to the field’s advancement.

### *Future Prospects*

Writing from Tallinn, Urve Laanemets (2003, 287) worries that there remain “too many atheoretical and ahistorical curriculum documents in use at the beginning of the 21st century.” In the western as well as in post-socialist countries such as Estonia, Laanemets argues that the lure of the future must not distract curriculum workers from their professional obligation to maintain balances between the tradition and innovation.

Sabar and Mathias (2003) worry about the future of the Israeli school: will it be an institution of solidarity and social integration that provides equal opportunity for all, including the weaker members of society, or will it perpetuate gaps and express mainly the division and disparity between cultures and social groups? Sabar and Mathias argue that, on the one hand, the Israeli Ministry must provide the schools with the tools and the moral, organizational, cultural and financial resources it needs to be autonomous, and, on the other, it must formulate policies supporting social integration. In their view, this imperative will constitute the principal test of the Israeli school in the future.

Not unlike the situation in the United States, in Japan, Asanuma reports, education has been exploited for political purposes. Politicians have invoked the image of “nation at crisis” to mobilize public opinion to their political advantage. While a number of publications have reported that strict discipline and pressures have prodded Japanese children to make strong scores on standardized school

achievement tests, it is not well known, Asanuma notes, that a very flexible and progressive curriculum policy was initiated in Japan beginning in April 2000.

In this reform – undertaken by the Central Council of Education - the most critical issue faced by contemporary Japanese children was taken to be the difficulty of living their every day lives, a difficulty underscored by the increase of the number of children committing suicide. The Council found the fact of Japanese children at risk for suicide derives from the “overloaded national curriculum content” which is based mostly on traditional subjects (Asanuma 2003, 437). The Central Council of Education proposed reducing the number of school hours and minimum essentials of curriculum content for all children. In effect, the Council supported a reduction academic competition. There is, Asanuma reports, no solid evidence demonstrating that the reduction of academic competition has led to lower test scores, as reflected on International Educational Achievement exams. Whether we understand this reform as, in Laanemets’s terms, a balance between tradition and innovation, or a national effort at the future survival of its children, the future course of public education in Japan has been, it appears, altered.

In her review of curriculum scholarship in Canada, Cynthia Chambers reports that many theorists in Canada have focused on the “hidden curriculum,” specifically its role in the reproduction of social injustice. There is work, for example, that challenges Western epistemology by articulating (albeit, in Western terms) an indigenous metaphysics. Other Canadian scholarship has focused on violence to women, for instance, the massacre at the University of Montreal in 1989. A second major domain of curriculum scholarship is phenomenological and hermeneutical. Chambers (2003, 227) suggests the reason for this uniquely North American tradition is due to “phenomenology’s focus on lived experience – the particulars of the life lived in a specific place in relation to others – [which] enables scholars to at once be critical of the abstract discourses dominating curriculum and the violence they do the earth and children.” She suggests that Canadians have focused on “the potential of the hermeneutic imagination” due to its “potential” to enable “dialogical counters among communities of difference,” to support conversation that traverses national and cultural boundaries (2003, 227).

Studies such as these that include attention to future prospects support the advancement of the field within national borders and, I think, worldwide. Certainly the most rudimentary significance for the term “advancement” in this

phase in the internationalization of curriculum studies is that it requires as a field (worthy of such a designation) to attend to both the character of and conditions for the field's future and its past.

### *Historical Studies*

Historical studies might enable us to understand and work through the specificities of our national cultures and the embeddedness of curriculum theory and practice within them. This potential is underlined in several of the essays of the handbook, among them the Lee (2003) essay on South Korean curriculum studies, the Kridel-Newman essay on U.S. curriculum history, Ulla Johansson's (2003) study of "shifting foci" in curriculum research in Sweden, and the Abiko (2003) and Hashimoto (2003) essays on Japanese curriculum studies. Here I attend to the Zhang-Zhong (2003) essay on Chinese curriculum studies.

Curriculum thought is not new in China, Zhang Hua and Zhong Qiquan explain. The term for curriculum, *ke-cheng*, first appearing during the Tang Dynasty (618-907). During the twentieth century, there have been four distinct periods of curriculum research, which Zhang and Zhong characterize as (1) learning from the United States (1900-1949), (2) learning from the Soviet Union (1949-1978, during which time the field of curriculum was, in effect, replaced by the field of instruction), (3) the re-emergence of curriculum studies (1978-1989), and (4) the current movement toward autonomy and independence for Chinese curriculum studies.

In addition to providing a brief history of curriculum thought in China, Zhang and Zhong also consider future prospects. They suggest that while "curriculum development" is at the present time the dominant paradigm in Chinese curriculum studies, the future belongs to the project of "understanding curriculum." Zhang and Zhong characterize contemporary curriculum studies in China as "vigorous," attracting many students. Many universities and teachers' colleges have established departments of curriculum and instruction and/or centers for curriculum research. Such infrastructure provides "a solid basis for possible new theoretical explorations in an increasingly interdependent and changing global society" (Zhang and Zhong 2003, 268). They conclude:

The Chinese curriculum field will maintain its strong tradition of historical studies, attempt to inform curriculum research by traditional curriculum wisdom, participate and contribute to worldwide curriculum discourses,

reflect on the reality of curriculum practice, and construct, finally, its own curriculum history. (Zhang and Zhong 2003, 268)

Given Zhang and Zhong's sophisticated understanding of what is at stake in the advancement of curriculum studies, the Chinese field seems posed to exert leadership in the emerging worldwide field of curriculum studies.

### *Productions of Locality*

Those studies about curriculum that constitute a typical research line of the 1990s, focus on the analysis of the subjective meanings of the pedagogical and curricular experiences.

Frida Díaz Barriga (2003, 465)

Historical studies may enable us to resist any uncritical acceptance of "globalization." Within our specific national and regional cultures, historical scholarship means that we are less vulnerable to political "slogans" (such as the "privatization" and "marketization" of public education), and to the discursive and material manipulations by specific regimes of reason and power. While internationalization supports transnational communication, it is important for each nation (and/or region) to cultivate its own "indigenous" and conceptually independent curriculum theorizing, inquiry, and research.

In asserting that, I realize I am drawing upon strands of critical thought that have sought to establish sites of resistance founded both on the individual identities of social subjects and the collective identities of national and regional groups, structuring such subjective sites in terms of "local" struggles. In this tradition I myself have constructed curriculum in terms of "place," and, specifically, the American South (i.e., the former slave states), in order to refocus and reanimate struggles of resistance to racism, classism, and misogyny (see Pinar in press, chapter 5). Internationally, place-based movements have been set up against the apparently "undifferentiated and homogeneous space of global networks" (Hardt and Negri 2001, 44).

At other times, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri point out, such political arguments have emerged from long-standing traditions of Leftists in which nationalism and the nation is posited as the site of resistance against the domination of foreign and/or global capital. If capitalist domination is now globalized, this reasoning went, then resistances must seize upon the local and

there construct barriers to global capital's accelerating flows. "What needs to be addressed, instead," Hardt and Negri (2000, 45) assert,

is precisely the production of locality, that is, the social machines that create and recreate the identities and differences that are understood as the local. The differences of locality are neither pre-existing nor natural but rather effects of a regime of production. Globality similarly should not be understood in terms of cultural, political, or economic *homogenization*. Globalization, like localization, should be understood instead as a regime of the production of identity and difference, or really of homogenization and heterogenization.

If Hardt and Negri are right, then, the historicization and theorization of curriculum do not guarantee help *contra* globalization and, specifically, the "marketization" of education. What they can do, at least for those of us working where these phenomena are well advanced, is to enable us to help our colleagues in the schools *understand* what is happening to them and to the children in their charge. That is a rather different project than bureaucratic intervention, especially intervention based upon governmental and other political initiatives.

I make this point because it is clear - I am thinking now of David Hamilton's and Gaby Weiner's (2003) essay on the United Kingdom - that the field remains very much focused on school improvement. We are less focused on the intellectual project of understanding. While the two are, of course, intertwined and synergistic, in the near term, at least, "advancement" might mean, certainly in the U.S. context, a certain shift in the center of gravity of the field: from an exclusive and often bureaucratic preoccupation with instrumental interventions in the school-as-institution to the intellectual project of understanding. While hardly abandoning bureaucratic protocols aimed at institutional improvement, some segment of the field, it seems to me, must be devoted to curriculum theory and history, i.e. scholarly efforts to *understand* curriculum, including curriculum development, implementation, and evaluation.

In doing so there are, as several essays in the *Handbook* make clear, important ethical and political dimensions to the labor of curriculum development and scholarship. We cannot pretend, as mainstream social science once did, to be "neutral." Especially in those nations in reconstruction after emancipation from colonial regimes, ethical and political dimensions are explicit, as indicated in Rivera's (2003) essay on the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand, in Jansen's (2003) essay on Zimbabwe and Namibia, and in the Pandey-Moorad (2003, 168)



essay on Botswana. “The narrowly conceived field of curriculum,” Pandey and Moorad tell us, “must give way to reconceptualizing curriculum theories and ideas to accommodate, appropriate, invite and tolerate the old, the new, the outlandish and so on to forge a new education including a vision of innovative curriculum, a project neglected until now but which must be undertaken in all immediacy to be decolonized.”

Not only are those engaged in decolonization engaged ethically and politically. Wherever we are located “in the non-place of Empire” (Hardt and Negri 2000, 208), we all are politically and ethically engaged, and in local and global ways that can be usefully articulated and elaborated in our research. For those of us facing and resisting the “privatization” and “marketization” of public education (see, for instance, Peter Roberts’ essay on New Zealand), we are forced to negotiate among complex and often conflicting professional responsibilities, themselves structured and animated by ethical obligations and political commitments.

#### Conclusion

[T]he field of curriculum is multidisciplinary.

Angel Díaz Barriga (2003, 446)

The accelerating and expanding complexity of our work as curriculum scholars – what Frida Daiz Barriga (2003, 457) so nicely characterizes as the polysemic character of the field - calls upon us to continue to make scholarly efforts toward the self-conscious understanding of our work and the work of teachers and students in the schools, all of us situated culturally, historically, and now, we are acutely clear, globally.

As the essays in the *International Handbook* testify, curriculum studies is a field that straddles the divide between contemporary social science and the humanities. Research in the field is sometimes quantitative, often qualitative, sometimes arts-based, sometimes informed by humanities fields such as philosophy, literary theory, and cultural studies. It is influenced as well by social science fields such as psychology, political and social theory, and, not only in the United States (see, for instance, Ulla Johansson’s [2003] essay on Sweden), by interdisciplinary fields such as women’s and gender studies and post-colonial studies. It is, as Angel Diaz Barriga (2003, 446) observes, “multidisciplinary.”

While that fact does mean that the boundaries of the field are porous, it also means that the field of curriculum remains, relatively speaking, open. Scholars and graduate students need not search for a niche, for some small area that has not yet been explored: in curriculum studies the “frontier” is all around us. Some might find that inviting. It is a field where one’s interests can be pursued. From my point of view, the one of the most important motives for participating in a field is that it is interesting, that it appeals, that one’s interests can be supported and developed.

That said, there are conditions – at least, perhaps *especially* in the English-speaking world – that render both theoretical and applied work in curriculum studies difficult. The “business logic” characterizing school reform, not only but especially in the U.S., creates anti-intellectual conditions in which to work. Still, scholars worldwide continue the necessary work toward self-definition, toward building conceptual, methodological and organizational infrastructure for the field to advance.

The essays in the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* constitute, I hope, a significant contribution to such scholarly self-understanding and to understanding of the field and, thereby, contribute to the advancement of the field. May this collection give us pause in order to reflect upon our respective national and regional fields, and inspire us to renew our commitment to them, as well as to the advancement of the field worldwide. In those nations and regions without “infrastructure,” may associations and societies of curriculum scholars be formed, scholarly journals established, and the project of understanding furthered.

If you decide the project of internationalization is worthwhile, I propose you consider joining the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies. Our first meeting was held October 26-29 in Shanghai, hosted by the Institute of Curriculum and Instruction of East China Normal University. The 2006 meeting is tentatively scheduled for Europe (perhaps Finland), and a third conference for Africa (2009). The conference comes to the Western Hemisphere in 2012 when it will be held in South America; in 2015 it comes to North America, before returning to Asia in 2018. For further information, you may contact me at your convenience at [wpinar@lsu.edu](mailto:wpinar@lsu.edu) and/or the IAACS website: [www.iaacs.org](http://www.iaacs.org)

Within Mexico, it may be important – in terms of building intellectual and organizational infrastructure – to establish a Mexican Association for the

Advancement of Curriculum Studies, with an annual meeting, a journal, affiliated perhaps, with the IAACS (as are a number of other national curriculum studies associations, among them the Australian Curriculum Studies Association, the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies, the Japanese Society for Curriculum Studies, and the Korean Association for Curriculum Studies. (As I write, the recently-established Portuguese Association for Curriculum Studies is in the process of applying for affiliated status.) The point of such internationalization, of all our work, it bears repeating, is to enable teachers to understand what is happening to them and to the children to teach; it is to help teachers and students alike to appreciate that the central question in education is the question of the curriculum.

My thanks for inviting me to speak with you. I wish you well.

\* A paper presented to the biannual meeting of the Mexican Council of Education's National Conference on Education Research, Guadalajara, November 2003.

#### *Footnotes*

- (1) The World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI), still an ongoing organization, pre-exists IAACS. Before moving to establish IAACS, I have with Norman Overly, Professor Emeritus, Indiana University, and one of the founders of the World Council of Curriculum and Instruction, regarding intersections and divergences between the two organizations, as well as their possible co-operation. For a history of WCCI, see Overly 2003.
- (2) The realize that the term "American" refers to all of us in the Western hemisphere, but, after common usage in the U.S., I use it here as an adjective referring specifically to the U.S.A.

#### *References*

Abiko, Tadahiko (2003). Present state of curriculum studies in Japan. In

William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (425-434). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Asanuma, Shigeru (2003). Japanese educational reform for the twenty-first century: The impact of the new course of study toward the postmodern era in Japan. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (435-442). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barriga, Angel Díaz (2003). Curriculum research: Evolution and outlook in México. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (443-456). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barriga, Frida Díaz (2003). Main trends of curriculum research in México. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (457-469). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Black, Earl and Black, Merle (1992). *The vital South: How presidents are elected*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Chambers, Cynthia (2003). "As Canadian as possible under the circumstances": A view of contemporary curriculum discourses in Canada. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (221-252). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fiske, E. (1991). *Smart schools, smart kids*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Hamilton, David and Weiner, Gaby (2003). Subject, not subjects: Curriculum pathways, pedagogies and practices in the United Kingdom. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (623-636). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hashimoto, Miho (2003). Japan's struggle for the formation of modern elementary school curriculum: Westernization and hiding cultural dualism in

the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (417-424). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Held, David, McGrew, Athony, Goldblatt, David, Perraton, Jonathan (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Huebner, Dwayne E. (1999). *The lure of the transcendent*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hwu, Wen-Song (1993). *Toward Understanding Poststructuralism and Curriculum*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University.

Jansen, Jonathon D. (2003). What education scholars write about curriculum in Namibia and Zimbabwe. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (471-478). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Johansson, Ulla (2003). Frame factors, structures, and meaning making: shifting focus of curriculum research in Sweden. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (575-598). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kliebard, Herbert M. (1970). Persistent issues in historical perspective. *Educational Comment*, 31-41. [Also in William F. Pinar (Ed.) (1975a), *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists* (39-50). Berkeley: McCutchan. Reissued in 2000 as *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualization*. Troy, NY: Educator's International Press.]

Kridel, Craig and Newman, Vicky (2003). A random harvest: A multiplicity of studies in American curriculum history research. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (651-665). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lasch, Christopher (1978). *The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations*. New York: Norton.

Lasch, Christopher (1984). *The minimal self: Psychic survival in troubled times*. New York: Norton.

Lasch, Christopher (1995). *The revolt of the elites and the betrayal of democracy*. New York: Norton.

Lévy, Pierre (2001). *Cyberculture*. [Trans. by Robert Bononno.] Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Macdonald, James B. (1995). *Theory as a prayerful act: Collected essays*. [Edited by Bradley Macdonald; introduced by William F. Pinar.] New York: Peter Lang.

Moreira, Antonio Flavio Barbosa (2003). The curriculum field in Brazil: Emergence and consolidation. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (171-184). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Overly, Norman V. (2003). A history of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI). In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (83-97). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pandey, Sid N. and Moorad, Fazlur R. (2003). The decolonization of curriculum in Botswana. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (143-170). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pinar, William F. (1994). *Autobiography, Politics, and Curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, William F. (Ed.) (1998). *Curriculum: Toward New Identities*. New York: Garland.

Pinar, William F. (2001). *The gender of racial politics and violence in America*. New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, William F. (Ed.) (2003). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pinar, William F. (in press). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pinar, William F., Reynolds, William M., Slattery, Patrick G., Taubman, Peter M. (1995). *Understanding Curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Rivera, F. D. (2003). In Southeast Asia: Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand: Conjunctions and collision in the global cultural economy. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (553-574). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Roberts, Peter (2003). Contemporary curriculum research in New Zealand. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (495-516). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Said, Edward W. (1996). *Representations of the intellectual: The 1993 Reith lectures*. New York: Vintage.

Sizer, Theodore (1984). *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Sabar, Naama and Mathias, Yehoshua (2003). Curriculum planning at the threshold of the third millennium: The Israeli case. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (381-400). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Trueit, Donna, Doll, William, Wang, Hongyu and Pinar, William, (Eds.) (2003). *The Internationalization of the Curriculum Studies: Proceedings of the LSU Conference*. New York: Peter Lang.

Zhang, Hua and Zhong, Ququan (2003). Curriculum studies in China: Retrospect and prospect. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (253-270). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.