

## EDITOR'S NOTE

---

This issue can be seen as opening an extended conversation between the two intertwined concerns of *JAAACS—North American* and *International* literatures. As discussed in editor notes in [volume 8](#) and [volume 9](#), these two interests work together to position North American curricular theory and theorists into relation with curricular theory and theorists from other parts of the world.

James C. Jupp, editor of *International Literature*, worked with founding section editor [João Paraskeva](#), among others, to establish the AAACS International Taskforce, which has served as inspiration and platform for *JAAACS's* International Literature section. In the Multi-vocal Response and Discussion section that he organized for this issue, Jim introduces five close readings of João's two single-authored books, *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory: Challenging Hegemonic Epistemologies* (2011) and *Curriculum Epistemicide: Toward an Itinerant Curriculum Theory* (2016).

In introducing these five essays, Jupp orients readers to three central dimensions of Paraskeva's work, positioning each of the essays in relation to these themes. Noting that "[g]lobal South intellectual traditions are understood as regional, derived, or inferior copies of Western European thinking platforms' with their assumed generalizability or universality" (Jupp, this issue, p. 5), Jupp suggests US curriculum theorists reframe their work in relation to "a newly critical, historicized, and politicized engagement in longstanding traditions of educational and cultural criticism from various geo-regions" (ibid, p. 3). Readers of the included essays by Maria Luiza Süssekind, Inez B. Oliveira, Maria Alfredo Moreira, Elizabeth Janson and Carmelia Motta Silva, and Todd Alan Price will find much with which to engage.

The section ends with two final essays: an author response essay that treats each of the five prior essays and recent critiques from the broader field; and a response to the entire section by William H. Schubert, a scholar who has devoted a large portion of his career to conceptualizing the history of the US curriculum studies field—a field that has now begun to open onto a broader world. Schubert situates Paraskeva's scholarship within this field, providing implicit counterpoint by returning readers to the nationally framed concerns that have historically organized discussion therein.

The first of two Critical Review Essays, by JAAACS editor Patrick Roberts, further explores this tension between where the US curriculum studies field has been and where it might now go, troubling the notion of ‘field’ as metaphor along the way. In his review of Paraskeva’s recent *edited* volume with Shirley Steinberg, (2016), Roberts, who chaired the AAACS Canon Committee, considers the intimate, reciprocal, and ultimately generative relation between canons and the work of decanonization. In a manner that resonates with Jupp’s suggestion above, Roberts draws on Spivak’s concept of ‘transnational literacy’ (2012) to suggest that *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* “promotes ... a transnational curriculum literacy that moves us beyond potentially reductive models of comparative internationalization” (Roberts, this issue, p. 10).

In our second Critical Review Essay, M. Jayne Fleener considers Craig Cunningham’s *Systems Theory for Pragmatic Schooling: Toward Principles of Democratic Education* (2014) in light of the related contributions that have been made in this area by others, particularly William E. Doll Jr. in his 1993 text, *A Post-Modern Perspective of the Curriculum*. While Fleener finds Cunningham’s project helpful in reflecting upon “how to unfetter the potential of students and schools and rethink education” (Fleener, this issue, p. 14), she also questions aspects of his approach and finds that he has not gone far enough in recognizing and addressing current realities of schooling.

Finally, founding editor Alan Block shares some recent thoughts on past experiences with hate in the classroom—both his own and that of his students—as these are informed by his reading of D.W. Winnicott’s ideas about confronting and transforming hate within therapeutic relationships. Drawing on Winnicott, Block maintains that, “[i]f we cannot acknowledge and manage our hate then we cannot realize our selves and we cannot see our students as separate from us’ (Block, this issue, p. 16).