

Discussion Response

GROWING CURRICULUM STUDIES:  
CONTRIBUTIONS OF JOÃO M. PARASKEVA

---

WILLIAM H. SCHUBERT

*Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois at Chicago*

---

*Conflicts in Curriculum Theory: Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies*

João M. Paraskeva / Palgrave Macmillan US / 2011

*Curriculum Epistemicide: Toward an Itinerant Curriculum Theory*

João M. Paraskeva / Routledge / 2016

I am pleased to have been invited to respond to the recent work of Joao Paraskeva (2011 & 2016) as it has been responded to in this special issue organized by James Jupp. I compliment Professor Jupp, Susan Mayer and Joseph Kyser for such careful work on this set of responses, and commend each of the respondents for continuing the discourse and praxis initiated by Professor Paraskeva.

I see the work of Joao Paraskeva and those who have responded to it as valuable contributions to the continued growth of curriculum studies. Indeed, much of my work for over forty years has been dedicated to cataloging and advocating such growth. Paraskeva urges curriculum scholars and workers to draw perspectives from a broader range of traditions, especially from the Global South. In considering conflicts in curriculum theory, he warns us to beware of hegemonic epistemologies, and urges us to sail in a critical curriculum river striving to overcome *curriculum epistemicide* through Itinerant Curriculum Theory (ICT). My comments here are drawn from study that builds on an article published in the 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary issue of *Curriculum Inquiry* entitled *Journeys of Expansion and Synopsis* (Schubert, 2010b) with attention to Paraskeva's recent work.

I have begun to write my response to this set of papers several times, and each time I meander into a long history of the curriculum field that cannot possibly fit the space allocation here. Jim Jupp generously offered to give more words, to even double my

1500, which I gladly accept; however, I need a book to do justice to what I want to say. In such a book I would write about how I have seen the curriculum field develop, the meaning of this development for me, and possibilities I imagine for the future. I have been impressed with the diversity of curriculum orientations, first vis-à-vis curriculum development, then attempts to conceptualize this process through analytical reason and empirical scientific methods, and then beginning my career during the era of reconceptualization. I have benefited from interacting with others who were trying to envision and portray this strange and wondrous realm of inquiry.

As I read Paraskeva and the insightful comments by those who are also reflecting on his work, I think back to my attempts to characterize the curriculum field (e.g., Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1980; Schubert, 1986; Willis, Schubert, Bullough, Kridel, & Holton, 1993; Marshall, Sears, & Schubert, 2000; Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, & Carroll, 2002; Marshall, Sears, Allen, Roberts, & Schubert, 2007; Schubert, 2008; Schubert, 2009a & b; Schubert, 2010a,b,c; articles in Kridel's (2010) encyclopedia and He, Schultz, & Schubert, 2015). This and related work lead me to reiterate and elaborate what I consider to be the central curriculum question: What is worthwhile? What is worth needing, knowing, experiencing, doing, being, becoming, overcoming, sharing, contributing, wondering, and imagining? Why? With and for whom? How? Where? When? For whose benefit?

In most of these sources, I admittedly portrayed, as did most others who wrote synoptic or historical conceptualizations of the field in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, perspectives that were mostly white, English speaking, middle class, and male; they smacked of the dominant values of research-oriented universities, which valued controlling modes of scientific inquiry and scholarship dominated by disciplines such as history, philosophy, psychology, and the several social sciences. Images of curriculum that captured the day (e.g., Caswell & Campbell, 1935; Smith, Stanley, & Shores, 1957; Cremin, 1961; Taba, 1962; Seguel, 1966; Tanner & Tanner, 1975; Pinar, 1975; Zais, 1976; Schiro 1978; Eisner, 1979; Kliebard, 1986) contended in my emergent work. As I wrote books about the growth of the curriculum field, I managed to insert disclaimers that we should acknowledge insights from non-English sources, scholars from other places, races, languages, cultures, socio-economic classes, value systems, and levels of oppression. In doing so, I often added disclaimers about not having the background to do that work. I suspect that other scholars in the accepted realms of academe in the United States have expressed or harbored similar sentiments. One of my main concerns in doctoral studies was that

there was a lot of literature on curriculum and it was not centralized. I set out to do this when I became an assistant professor.

So much seemed left out. The same was true in other areas of study and disciplines of knowledge. Still, within that corpus of curriculum literature there was much variation. There were advocates of classical education, liberal arts and sciences, social efficiency; there were progressive challenges to autocratic authority; there were the beginnings of critical questioning of dominant political, economic, and philosophical or theological orientations. School population increase in the United States led to a call for specialists—one of those being curriculum specialists. These curriculum leaders seemed to be thought of as functionaries who engineered interests of domination as determined by a *power elite* (Mills, 1956) of the emergent corporate state to further its interests. It seemed that these curriculum leaders had to be certified and that it was done by graduate schools in universities, where they learned to select learning experiences, efficiently organize them, and evaluate the results. While I know that many will associate the last sentence with the Tyler (1949) Rationale, I may be unusual to think that Ralph Tyler's contributions to curriculum were greater than the mystical symbol of curriculum development incarnate conjured up by his name. I will not dwell on this; rather, I simply suggest two biographic interviews (Tyler, Schubert, & Schubert, 1986; Tyler, 1987) and two articles (Tyler, 1977; Wraga, 2017).

In any case, efficient engineering of purposes that were deemed of little worth and often harmful seemed to be a major contradiction to those of us who had experienced universities as places that raise questions, sometimes uncomfortable ones, about pillars of value that support societies and social control, as well as places to imagine hopeful possibilities for personal growth and fulfilling ways to be together in the world. In the 1950s and 1960s, some curriculum developers became curriculum scholars, perhaps because they saw worth in pursuing deeper and broader matters. I resonated positively with those who shared this kind of experience when I entered the field in the 1970s. Many of us were unconvinced that the social values that curriculum developers were expected to refine and implement were derived democratically. Moreover, many of us were dedicated to protest against *the establishment* and supported civil and human rights struggles—movements for peace, environmental quality, racial justice, women's rights, consumer protection, and more.

I felt at home among curriculum scholars who did not want to mindlessly train educators to uncritically orchestrate the purposes of what Joel Spring (1972) called a *corporate state* that benefited only a small proportion of the public. How could schools be called *public schools*, if they were not of, by, and for the public, to draw upon Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dewey (1938, p. 29) did (Schubert & Lopez Schubert, 1981)? Conferences begun in 1973 under the leadership of William Pinar, supported by his mentor Paul Klohr, Janet Miller and others, built upon work of an earlier generation of scholars (e.g., Maxine Greene, James B. Macdonald, and Dwayne Huebner). Greene (1965, 1967, 1973) was the first major existentialist philosopher of education, and one of the few women in the field; she exemplified the art of drawing upon literary and artistic sources as well as pragmatist, phenomenological, poststructuralist, postmodern, and neo-Marxist critical literatures. Macdonald and Huebner, both having studied with Virgil Herrick, also tapped such literature. Macdonald, along with Bernice Wolfson and Esther Zaret (Macdonald, Wolfson, & Zaret, 1973) brought attention to the relevance of Ivan Illich (1970) on *deschooling* to reform this idea into a conception of *re-schooling*; Macdonald also showed the relevance of Paulo Freire's (1970) pedagogy on relationships among oppressors and the oppressed, and helped us consider the need for a *problem posing pedagogy* instead of the dominant *banking* form of education (Macdonald, 1974). Again, with Zaret, he called on many of us to seek education for meaning (Macdonald & Zaret, 1975), and to theorize as a prayerful act (Macdonald, 1995).

At the first conference among the precursors to Bergamo that I attended (1976 in Milwaukee), Macdonald (1977) emphasized the need for curriculum scholars to clarify social democratic values and to directly address how we can live together in the world. Huebner presented brilliantly at the Milwaukee conference, too; however, I was most influenced by a piece he had written a decade earlier in which he called for the invention of new curricular languages, meaning paradigms; he said that the dominant technical and scientific paradigms were insufficient, and that we needed political, ethical, and aesthetic languages to think and act with a fuller understanding of curriculum (Huebner, 1966). Clearly, many scholars who began professorial careers in the 1970s moved in these directions, such as Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, William Pinar, Madeleine Grumet, Janet Miller, George Willis, Landon Beyer, Janet Miller, Jean Anyon, Peter McLaren, and others.

Three years after Huebner's call, Joseph Schwab (1969) also used the term *languages* to advocate for a move from theoretic to practical, quasi-practical, and eclectic languages for curriculum, interpreting the terms *theoretic* and *practical* as Aristotle

used them to mean highly generalizable and lawlike (theoretic), situational and concrete decision making (practical), and artistically matching, adapting, and inventing theory and precedent to pose and solve particular needs using arts of the eclectic from the Aristotelian (*productive*). Many followed his admonitions: F. Michael Connelly, D. Jean Clandinin, William Reid, Ian Westbury, and many more. The use of the term *language* is salient here; for sophisticated fluency in understanding a language requires depth and breadth of cultural knowledge. To me, the metaphors of language and culture seemed fuller even than Thomas Kuhn's (1962/1970) idea of paradigm. Even though paradigm is associated with worldview, language seemed more embedded and embodied in lived experience, representing the ways many of us wanted to envision the scholarly work that needed to be done. By noting those who furthered new scholarly languages, such as those depicted by Huebner or Schwab, I intend only to be illustrative, not to set up camps with gurus and followers. Furthermore, many of those mentioned developed languages of their own that moved in a host of different directions. I strived to do this, and I feel sure (reflecting back to these conferences) that many others did, too: Max van Manen, Edmund Short, William Doll, Tim Leonard, Norm Overly, Patti Lather, Jim Sears, and a host of others who added to the conversations in the 1980s.

Questions remained about how we could enter more fully in the larger field of educational research. In 1964, the American Educational Research Association (AERA) had created a curriculum division, Division B, and its name was *Curriculum and Objectives*. This label was heavily influenced by conceptual empiricist scholars such as Arno Bellack, B. Othanel Smith, Robert Hastings, and John Goodlad. Many who participated in the pre-Bergamo curriculum conferences expressed desire to be involved more in AERA. We saw curriculum work as derived from the example of Klohr, Greene, Macdonald, Huebner, and Schwab, along with those who regularly presented at the 1973-1980 conferences as worthy of becoming part of AERA. We did not see reconceptualization as a movement, but instead as opportunity to add to the scholarly lore of the curricular past with new pathways. The kind of scholarly curriculum work that emerged was immensely diverse as characterized by Paul R. Klohr (1980), who pointed to several directions or points of emphasis in a field he characterized as *gritty and ragged*. These included but were not limited to: organic views of nature; individuals as creators of knowledge and culture; experiential bases of method; preconscious experience; searches for liberty and higher levels of consciousness; means and ends that include diversity and pluralism; and new language forms. Klohr's presentation of these emphases was rather brief, and I attempted to elaborate on them in *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility*

(Schubert, 1986, pp 176-180). Such emphases covered more intellectual territory than forms of research; nonetheless, research was the key to AERA. Klohr joined with Edmund Short to develop an AERA Special Interest Group (SIG) that proposed to accept high quality conference proposals that explored a diversity of research modes, what Short (1991) would later parlay into a long-lasting and influential book called *Forms of Curriculum Inquiry* wherein graduate students and beginning faculty members could learn about a range of extant research done by curriculum scholars in the 1970s and 1980s. A few years, as reconceptualization had grown and differentiated, Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman (1995) summarized the field by identifying a range of interactive discourses or texts (languages writ large, I submit): historical, political, racial, gender, phenomenological, poststructuralist, postmodern, autobiographical/biographical, aesthetic, theological, and international. These offered then and continue to offer alternative viewpoints to the dominant institutionalized texts that focus on curriculum development, teachers, and students in schools. During the 1980s the CUCK SIG became one of AERA's largest SIGs and collaborated with Division B, influencing the scope, depth, and variety of sessions sponsored by the Division and the SIG. Eventually, participants in the SIG became key members and leaders of the Division, which by 1983 renamed itself Curriculum Studies. Meanwhile, the SIG, a beacon for curriculum scholarship, shifted to emphasizing critical scholarship more fully and changed its name to the SIG on Critical Issues in Curriculum. With the acceptance of both diverse forms of inquiry in Division B, feminist studies and cultural studies came to the fore and SIG's name was again modified to be the SIG on Critical Issues in Curriculum and Cultural Studies. The SIG continues under that title to provide opportunities for cutting edge work in curriculum studies, as does a rejuvenated Division B and AAACS.<sup>1</sup>

Major reference works on curriculum portray growth of the field in many diverse directions, for example, Philip Jackson's (1992) *Handbook of Research on Curriculum*, and an update on work of the field in policy~practice, context, and theory~history by F. Michael Connelly, Ming Fang He, and JoAnn Phillion (2008) in the Sage *Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction*. While these two handbooks provide renditions of major aspects of the field for scholarly audiences, a two volume summation also commissioned by Sage, the *Encyclopedia of Curriculum Studies*, edited by Craig Kridel (2010), provides briefer pieces on many topics, sometimes giving readers alternative views of key topics by different authors. The next generation(s) of curriculum studies, expressing new avenues of reconceptualization in dialogue with those who initially emphasized reconceptualization, was edited by Erik Malewski (2010), based on the 2006 Purdue Conference, titled *Articulating (Present) Next Moments in*

*Curriculum Studies: The Post-Reconceptualist Generation(s)*. More recent focus on the ways in which broad interpretations of cultural studies have combined with forms of public pedagogy were portrayed in a *Handbook of Public Pedagogy* (Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2010). Building upon the reference book *Understanding Curriculum* (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995), Marla Morris (2016a & 2016b) has developed a two-volume set of Curriculum Guidebooks treating major topics that have emerged in the literature since the 1995 volume. Sage commissioned a somewhat different kind of *guide*, i.e., a reference work that resides between the more detailed handbook and the more general encyclopedia, and I was glad to be involved in that venture (He, Schultz, & Schubert, 2015). It was organized around Schwab's (1973) curriculum commonplaces: teacher, learner, subject matter, and milieu. By this time, Pinar (2008) had also advanced a move toward internationalizing the curriculum studies field, which is, of course, represented by the creation of the IAACS and symbolized by the reference work that initiated this organization (Pinar, 2003). This focus on internationalization has doubtless provided a door of opportunity for the work of many scholars, including Paraskeva. While unquestionably laudable, it is indeed difficult to pursue international, transnational, counternational, and global curriculum perspectives that are not dominated by conquering powers: imperialism too often prevents or overpowers diversity.

Questions of diversity still rightly persisted. Why was the field to which many of us were devoted dominantly white, male, and American and English, even though we claimed that it should not be? Why were so few people of color or from other parts of the world acknowledged as part of the curriculum field? Again, Joel Spring, Native American, who had jogged our psyches with the term *corporate state* in the early 1970s, two decades hence put into bold relief the deculturalization of dominated cultures in the United States (Spring, 1994). Although this book was not explicitly about curriculum, I grimaced as I read and reflected on the massive absence of African Americans, Native Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Asian Americans in our conceptualizations and reconceptualizations of the curriculum field. Surely, each of these cultural groups pondered expansively on questions of worth. Why were they so seldom and minimally acknowledged? Why did we not seem to know or at least recognize the contributions of key theorists in each of these areas? Even Carter G. Woodson's (1933) salient curriculum work was seldom cited. I experienced feelings of respect and gratification to find an incisive and insightful article by Anthony Brown and Wayne Au (2014) in *Curriculum Inquiry* that addressed this very point directly, notwithstanding its criticisms of my books, along with others who were widely cited in the field. I was heartened to learn that

the article was the beginning of a larger project to identify contributions to curriculum roots from multicultural traditions (Native American, African American, Mexican American, and Asian American) that had been neglected by U.S. curriculum scholars (Au, Brown, and Calderon, 2016) and to look back at African American scholars who were often neglected in dominant scholarly literatures and institutions, such as Carter G. Woodson, Anna Julia Cooper, and Alaine Locke (Grant, Brown, & Brown, 2015).

During my retirement, beginning in 2012, one of my quests has been to find exemplars who created educational opportunities that were not captured by the funding, agendas, and mandates of the corporate state. In the U.S., I looked at Freedom Schools in Southern states that prepared for literacy and voting through the work of Septima Clark, Ella Baker, Charlie Cobb, Andrew Young, Bob Moses, Dorothy Cotton, and more. I thought of the whole White architecture of Black education from the Civil War to the 1950s, which I learned about through working with my first Ph.D. advisee, William H. Watkins (2001), who a decade earlier had proposed an expanded view of African American orientations for curriculum studies (Watkins, 1993). I looked carefully over a decade of work by my friend Craig Kridel (2015) on the little known Black High School Study, led by a too little known scholar William A. Robinson and patterned after the Eight Year Study (Aikin, 1942; Kridel & Bullough, 2007). I reflected on my former colleague, Bernardo Gallegos and his historical writings on Coyote (mixed blood) education of Spanish, Mexican, and Native populations in what is now the southwestern U.S., mostly New Mexico, and the myriad complexities of their school and non-school lives (Gallegos, 1992; 2017). I learned from the work of Ronald Takaki (1989) about what I want to call Asian American curriculum, and especially from the idea of living *in-between* cultures developed by Ming Fang He (2003) and her notions of living in (often self-imposed) curricula and pedagogies of exile (He, 2010; 2017). Some of the impetus for my search for historical and contemporary examples stems from revisiting Frantz Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth* (1964) and Edward Said's (1993) amazingly relevant in *Culture and Imperialism*. I continue to wonder about how curriculum studies can be a field that pays so little attention to insights of the immense proportion of Earth's populations that live wretched lives under new forms of the imperialism that is always with us and is even promoted by the powers that create fields, such as the Curriculum Field, and thus infuse the studies conducted by those fields. I know that colleagues, from Janet Miller (2005) to Noah De Lissovoy (2008; 2015) share such concerns. I am convinced that Madhu Prakash and Gustavo Esteva have rightly

called for an escape from education as too often practiced by imperialist institutions, as they encourage us to realize the wisdom in indigenous groups (Prakash & Esteva, 1998; Esteva & Prakash, 1997).

From the early years of my career, I have been impressed with so many curriculum examples of alternatives to the schools of corporate states, on the periphery of the field of Curriculum Studies: ways in which Myles Horton (Horton, Kohl, & Kohl, 1990) organized folk education based on the Danish Folk School example; the example of Summerhill School by A.S. Neill (1960), and Sudbury schools that were modeled after it; calls of Ivan Illich (1970) for communities to reconstruct centers of education that grow from and serve the publics that they are; John Dewey's (1933; Schubert, 2009a) illustration of utopians who pushed aside acquisitive values to create gathering places of shared learning to supplant schools as we usually know them; John Holt's (1981) inspiration that enabled families to form communities to *unschool* their children; Paulo Freire's (1970, 1998) work with peasant populations in Brazil that shows the power of problem-posing pedagogies. I looked back to some of my doctoral students who studied alternative educators in other parts of the world: the Ki Hadjar in Indonesia (Truly Wangsalegawa, 2009); Sandinista Liberation education in Nicaragua (Sheila Giesbrecht, 2007); school re-creation by Leo Tolstoy in his hometown in Russia (Joanne Donahue, 1995); and ways in which indigenous Mixtec Indians of Oaxaca Mexico self-educated (Eduardo Rivera, 2006). I have been intrigued by the schools developed by novelist and poet Rabindranath Tagore in communication with Ki Hadjar after the two met in a kind of exile in Holland. From interaction with Jason Goulah at DePaul University, his work, and the Ikeda Center in Boston, I have endeavored to draw connections between the value-creating curriculum and teaching of Tsunesaburo Makiguchi along the rivers of Japan and his death while in prison for his counter-militaristic curriculum ideas and practices during World War II, those of his student Josei Toda who furthered those ideas under persecution, and of Toda's student Daisaku Ikeda, who carried the ideas to new heights by establishing exemplary Soka schools around the world and two Soka Universities, by publishing over sixty exemplary dialogues, and many books that call for education that values peace, cooperation, and happiness (Ikeda, 2011). Recently, in China, I participated in an intellectual salon in schools that Gu Mingyuan has initiated as a place of public development of educational ideas, policies, and practices. Granted, all of these educational ventures (like those of Jane Addams, Maria Montessori, Rudolph Steiner, J. Krishnamurti, and so many more) differ in many ways; they are held together, however, by their development of

ethical visions as shown by David Hansen (2007) and colleagues. Furthermore, they have all been developed by publics who see education, and thus curriculum, as a process described well in Mary Catherine Bateson's (1989) phrase *composing a life*, while seeing that life as more than the life of a person, but as the life of humanity in harmony or dissensus (as Janet Miller, Bill Pinar, AAACS and IAACS projects encourage) with the rest of the living and non-living world or universe, as inspired also by Jacques Ranciere.

It is only with the above stage setting in mind that I feel I can comment on some of the central elements of Paraskeva's work on curriculum; I realize this preamble is too long and at the same time contend that much more prerequisite background should be provided about the need to overcome schooling by and for corporate states (or, better, statesian corporations) that govern the world. When I consider Parakeva's proposals and examples for the growth of curriculum studies, I want to review the work of James C. Scott, who says we should know how states see the world (Scott, 1998) and strive to overcome their domination (Scott, 1990; 2012) in efforts to imagine and practice curricular diversities.

Toward such ends, I commend Paraskeva's search for curricular insights and practices in places that rarely have been tapped by the mostly U.S., English-speaking, White, Western coterie of scholars that has had the temerity to call itself The Curriculum Field. Thus, I am hopeful when I see the emergence of sources from the Global South (Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and related oceanic regions). The aforementioned work of Spring (1994) and Au, Brown, and Calderon (2016) to include multicultural roots of U.S. curriculum can be seen as an illustration of inclusive inquiry and practice that is needed in many countries, regions, and communities. I concur that the good work already under way toward such ends needs to be recognized more fully. During the past year, I have worked with educational leaders in Mexico and in China, and have seen the lack of credibility given to indigenous, ethnic minority, and immigrant groups that exist in most places (see Lim & Apple, 2016; Yu, 2016). By opening our eyes, hearts, and minds to the *wretched of the earth* among those in the *Global South*, as Paraskeva advocates, we grow in our capacity to embrace those in desperate need throughout the world. It is noteworthy that his advocacy is not merely invocation or evocation; it exemplifies how ideas can be added powerfully to the sources of curriculum studies by substantially including works of Boaventura de Sousa Santos and numerous other scholars who have been almost entirely absent in the volumes cited in the Western (especially U.S.) curriculum field.

I compliment Paraskeva both when he criticizes curriculum theory of the past and when he finds insight in that work, as well. Ming Fang He (2017) has urged us to recognize the good done by radical departures from previous work throughout the past in curriculum literature, even as we criticize those sources and move on to other phases. There are important nuances in each of the transformations of curriculum theory Paraskeva recounts on the way to what he calls the *critical curriculum river*, which reminds me of Ming Fang He's (2003) river, which is, as she says, *forever flowing*. The ebbs and flows of previous eras are still within us. Nonetheless, we must be mindful of a key insight of the synthetical stage of *currere* (Pinar & Grumet, 1976), "I choose what of it to honor, what of it to let go...." (p. ix).

I remember how, on my first reading Linda Tuhiwai Smith's (2001) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, I knew I had to use it as a counter-valent text in my Philosophical Foundations of Educational Research course at the University of Illinois at Chicago. I used it for the next decade, until my retirement. What I felt implicitly, as I read that book, has been made explicit again by Paraskeva (2011) in his subtitle: *Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies*, and even more thoroughly declared in the title of his more recent book, *Curriculum Epistemicide* (Paraskeva, 2016), as well as amplified by Paraskeva and Steinberg (2016). Many ecologists predict that without careful prevention, enormous percentages of the world's species may die from human devastation of the environment within the next century. Similarly, indigenous languages are dying out along with the extinction of species as humans continue to hold a view of human supremacy (Jenkins, 2016) that valorizes those who dominate the human species. As I reflect on this reality, I cannot avoid associating it with the dying of epistemologies, i.e., of ways of knowing, particularly indigenous ones, and seeing what Paraskeva calls *epistemicide* as a fate as dangerous as the extinction of species and languages.

The seriousness of Paraskeva's warning invokes again the use of the term *language* by Huebner (1966) and Schwab (1969) discussed earlier. In 1966, I completed my Bachelor's degree and took a course in Philosophy of Education as an elective. It introduced me to realms of philosophy such as epistemology, metaphysics, ontology, axiology, ethics, aesthetics, logic, politics, and theology. I remember thinking at the time that these terms captured key aspects of my developing self, and I renewed my commitment to see these as dimensions or categories of my lifelong learning project. Moreover, I determined that I would strive to help others in this process of composing their lives. So, I thought that if I wanted to attend graduate school, which I did, it should be pursued in an area that dealt with such topics and

at the same time should help me to enable others to think about these matters as they journey through this world.

Now, as I think back on the analyses that Professor Jupp and I (Jupp & Schubert, 2015, 2016, 2017) did of the CUCK SIG documents, which show how curriculum studies entered AERA, I feel that Klohr's (1980) categories of reconceptualized curriculum studies were unequally emphasized. Primacy was extended to curriculum *inquiry*, and less emphasis was placed on other topics of study that Klohr mentioned such as: organic views of nature; individuals (rather than just credentialed experts) as creators of knowledge and culture; higher levels of consciousness; and liberation from chains of class, race, gender. Perhaps broadening inquiry to a diversity of forms or even methods was less unpalatable to gatekeepers than these other topics Klohr noted. Pondering Paraskeva makes me respect even more fully the choice of the term *language* by Huebner and then Schwab. They could have used the term *paradigm*, following Kuhn (1962/1970) instead of *language*. After all, paradigm was newly in vogue; maybe that is why they did not choose that term, which, again, incorporates the notion of worldview. Something I cannot quite understand makes me view worldview as less pervasive than culture as a metaphor for research postures. More than paradigm and worldview, I think *language* necessitates seeing the work of curriculum studies in ways that bespeak embodiment, enactment, and praxis in lived experience.

With the term *epistemicide*, Paraskeva (2016) enacts the call for new languages for curriculum studies. Harkening back to my feeling of being enlightened in my encounter with sub-dimensions of philosophical inquiry as an undergraduate who was attempting to pursue self-education, I wonder if curricular theorists should focus primarily on epistemology. As perceptive as is Paraskeva's calling of attention to epistemicide, I suggest that a caveat should be considered. Does focusing on epistemicide diminish attention to other dimensions of philosophy that are being exterminated in curriculum work? Do we need to broaden our gaze beyond the realm of knowledge and knowing? After all, we are concerned with *what is worthwhile* (needing, knowing, experiencing, doing, being, becoming, overcoming, contributing, sharing, wondering, imagining, and more)? Should we not warn of everything that threatens the larger whole of growing toward the never assailable pinnacle of worth? Just as Paraskeva admonishes that we should beware of epistemicide (death of knowledges), should we also beware of the death of diverse realities (metaphysicicide), the death of diverse values (axiologicide), the death of ways of being (ontocide), the death of ideas of good and evil (ethicide), the death of

diversity of beauty (aestheticide), the death of modes of reason (logicide), the death of diverse ways of living together (politicide), the death of ways of spiritually connecting with the essence or ground of existence (theocide)? It is intriguing that Paraskeva (2011, p. 117) begins a most promising chapter of *curriculum vitality* with the institutionalization of progressive education in the Progressive Education Association<sup>2</sup> in 1919. Should we worry about this institutionalization as a force that hinders, as well as helps, our journey on a *critical curriculum river*? How shall we make our way amid the rapids ahead of us in that river that portends destruction or death in each dimension of our journey?

To respond to this question, I find it illuminating to consider Paraskeva's image of *itinerant curriculum theory (ICT)*, introduced in his 2011 book and elaborated throughout the 2016 book. I am glad that it is elaborated and still remains, I suspect intentionally, vague: the vagueness should not be considered a flaw. I conjure up the image of a peripatetic philosopher (Socrates, Confucius, or Lao-tse) or religious prophet (Buddha, Jesus, Muhammed) as an embodied exemplar for ICT. Put another way, ICT reminds me of Dewey's (1934) *common faith*—a continuously growing faith in humanity and its capacity to form and reform participatory democracy and philosophical imagination, attending to consequences, re-envisioning and moving onward, seeking growth. I see this as an embodied theory that we need to imagine, pursue, and live—continuously evolving, never ending curricula which we should all seek to be and share. I see it as a shape-shifting theory that lives within us and is recreated in each situation encountered, striving to do and be what is worthwhile and just.

## References

- Aikin W. M. (1942). *The story of the Eight Year Study*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Au, W., Brown, A. L., & Calderon, D. (2016). *Reclaiming the multicultural roots of the U.S. curriculum: Communities of color and official knowledge in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bateson, M. C. (1989). *Composing a life*. New York: Penguin (Plume).
- Brown, A. L. & Au, W. (2014). Race, memory, and master narratives: A critical essay on U. S. curriculum history. *Curriculum Inquiry* 44 (3), 358-389.
- Caswell, H. L. & Campbell, D. S. (1935). *Curriculum development*. New York: American Book Company.
- Connelly, F. M., He, M. F., & Phillion, J. A. (2008). *Handbook of curriculum and instruction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Counts, G. S. (1932) *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: John Day.
- Cremin, L. (1961). *The transformation of the school*. New York: Knopf.
- Dewey, J. (1933). Dewey outlines utopian schools. *New York Times*, April 23, p 7. Also in Boydston, J. A. (Ed.), *The later works (1925-1953) of John Dewey*, Volume 9, (pp. 136-140) Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *A common faith*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- De Lissovoy, N. (2008). *Power, crisis, and education for liberation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- De Lissovoy, N. (2015). *Education and emancipation in the neoliberal era: Being, teaching, and power*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Donahue, J. (1995). *Leo Tolstoy's curriculum perspectives: A contemporary retrospective*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Eisner, E. W. (1979). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of educational programs*. New York: Macmillan.
- Esteva, G., & Prakash, M. S. (1997). *Grassroots postmodernism: Beyond human rights, the individual self, and the global economy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Fanon, F. (1964). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gallegos, B. (1992). *Literacy, education, and society in New Mexico, 1693-1821*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

- Gallegos, B. (2017). *Postcolonial indigenous performances: Coyote musings on Genízaros, hybridity, education, and slavery*. Boston: Sense.
- Giesbrecht, S. (2007). *Our collective life as curriculum: Speculative essays in a postmodern vein*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Graham, P. A. (1967). *Progressive education: From Arcady to academe*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grant, C. A., Brown, K. D., & Brown, A. L. (2015). *Black intellectual thought in education: The missing traditions of Anna Julia Cooper, Carter G. Woodson, & Alain Locke*. New York: Routledge.
- Greene, M. (1965). *The public school and the private vision*. New York: Random House.
- Greene, M. (1967). *Existential encounters for teachers*. New York: Random House.
- Greene, M. (1973) *Teacher as stranger*. New York: Wadsworth.
- Hansen, D. T. (Ed.). (2007). *Ethical visions of education: Philosophies in practice*. New York: Teachers College Press in association with the Boston Research Center for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.
- He, M. F. (2003). *A river forever flowing: Cross-cultural lives and identities in the multicultural landscape*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers.
- He, M. F. (2010). Exile pedagogy: Teaching in-between. In J. A. Sandlin, B. D. Schultz, & J. Burdick (Eds.), *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*. (pp. 469-482) New York: Routledge.
- He, M. F. (2017). Exile curriculum: Compelled to hope radically and live creatively. Division B Vice-President Outgoing Address. American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Antonio, TX, April 28, 2017.
- He, M. F., Schultz, B. D., & Schubert, W. H. (Eds.). (2015). *Guide to Curriculum in Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Holt, J. (1981). *Teach your own: A hopeful path for education*. New York: Delta Seymour/Lawrence.
- Horton, M., Kohl, H., & Kohl, J. (1990). *The long haul: An autobiography of Myles Horton*. New York: Doubleday.
- Huebner, D. (1966). Curricular language and classroom meanings. In J. Macdonald & R. Leeper (Eds.), *Language and meaning* (pp. 8-26). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Huebner, D. (1999). *The lure of the transcendent: Collected essays of Dwayne Huebner* [collected and introduced by W. F. Pinar, edited by V. Hillis]. Mahwah, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ikeda, D. (2011). *Toward a world of dignity for all: The triumph of the creative life*. Tokyo: The Soka Gakkai.

- Illich, I. (1970). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Jackson, P. W. (Ed.). (1992). *Handbook of research on curriculum*. New York: Macmillan and the American Educational Research Association.
- Jensen, D. (2016). *The myth of human supremacy*. New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.
- Jupp, J. & Schubert, W. H. (2015). Reconstructing curriculum history of the 1970s through archival work in the Schubert and Short Curriculum Studies Archives from the Georgia Southern Library. Savannah, GA, Curriculum Studies Summer Collaborative, June 12, 2015.
- Jupp, J. & Schubert, W. H. (2016). Reconceptualization of U.S. curriculum studies in context: The 1960s and the AERA Critical Issues in Curriculum and Cultural Studies SIG. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. April, 12, 2016.
- Jupp, J. & Schubert, W. H. (2017). Decolonizing and decanonizing curriculum futurity: An engaged discussion on *Conflicts in curriculum theory* by Joao Paraskeva. Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), San Antonio, TX, May 1, 2017.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1986). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958*. NY: Routledge.
- Klohr, P. R. (1980). The curriculum field – gritty and ragged? *Curriculum Perspectives*, 1 (1), 1-7.
- Kridel, C. (Ed.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kridel, C. (2015). *Progressive education in Black high schools: The Secondary School Study, 1940-1946*. Columbia, SC: Museum of Education, University of South Carolina.
- Kridel, C., & Bullough, R. V. Jr., (2007). *Stories of the Eight Year Study and rethinking schooling in America*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1962/1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lim, L. & Apple, M. W. (Eds.). (2016). *The strong state and curriculum reform*. New York: Routledge.
- Mills, C. W. (1956). *The power elite*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Macdonald, B. J. (Ed.). (1995). *Theory as a prayerful act: The collected essays of James B. Macdonald*. New York: Lang.
- Macdonald, J. B. (1974). A transcendental developmental ideology of education. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory* (pp. 85-116). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

- Macdonald, J. B. (1977). Value bases and issues for curriculum. In A. Molnar & J. Zahorik (Eds.), *Curriculum theory* (pp. 10-21). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Macdonald, J. B., Wolfson, B., & Zaret, E. (1973). *Reschooling Society*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Macdonald, J. B., & Zaret, E. (Eds.). (1975). *Schools in search of meaning*. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Malewski, E. (Ed.). (2010). *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment*. New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., & Schubert, W. H. (2000). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary curriculum memoir*. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
- Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., Allen, L., Roberts, P., & Schubert, W. H. (2007). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary curriculum memoir* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
- Miller, J. L. (2005). *Sounds of silence breaking*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Morris, M. (2016a). *Curriculum studies guidebooks. Volume 1, Concepts and theoretical frameworks*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Morris, M. (2016b). *Curriculum studies guidebooks. Volume 2, Concepts and theoretical frameworks*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Neill, A. S. (1960). *Summerhill: A radical approach to child rearing*. New York: Hart.
- Paraskeva, J. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paraskeva, J. (2016). *Curriculum epistemicide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paraskeva, J. M. & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (2016). *Curriculum: Decanonizing the field*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Pinar, W. F. (Ed.). (2003). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pinar, W. F. (2008). Curriculum theory since 1950: Crisis, reconceptualization, internationalization. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion. (Eds.). *Handbook of curriculum and instruction*. (pp. 491-513). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Prakash, M. S. & Esteva, G. (1998). *Escaping education: Living as learning within grassroots cultures*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Rivera, G. E. (2006). *Resistance among Mixtec Indians of Oaxaca to the official school: 1920-1952*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- Sandlin, J. A., Schultz, B.D., & Burdick, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Schiro, M. (1978). *Curriculum for better schools: The great ideological debate*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
- Schubert, W. H. (2008). Curriculum inquiry. (Chapter 19). In F.M. Connelly, M.F. He, and J. Phillion, (Eds), *Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction* (pp. 399-419). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schubert, W. H. (2009a). What's worthwhile: From knowing and experiencing to being and becoming. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*. 6(1), 21-39.
- Schubert, W. H. (2009b). *Love, justice, and education: John Dewey and the Utopians*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Schubert, W. H. (2010a). Curriculum thought, categories of. In C. Kridel, (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies, Volume 1* (pp. 270-272), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schubert, W. H. (2010b). Journeys of expansion and synopsis: Tensions in books that shaped curriculum inquiry, 1968-present. *Curriculum Inquiry* 40(1), 17-94.
- Schubert, W. H. (2010c). Outside curricula and public pedagogy. In Sandlin, J.A., Schultz, B.D., & Burdick, J. (Eds.). *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling*. New York: Routledge.
- Schubert, W. H. (2016). Perspectives on evaluation from curricular contexts. The IAE (International Academy of Education)-INEE (Instituto Nacional para la Evaluacion de la Educacion), Ministry of Education, Mexico City, Mexico, September 1, 2016.
- Schubert, W. H., & Lopez Schubert, A. L. (1980). *Curriculum books: The first eighty years*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Schubert, W. H., & Lopez Schubert, A. L. (1981). Toward curricula that are of, by, and therefore for students. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 3 (1), 239-251.
- Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Schwab, J. J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review* 78, 1-23.
- Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum, *School Review*, 81, 501-522.

- Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scott, J. C. (2012). *Decoding subaltern politics, ideology, disguise, and resistance in agrarian politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Seguel, M. L. (1966). *The curriculum field: Its formative years*. New York: Teachers College.
- Short, E. C. (Ed.). (1991). *Forms of curriculum inquiry*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Short, E. C., Willis, G. H., & Schubert, W. H. (1985). *Toward excellence in curriculum inquiry: The story of the AERA SIG on Creation and Utilization of Curriculum Knowledge*. State College, PA: Nittany Press.
- Smith, B. O., Stanley, W. O., & Shores, J. H. (1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*. [Revised ed.]. NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Spring, J. (1972). *Education and the rise of the corporate state*. Boston: Beacon.
- Spring, J. (1994). *Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.
- Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore: A history of Asian Americans*. Boston: Back Bay Books.
- Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. N. (1975). *Curriculum development*. New York: Macmillan.
- Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2001/2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tyler, R. W. (1977). Desirable content for a curriculum development syllabus today. In A. Molnar & J. Zahorik (Eds.), *Curriculum theory* (pp. 36-44). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tyler, R. W., Schubert, W. H., & Schubert, A. L. (1986). A dialogue with Ralph W. Tyler. *Journal of Thought*, 21(1), 91-118.
- Tyler, R. W. (1987). *Education: Curriculum development and evaluation (Oral history transcript interviewed by Malca Chall)*. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Regional Oral History Office.
- Wangsalegawa, T. (2009). *Origins of Indonesian Curriculum Theory and Practice: Possibilities for the Future*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL.

- Watkins, W.H. (1993). Black curriculum orientations: A preliminary inquiry. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(3), 321-338.
- Watkins, W. H. (2001). *The white architects of black education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Willis, G. H., Schubert, W. H., Bullough, Jr., R., Kridel, C., & Holton, J. (Eds.). (1993). *The American curriculum: A documentary history*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Woodson, C. G. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Washington, DC: Associated Publishers.
- Wraga, W. G. (2017). Understanding the Tyler rationale: *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* in historical Context. *Tiempo y Education* 4 (2), July-December, 227-252.
- Yu, M. (2016). *The politics, practices, and possibilities of migrant children schools in a contemporary China*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Zais, R. S. (1976). *Curriculum: Principles and foundations*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Collections of Newsletters beginning with the SIG's founding reveal this briefly described trajectory of curriculum studies in AERA. The first decade of the SIG is depicted in a short history by three early chairs of the SIG (Short, Willis, & Schubert, 1985), and interpretative analyses of the SIG Newsletters and related documents in the Edmund C. Short Curriculum Studies Collection and the William H. Schubert Curriculum Studies Collection at the Zach S. Henderson Library at Georgia Southern University (see Jupp & Schubert, 2015, 2016, & 2017).

<sup>2</sup> I would be remiss if I did not mention a rather pronounced error at the beginning of Paraskeva's (2011, Chapter 7, p. 117). It asserts that the Progressive Education Association was created in 1919 under the leadership of *Tyrus Cobb*. Tyrus (Ty) Cobb was one of the best major league baseball players in history. He played for the Detroit Tigers for over 20 years, and was reportedly mean and racist. Patricia Graham (1967) is cited as the source, but her mentor, Lawrence Cremin (1961), said the founder was Stanwood Cobb, which is corroborated in Kridel and Bullough (2007). I could not find a copy of Graham's book to check directly, but I asked Robert Bullough, Jr., to look at his copy, and he kindly informed me that Patricia Graham refers to Stanwood Cobb, and two of his relatives, neither of whom was Tyrus Cobb. Admittedly, I have made profound errors in writing over the years, and I do not think this error detracts from the substantial insight and high quality of scholarship by Paraskeva. I just thought that the point should be corrected.