

CURRICULA APOCRYPHA

PATRICK ROBERTS

Northern Illinois University

Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field

João Paraskeva and Shirley Steinberg / Peter Lang / 2016

The boundaries of the field are diffuse, so much so that one may wonder sometimes whether it has any boundaries at all. To some, that condition is troublesome; to others, it is exhilarating; to all, it can become confusing at times.

- Philip Jackson, 1992, p. 37

Twenty-five years ago, Philip Jackson concluded his introductory chapter in the AERA *Handbook of Research on Curriculum* (which Jackson himself edited) with a summation of what he felt to be the state of the curriculum field. At least some of the time, Jackson believed, that state was confusion due to the field's lack of clear disciplinary boundaries. It's a conclusion that begs an important question: Have the boundaries of the field ever been anything but diffuse?

As Jackson himself surely knew, there is an argument to be made that the curriculum field (for lack of a better word) has rarely, if ever, enjoyed the luxury of clearly defined boundaries despite its best efforts to establish them. A key historical example is provided by *The Twenty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Published in 1926, the 26th Yearbook reported on the work of the NSSE's Committee on the Technique of Curriculum-Making and was an early effort to bring disciplinary coherence to the study of curriculum in the United States. In his "Editor's Preface" to Part II, Guy Montrose Whipple wrote that the goal of the Committee was "to unify or reconcile, the varying and often seeming divergent or even antagonistic philosophies of the curriculum that were being espoused by leading authorities or by their adherents in this country" (p. vi). The effort to achieve synthesis was not wholly successful, as many of the committee members (e.g., W. C.

Bagley, Franklin Bobbitt, W.W. Charters, George Counts, Charles Judd, William Kilpatrick) added supplementary statements to the final report in an effort to counter the tendency of the agreed upon general statement to, as Rugg put it, “flatten out peaks of emphasis which, in the statement of personal positions, stand out more or less boldly” (p. 147). Given that the conceptual boundaries of the field were never firmly established even at a moment when the field’s leading representatives were deliberately attempting to do so, the belief that the curriculum field once enjoyed a well-defined disciplinary cohesiveness that the contemporary field has fallen away from is, perhaps, apocryphal.

This restless search for disciplinary coherence as a means toward institutional legitimacy might also be exemplified by the longstanding impulse in the field toward synoptic thinking. Schubert, Lopez Schubert, Thomas, and Carroll (2002) date the emergence of the synoptic text to the 1930s, a decade Jackson (1992) calls the curriculum field’s “heyday” (p. 21), and a time when curriculum was becoming increasingly differentiated in the academy as a specific domain of study. According to Schubert et al. (2002), synoptic texts attempted to “embrace all of the evolving components of the curriculum mosaic at once” (p. 70) and served “as compendia, encyclopedic portrayals of an ever-increasing stockpile of curricular knowledge. A major function of such books was to introduce new members to the curriculum field” (p. 71). But what falls within the synoptic field of vision? And who decides?

These questions bring me to my review of João Paraskeva and Shirley Steinberg’s valuable and timely edited volume *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* (2016, Peter Lang). Drawing on a range of theoretical frameworks, historical analyses, and international perspectives offered by contributors from, among other places, Australia, Brazil, Cape Verde, Chile, Italy, Portugal, Puerto Rico, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, and the United States, the thirty-six essays contained in this work (plus a brief Preface by William Reynolds and an Afterword by Steinberg) collectively represent a form of the *contemporary* synoptic text, which Pinar (2006) characterized as “both ‘documentary’ and ‘worklike,’ both carefully synoptic and ‘critical transformative,’ leading us—students and teachers—back to the original texts and forward to our ongoing subjective self-formation in society” (p. 13). Indeed, this movement is exactly what *Decanonizing* is able to accomplish as its essays (a handful of which are reprinted from other sources, mostly *Contemporary Curriculum Discourses: Twenty Years of JCT*) gesture to what I believe are more productively called *signature texts* (rather than “original texts”) in the interest of generating a

vision of critical, emancipatory education built on transnational understandings of curriculum theory and practice.

Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field is impressively cohesive even with such a diversity of theoretical and geographical locations. Although edited by Paraskeva and Steinberg, it seems clear that the volume is generally guided by Paraskeva's vision. Those familiar with his work will recognize in the two essays he contributes familiar constructs. Chief among these is his formulation of an "Itinerant Curriculum Theory" (ICT) which he characterizes as "a deterritorialized approach" or "path" that "is the best way not only to challenge the secular dominant curriculum canon, but simultaneously to address in a timely manner some of the sinkholes with the very counter-dominant perspectives" (p. 18). As an emblematic contemporary synoptic text, *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* captures exactly the kind of itinerant spirit Paraskeva argues for as it seeks to call into question signature texts while avoiding an oppositional stance that would reinforce any number of seductive binaries, for example exclusion/inclusion, canon/anti-canon, past/present, and national/international.

Before going further, I should note that I chaired the 2009-2010 American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (AAACS) Curriculum Canon Project Committee. In that capacity, I led the difficult effort to construct a curriculum studies canon to be reviewed and debated by the AAACS membership. In our deliberations, our four-person committee struggled to come to terms with what we knew to be criticisms of our charge, namely, that canons often serve the hegemonic interests of power elites to identify, purify, and police the horizons of official knowledge. Despite our misgivings, the Committee created a list of thirty-four texts and essays (*The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook* among them) published between 1855 (Spencer's "What Knowledge is of Most Worth") and 1970 (Kliebard's "Persistent Curriculum Issues" and Schwab's "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum") that we felt represented significant contributions to the development of the field in North America. This list was submitted to the AAAC membership for review in February, 2010. In its final report, the Committee noted:

[I]t is the committee's hope that the curriculum studies canon will encourage, through concrete understanding of the field's historicity, curriculum scholars to see their own work in complicated conversations with this history, and to imagine and work toward a

curriculum canon of the future that will represent a plurality of diverse voices, experiences, and ideas.

- The AAACS Curriculum Canon Project, February, 2010)¹

My goal in referencing this passage isn't to defend the charge of the AAACS Canon Committee or the list that we generated. However, I do want to suggest—and I in no way speak for the other members of the Canon Committee—that in many ways, the goal of *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field*, when taken as a whole, aligns with the goal of the AAACS Canon Committee to provoke engagement with the contemporary field's "anxiety of influence" (see Roberts, 2012). What garnered inclusion on the list the canon committee submitted for debate was not the belief that each text exemplified the best and brightest expressions of the field's ideals. Rather, the committee was interested in mapping *influence*—the ideas that mark historical strands of thought in the United States that have helped to shape and stimulate contemporary curriculum theory.² What historical texts should curriculum scholars read and study in order to understand and critique the present moment so as to posit an alternative vision for the emancipatory potential of education?

One challenge of editing a volume of diverse essays dedicated to a project of decanonization is that as a category of epistemological essentialism, use of the word canon can become over-determined, saturated with meaning in excess of its usage. In *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field*, "canon" is used to encapsulate the hegemonic deployment of Western epistemologies, the school curriculum, and the boundaries of the curriculum studies field. Thus, the essays move back and forth between the canon of official school knowledge, disciplinary canons, and geo-ideological epistemologies. This provides an understanding that disciplinary canons are never neutral and are complicit in the epistemic violence that can result. Decanonizing the curriculum studies field is not a call to draw more inclusive boundaries around which texts to include. Nor is it about establishing a counter-canon.

In the volume's introductory chapter, "Opening Up Curriculum Canon to Democratize Democracy," Paraskeva writes, "Opening up the canon of knowledge includes challenging and destroying the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being, thus transforming the very idea and practice of power. ... It is a struggle to save democracy by democratizing it—probably one of the most crucial battles of our generation. This volume needs to be seen in this context, a context that addresses the conditions for a new critical theory and a new emancipatory practice" (p. 22). Here Paraskeva elevates the stakes associated with a decanonizing project focused not

only on the field, but also Western, hegemonic neoliberal epistemologies normalized through the curriculum models that dominate schools. Deconstructing official knowledge hardly represents new territory (see of course Apple, 2014). What I think does represent relatively new territory is the way in which Paraskeva and Steinberg attempt to leaven critical strands of thought in contemporary curriculum theory with de-colonizing, transnational perspectives without reducing that attempt to either a stale, comparative internationalism or a narrowly oppositional postcolonial critique of the U.S. curriculum field (I will say more about this further on in this review). Borrowing closely from one of his intellectual touchstones, Boaventura de Sousa Santos, a professor of Sociology at the University of Coimbra in Portugal, Parakeva links decanonizing to a struggle for “cognitive justice,” which Paraskeva refers to as “one of the great leitmotifs of the decolonial and Southern path” (p. 16). As he notes, “The main goal for critical progressive educators should be social justice and real democracy, coupled with an acknowledgement that there is no social justice without cognitive justice” (p. 19).

Who is to be counted among “critical progressive educators” (or the “non-organized group of radical critical intellectuals” that Paraskeva also calls “a critical progressive river” [p. 10])? What is “real democracy”? How does one posit and work toward a progressive ideal of justice while also qualifying that ideal in terms that attempt to be always contingent, always partial, always contested, and never foreclosed? Attempts to achieve the balance expressed in this last question (and I see *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* as one such attempt) point to why the discursive boundaries of our “field” are indeed so diffuse; we wrestle with disciplinary legitimacy (our place in the academy) and definitional exactitude (what the hell is “curriculum” anyway). Animating these concerns is the anxiety over the field’s historicity out of which the discourse of canons has emerged. Pinar (2011) argues, “[H]istoricity—as a disciplinary structure—must come to characterize curriculum research generally if intellectual advance across the field is to occur” (p. 123). He further notes that “emphasizing the history of the field’s ideas, participants, and events” helps “compensate for our “presentism” (p. 124). Pinar’s point echoes one made by Gayatri Spivak (2012) as she quotes Pierre Bourdieu, “[E]ven the apparently freest and most creative of actions is never more than an encounter between reified and embodied history” (Bourdieu, quoted in Spivak, p. 139).

Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field does an excellent job of clarifying that the aim of decanonizing should not be understood as advancing an argument against “historicity.” For example, Part I of the volume, which is simply titled “The

Curriculum Field” is intended, in Paraskeva’s words, as “an examination not just of the emergence of our field, but also its different and international contours” (p. 23). It attempts to provide an impressionistic sense of the intellectual landscape and to plant a set of historically focused survey stakes that quite broadly map out the “field.” In the opening essay, which also serves as the introduction to the entire volume, Paraskeva offers a review of key historical texts, often drawing on the late Herb Kliebard’s *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, which Paraskeva calls a “masterpiece” (p. 4), a curious word to use in an essay that opens a book devoted to decanonizing. Paraskeva cites as well Schubert and Lopez’s groundbreaking work *Curriculum Books: The First Eighty Years* and notes that the book “unveils secular curriculum’s ideological and epistemological perspectives or discourses that emerged in each decade of the twentieth century” (p. 4).³ There follows an overview of Charles Eliot and the Committee of Ten, William Torrey Harris, Stanley Hall, Joseph Rice, and Lester Ward. Paraskeva offers this overview in order to foreground “how a superior cult of a particular Western episteme has been defended and legitimized since the turn of the twentieth century in the United States” (p. 5). As I suggested earlier, this is a purpose not all that divergent from the goal of the AAACS Canon Committee.

In addition to Paraskeva’s introductory piece, Part I also features essays by well-known scholars such as the late Herb Kliebard (reprinted), Barry Franklin, and the late Bill Watkins, whose forceful overview of the “Black Marxian critique of education in America” reminds us how important his voice has been to the field. Also included here is an essay by William Wraga, whose claim that “the contemporary field of curriculum studies in the United States has sustained a loss of integrity” characterized by weak scholarship and disciplinary fragmentation echoes Jackson’s 1992 observation (although Wraga is far less neutral than Jackson seemed to be). James Jupp offers a thoughtful explication of “cosmopolitan sensibilities” as a frame for working through the field’s “a-historical double bind,” and Jose Felix Angulo Rasco argues that to subject the school curriculum and the cultural content it transmits to “any type of canon ... is to carry out an intellectual perversity.”

Rasco’s essay is an important pivot to Part II: The Political and the Power of the Personal, which in Paraskeva’s words, “unveils a specific approach to the curriculum field that challenges the dominant curriculum forms overwhelmingly framed within the reductive canon based on the cult of positivism” (p. 25). A good example of this unveiling is Bernadette Baker’s essay, “Subject Matters? Curriculum History, the Legitimation of Scientific Objects, and the Analysis of the Invisible.”

Here Baker proposes “a rethinking of what has come to count as curriculum, as curriculum studies, and thus pertaining to curriculum’s histories and/or conceptions of the past” (p. 205). The value of curriculum historical scholarship is the diversity of its epistemologies “relative to a history of education scholarship” —her essay offers an illustration of the opening up of Western epistemology, deconstructive possibility, “interpretive possibilities” that “open onto all the problems of borders, territoriality, porousness, intersubjectivity, and suggestibility that now mark the social sciences, their inscription as Western, and the (un)availability of authenticity and purity in academic inquiry” (p. 218).

This question of what counts is a question of authorization, authenticity, and authorship. Giorgio Agamben (2009) is instructive on this point:

The theory of signatures (or of statements) rectifies the abstract and fallacious idea that there are, as it were, pure and unmarked signs, that the *signans* neutrally signifies the *signatum*, univocally and once and for all. Instead, the sign signifies because it carries a signature that necessarily predetermines its interpretation and distributes its use and efficacy according to rules, practices, and precepts that it is our task to recognize. (p. 64)

In so far as decanonizing is an attempt to call attention to those relations—rules, practices, and precepts—all texts can be understood as apocryphal text as authorial authenticity is called in to question. I do not mean to suggest that we question whether or not authorship of *Democracy and Education* is properly attributable John Dewey. Authority here refers to whether or not the text *qualifies* as a signature text within a particular field. It is this question of authority around which discussions of canonical inclusion circulate.

As critical method, de/canonizing (and I have introduced the forward slash in order to stress this point and mark it throughout the remainder of this review) brings into signatory relief a constellation of influences and ideas that have structured our consciousness of the field. In other words, decanonizing retains critical force only in relation to a canonical ideal (just as “democratizing” depends on an ideal of democracy). Charles Altieri (1990) writes, “Canons play the role of institutionalizing idealization: they provide contexts for their own development by establishing examples of what ideals can be, how people have used them as stimuli and contexts for their own self-creation, and why one can claim that present acts can address

more than the present. ... Canons make us want to struggle, and they give us the common questions and interests we need to ennoble that project" (p. 34). Pinar notes something similar when he writes, "As scholars, as human subjects, we are responding to a set of inherited circumstances that informs our assumptions, structures our thinking, and animates our imagination" (p. 124). Pinar makes it clear that the "supersession of these circumstances" through generative critique is "always informed by—even when reconstructing—these prior concepts and practices" (p. 124). That is the irony: As critical method, de/canonization depends on canonical idealization. But the anxiety of influence and authenticity are also anxieties about coherence and academic legitimacy. How can we identify ourselves as a field, and thus achieve legitimacy in the academy, if we lack coherent "verticality"?

The book's core is Part III, "Curriculum Inquiry: Re-Thinking/De-Canonizing the Canon," with Paraskeva authoring the essay that begins this section. It's important to note that Paraskeva indicates that Part III "offers different perspectives regarding the need for a non-stop struggle against dominant traditions, both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic" (p. 26). Through clear accounts of epistemic privilege and "coloniality," Paraskeva argues, "We need myriad ways to build a deterritorialized curriculum and theoretical posture that will force curriculum research to deal with multiple, not fixed, frameworks within ample and intricate epistemological waves" (p. 271). The primary strength of Paraskeva and Steinberg's book, in my view, is the enactment of that call, made by Pinar (2006) as well in "The Synoptic Text Today."

Dennis Carlson's contribution in Part III offers a deconstructive take on the curriculum studies field and its implication in the binaries that structure and rationalize the "modern university" (p. 330). Carlson writes, "I take [the current debate within the field about a curriculum canon] as a sign of a crisis of identity in the field, resulting in an attempt to re-anchor the field in an authoritative, unified, and stable corpus of knowledge and collection of texts that also implicitly and explicitly define and police the borders of the field" (p. 331). In my view Carlson here both misreads the intent of the canon project and commits the same overgeneralization that Jackson did in 1992, albeit for different reasons. Despite this misreading, Carlson's call for a "reconstruction of curriculum and pedagogy as *praxis*" (original italics, p. 332) is worth noting: "To shift toward re-thinking the "field" as *praxis* calls into question whether the word 'field' adequately describes what is by now a set of global networks and movements that have little in common other than the question: Whose knowledge is worth knowing, and for what

purpose?" (p. 332). But of course, "Whose knowledge is worth knowing, and for what purpose?" is no small question.

Carlson's essay highlights the need to deconstruct the institutional context within which debates over a curriculum studies canon unfold. Curriculum studies cannot be called a "field" without also positing an idealization of a center, a core, a canon, that provides protective coherence and rationality to our status as institutionalized academics and helps us defend our self-interested, disciplinary investments. But such coherence and unifying rationality is not without strategic value for critical educators committed to effectuating praxis from within the very systems they seek to disrupt. Spivak (2012) notes:

As long as we are interested, and we must be interested, in hiring and firing, in grants, in allocations, in budgets, in funding new job descriptions, in publishing radical texts, in fighting for tenure and recommending for jobs, we are in capitalism and we cannot avoid competition and individuation ... Under these circumstances, essentializing difference, however sophisticated we might be at it, may lead to unproductive conflict among ourselves ... Difference cannot provide an adequate theory of practice. (p. 140)

In her essay "Canons as Neocolonial Projects of Understanding," *JAAACS* editor Susan Jean Mayer, drawing heavily on C. Sandoval's book *Methodology of the Oppressed*, writes, "[A]s educators and curriculum scholars, we must always ask ourselves who we can trust to employ the conceptual tools of our field reliably and with perspicacity and a cultivated awareness of all that continues to privilege and celebrate the lifeworlds of those who have oppressed over those who have been oppressed" (p. 354). In illustrating how all of us working within the field call on intellectual touchstones that ground our work, from Dewey to Freire, both of whom might be considered "canonical" within the field, Mayer states, "Such conceptual markers must serve to orient the work of scholars within any field and can only live and breathe as the result of focused, collaborative study of what we have traditionally called canonical texts" (p. 356). I hear in Mayer's point a call for the kind of "situational unity" Spivak (2012) calls for when she writes, "It is a travesty of philosophy, a turning of philosophy into a direct blueprint for policy making, to suggest that the search for a situational unity goes against the lesson of deconstruction" (p. 140).

Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field has helped me to understand “de/canonizing” as a critical method for bringing into signatory relief the apocryphal boundaries of disciplined knowledge. Traditionally, *Apocrypha* refers to religious texts of questionable authority and authenticity that are denied official sanction and inclusion in the recognized canon. The term itself is derived from the Classical Greek word for “hidden things” (Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia, 6th Edition. [November 1, 2011]. *Apocrypha*, p. 1-1). In its inscription of boundaries, a canon makes visible “hidden things,” establishes the background against which the *Apocrypha* becomes identified as such. Curriculum *Apocrypha* refers not only to those texts of “questionable” authority (i.e., do they carry the right signature), it also suggests that the very notion of curriculum, as a social practice, is little different from canon formation, a point that at least in my reading is implicitly raised throughout this volume.

Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field also effectuates moving curriculum studies off the mark of comparative internationalization toward what I would call, borrowing from Spivak (2012), “transnational literacy.” This represents an evolution of Pinar’s generative perspective on the worldwide field as he expressed it seventeen years ago (and which in many ways was a call for situational unity in response to the context of that particular historical moment). At the 2000 conference on the internationalization of curriculum studies, Pinar (2003) noted, “[W]hen 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 state of things and for the foreseeable future, curriculum inquiry occurs within national borders, often informed by governmental policies and priorities, and is thereby nationally distinctive. I do not secretly dream of a worldwide field of curriculum studies mirroring the standardization and uniformity that the larger phenomenon of globalization threatens” (Pinar, 2003, p. 5). As its various contributors roam across a diverse theoretical, methodological landscape (in good itinerate fashion), *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* offers a transnational perspective that helps us see that in the current historical moment we need not think of curriculum inquiry as either nationally distinctive or globally uniform according to standards set by the hegemonic West *so long as we remain open to a critical method of del/canonizing*. In other words, as a contemporary synoptic text, *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* promotes what I would call a transnational curriculum literacy that moves us beyond potentially reductive models of comparative internationalization.

As I noted, I am borrowing the concept of “transnational literacy” from Spivak, who poses it as a conduit for an “interruptive praxis” generated within and out of our “habituated” but contradictory investments in capitalism (p. 152). “[L]earning this praxis,” she writes, “...requires us to make future educators in the humanities transnationally literate, so that they can distinguish between the varieties of de-colonization on the agenda, rather than collapse them as ‘postcoloniality.’ ... “[Literacy] allows us to sense that the other is not just a voice, but that others produce articulated texts, even as they, like us, are written in and by a text not of our own making” (p. 152). Paraskeva and Steinberg’s volume is a step in that direction. If within the curriculum studies field we can promote the kind of “transnational literacy” one that offers a “disarticulating rather than a comparative point of view” (Spivak, p. 152) on epistemological diversity, we can help to foreground de/canonizing as method.

I have already suggested that the application of Boaventura De Sousa Santos’s work to the curriculum studies field by Paraskeva and others writing for this volume represents a significant contribution to the field’s deepening interest in transnational curriculum. Indeed, many of the essays draw on scholarship from the global South. In this, the transnational character of both the book’s design and focus means that *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* serves in some sense as a book of translation. De Sousa Santos and Leonard Avritzer (2005) write, “We have emphasized the idea that the hegemonic model of democracy has been hostile to the active participation of citizens in political life and, when it has accepted it, has confined it to a local level. The counter-hegemonic alternative answer lies in the transnational articulations between different local experiments in participatory democracy or between those local experiments and transnational movements and organizations interested in promoting participatory democracy” (p. lxviii).

Transnational “articulations” or (“disarticulation” in Spivak’s terminology) seem most evident in latter part of the book, where the essays seem particularly evocative of praxis in the senses offered by both Spivak and Carlson. In Part IV: The Dynamics of Ideological Production, Part V: Curriculum (Counter)Discourses, and Part VI: Teaching Education, Narratives, and Social Justice, the essays generally become more focused on micro-analyses of the hegemonic ways in which neoliberal curriculum regimes shape/disfigure intercultural curriculum, identity, teacher education. Part IV, which includes essays by Patty Lather, Ana Sánchez-Bello, and Cameron McCarthy, “exposes crucial contributions for relational analysis of education in general and curriculum in particular” (p. 27). For example, Elizabeth

Janson's essay "Globalization: The Lodestone Rock of Curriculum" provides important perspective on how globalization, as the neoliberal expression of the colonial drive for economic hegemony and exploitation, forces curriculum "standardization and control of knowledge" (p. 474).

Part V, Paraskeva notes, "offers a diverse set of counter discourses concerning the intercultural curriculum and identity discourses, as well as neoliberalism and (neo)(de)colonialism and its implications in the construction of the subject" (p. 30). *Decanonizing the Field* effectively works these spaces of transit between the local and the global as it moves back and forth between the epistemologies that structure our discipline, and therefore our sense of the world, and the epistemologies that structure other regions of the world. This movement is one of the volume's greatest strengths as a whole. For example, Giovanna Campani's essay, "Intercultural Curriculum in Neonationalist Europe: Between Neonationalism and Austerity," diagnoses the absence of "full intercultural curricula" (p. 482) in European education systems against the retrenchment of "'nationalist' curricula" (p. 487). Silvia Redon's essay "Voices of the Curriculum to the South of Latin America: The Subject, the History, and the Politics" looks at how "the teaching and learning methods embedded in the curricular models" of Chile "operate as subjectivation practices" (p. 584).). In the essay, "Under the Gaze of Neoliberal Epistemology: Dislocating the National Curriculum and Re-engineering the Citizen," Joao Rosa offers a review of fourth-grade textbooks used in Cape Verde in order to illustrate curriculum processes of the "legitimization of official knowledge" (p. 568) for the colonial subject.

Part VI: Teaching Education, Narratives, and Social Justice "examines the complex mantra of teacher education that, especially under the gaze of neoliberalism, has been reduced to training" (p. 31). In her essay "Renegotiating Epistemic Privilege and Enchantments with Modernity: The Gain in the Loss of the Entitlement to Control and Define Everything," Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti provides a number of useful illustrations for how she conceptualizes the "discursive struggle" with modernity in her work with her students to scaffold the "re-scrambling of cognitive and affective assemblages from investments in absolute certainties (tied to one's enchantment with modernity)" (p. 319). Andreotti's explication of how she approaches in her own teaching the "re-negotiation of epistemic privilege" grounds her critiques of practice (p. 319).

To conclude, *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* is sharpest when dealing directly with the tensions and contradictions embedded in the concept of canon, for then it brings into relief apocryphal return. *All* texts are apocryphal, and *all* texts are canonical; they are one in the same. It's a thought that Shirley Steinberg comes closest to articulating when she notes in her too brief Afterword, "Indeed, one cannot live in any type of society without the expectation of adaptation to a series of canons" (p. 720). Relatedly, "the concept of curriculum must be tentative at best. That it needs to be, in order to change, but the essence of the *being* of curriculum should be continually changing" (p. 720).

Like Dennis Carlson, I believe that "field" is no longer (and in fact never was) an adequate metaphor for describing what binds those of us who profess an interest in curriculum matters, questions, and practices. Instead, I offer the following: Contemporary curriculum study is a transnational, transdisciplinary "distal confabulation" of scholars and practitioners committed to disarticulating the ideals that define our past and present. "Distal " because, like electrons circling around the nucleus of an atom, we are never quite able to get to the heart of the matter, and "confabulation" in the sense of both conversation and "the invention of imaginary experiences [or metaphors] to fill gaps in memory" (OED). That curriculum studies abounds in metaphor (like field or river) illustrates that curriculum is nothing if not a figure of speech, a theoretical construct always operative *as*—a turn of speech deconstructive of boundaries. "Canons," writes Charles Altieri (1990) sustain complex contrastive languages by showing concretely what competing choices are likely to involve" (p. 36). With an eye toward advancing a disarticulating transnational literacy within our confabulation, de/canonizing as method awakens our critical commitments to the apocryphal. For me, this is a point that *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field* makes over and over again. I would recommend it be on the reading list of every curriculum studies student and scholar. Oh, the irony.

References

- Agamben, G. (2009). *The Signature of All Things: On Method*. New York: Zone Books.
- Altieri, C. (1990). *Canons and consequences: Reflections on the ethical force of imaginative ideals*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2014). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*, 3rd Edition. New York: Routledge.
- Jackson, P. W. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.). *Handbook of research on curriculum*, (pp. 3-40). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Jacobs, A. S. (2000). The disorder of books: Priscillian's canonical defense of Apocrypha. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 93 (2), 135-159.
- Marshall, J. D., Sears J. T., Allen, L. A., Roberts, P. A., Schubert, W. H. (2007). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary American memoir*, 2nd Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2011). *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Paraskeva, J.M. & Steinberg, S. R. (Eds.). (2016). *Curriculum: Decanonizing the Field*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2003). Toward the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies. In D. Trueit, W.E. Doll, Jr., H. Wang, & W. F. Pinar (Eds.). *The Internationalization of Curriculum Studies: Selected Proceedings from the LSU Conference 2000*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2006). The synoptic text today. In *The Synoptic Text Today and Other Essays*. (p. 1-14) New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W. F. (2011) *The character of curriculum studies: Bildung, currere, and the recurring question of the subject*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roberts, P. (2012). Living in view of the past. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 8.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa (2005) Reinventing social emancipation: Toward new manifestos (pp. xvii-xxxiii). In Boaventura de Sousa Santos (Ed). *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*. London: Verso.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa & Avritzer, L. Introduction: Opening Up the Canon of Democracy. (xxxiv-lxxiv). In Boaventura de Sousa Santos (Ed). *Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*. London: Verso.
- Schubert, W. H. (1991). Philosophical inquiry: The speculative essay. In E. C. Short (Ed.). *Forms of curriculum inquiry*, pp. 61-76. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

- Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., Carroll, W. M. (2002).
Curriculum books: The first hundred years, 2nd Ed. New York: Peter Lang.
- Spivak, G. C. (2012). *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*. Cambridge:
Harvard University Press.

Notes

¹ The other members of the Canon Project Committee were Janet Miller, Nina Asher, and Erik Malewski. My characterization of the Committee's work and the ideas expressed in relation to that work are entirely my own.

² For another take on how intellectual influence within the field can be framed, see Marshall, J. D., Sears J. T., Allen, L. A., Roberts, P. A., Schubert, W. H. (2007). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary American memoir*, 2nd Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

³ Paraskeva overlooks the more recent 2002 edition of this book: Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., Carroll, W. M. (2002), *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*, 2nd Ed. New York: Peter Lang.

Appendix A The AAACS Curriculum Canon Project

February, 2010

The AAACS Proposed Canon is offered by the members of the Curriculum Canon Project: Patrick Roberts (chair), Nina Asher, Erik Malewski, and Janet Miller. The committee was constituted following the 2009 annual meeting and charged with formulating a specific list of “key texts in the intellectual history of curriculum studies” (AAACS Canon Project) that, in the professional judgment of the committee, would constitute “a base-line of curriculum studies expertise” (Pinar, 2008). The committee has fulfilled this charge and hereby submits its work to the AAACS general membership for review and discussion. It is now up to the general membership to: 1) Decide whether the proposed list should be endorsed, adopted, revised, and/or amended; 2) Clarify how and in what specific ways the creation and adoption of a curriculum studies canon will be used to help advance the curriculum studies field.

From September 2009 through January 2010, the committee communicated by email and met multiple times by phone. The committee first developed criteria for judging whether or not a particular text merited inclusion on the list:

- I. Eligibility Criteria:
 - a. Published prior to 1970
 - b. Major contribution that by all reasonable standards falls within the scope of curriculum studies.
- II. Evaluative Criteria:
 - a. Key text that made “a distinctive and necessary contribution” to the field of curriculum studies;
 - b. Key text that represented a “turning point” in the field of curriculum studies;
 - c. Key text that “helped change the direction and scope of curriculum studies;”
 - d. Key text that was generative of new lines of inquiry in the curriculum studies field.

Each member of the committee was tasked with formulating a broad list of curriculum studies texts that in their individual judgment met at least some of these

criteria. In formulating their lists, committee members consulted Bill Schubert's 2009 report as well as a number of other sources dealing with the history of the field. These sources are noted in the reference list below. Over the course of a number of meetings the committee members discussed, synthesized, and refined their respective lists into the master list that is presented here.

The committee discussed at length the challenge of being inclusive while yet wanting to avoid tokenism or broadening the list beyond what was felt to be a useful core. Thus, the committee ran into the inherent conflict that by attempting to name texts that met the criteria for the project it necessarily did not include many important works that might have brought more diversity to the list. However, while we may dislike the fact that the intellectual history of the curriculum studies field lacks, among other forms of difference, intellectual, racial, gender, and class diversity, a comparison of that history to the present day field illustrates both how far we have come and how far we have to go. If nothing else, it is the committee's hope that the curriculum studies canon will encourage, through concrete understanding of the field's historicity, curriculum scholars to see their own work in complicated conversations with this history, and to imagine and work toward a curriculum canon of the future that will represent a plurality of diverse voices, experiences, and ideas.

Finally, it should be noted that inclusion of a particular work on the list does not equal committee endorsement of the ideas or perspectives expressed in that work.

Chronological List, 1855-1970

1855-1900

Spencer, H. (1855). "What Knowledge is of Most Worth?"

National Education Association (1893). Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies.

National Education Association (1895). Report on the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education.

Washington, B. T. (1895). *Speech from Atlanta Exposition*.

1900-1920

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*.

Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum*.

Kilpatrick, W. (1918). *The project method*.

National Education Association (1918*). *Cardinal principles of secondary education: A report of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education*. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

1920-1930

Rugg, H. et al. (1927). *The foundations of curriculum making* (26th Yearbook).

1930 – 1940

Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order?*

Bond, H. M. (1934). *The education of the Negro in the American social order*.

Dubois, W. E. B. (1935). "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools?"

Woodson, C. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*.

Bode, B. (1938). *Progressive education at the crossroads*.

1940-1950

Aikin, W. (1942). *The story of the eight year study*.

Miel, A. (1946). *Changing the curriculum: A social process*.

Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*.

1950-1960

Smith, B., Stanley, W., & Shores, H. (1950, 1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development*.

Herrick, V. E. & Tyler, R. W. (Eds.). (1950). *Toward improved curriculum theory*.

1960-1970

Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*.

Beauchamp, G. A. (1961). *Curriculum theory*.

Alberty, H. & Alberty, E. (1962). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum*.

Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*.

Goodlad, J. (1964). *School curriculum reform in the United States*.

Phenix, P. (1964). *Realms of meaning: A philosophy of the curriculum for general education*.

Greene, M. (1965). *The public school and private vision*.

Seguel, M. (1966). *The curriculum field: Its formative years*.

Huebner, D. (1967) "Curriculum as concern for man's temporality."

Macdonald, J. (1967). "An example of disciplined curriculum thinking."

Berman, L. (1968). *New priorities in curriculum*.

Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*.

Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*.

Kliebard, H. M. (1970). "Persistent curriculum issues."

Schwab, J. (1970). "The Practical: a language for curriculum."

Alphabetical List

1. Aikin, W. (1942). *The story of the eight year study.*
2. Albery, H. & Albery, E. (1962). *Reorganizing the high school curriculum.*
3. Beauchamp, G. A. (1961). *Curriculum theory.*
4. Berman, L. (1968). *New priorities in curriculum.*
5. Bobbitt, F. (1918). *The curriculum.*
6. Bode, B. (1938). *Progressive education at the crossroads.*
7. Bond, H. M. (1934). *The education of the Negro in the American social order.*
8. Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education.*
9. Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order?*
10. Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education.*
11. Dubois, W. E. B. (1935). "Does the Negro Need Separate Schools."
12. Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.*
13. Goodlad, J. (1964). *School curriculum reform in the United States.*
14. Greene, M. (1965). *The public school and private vision.*
15. Herrick, V. E. & Tyler, R. W. (Eds.). (1950). *Toward improved curriculum theory.*
16. Huebner, D. (1967) "Curriculum as concern for man's temporality."
17. Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms.*
18. Kilpatrick, W. (1918). *The project method.*
19. Kliebard, H. M. (1970). "Persistent curriculum issues."
20. Macdonald, J. (1967). "An example of disciplined curriculum thinking."
21. Miel, A. (1946). *Changing the curriculum: A social process.*
22. National Education Association (1893). Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies.
23. National Education Association (1895). Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education.
24. National Education Association (1918). *Cardinal principles of secondary education: A report of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education.* Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.
25. Phenix, P. (1964). *Realms of meaning: A philosophy of the curriculum for general education.*
26. Rugg, H. et al. (1927). *The foundations of curriculum making* (26th Yearbook).
27. Seguel, M. (1966). *The curriculum field: Its formative years.*
28. Schwab, J. (1970). "The Practical: a language for curriculum."
29. Smith, B., Stanley, W., & Shores, H. (1950, 1957). *Fundamentals of curriculum development.*
30. Spencer, H. (1955). "What Knowledge is of Most Worth?"

31. Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*.
32. Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*.
33. Washington, B. T. (1895). *Speech from Atlanta Exposition*.
34. Woodson, C. (1933). *The mis-education of the Negro*.

Resources

- Kliebard, H. M. (1995). *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. 2nd Ed. New York: Routledge.
- Kridel, C. (2000). *Books of the Century Catalog: The Curriculum Collection*. Columbia, SC: Museum of Education, University of South Carolina.
- Marshall, J.D., Schubert, W.H. and Sears, J.T. (1994). *Turning points survey*. A compilation of different areas of professional preference of and influences on curriculum scholars. Columbia, S.C.: College of Education, University of South Carolina, Funded by the Curriculum Teachers Network of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 45 pps.
- Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., Allen, L. A., Roberts, P. A., & Schubert, W. H. (2007). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary American memoir*, 2nd Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Pinar, W. F., Reynolds, W. M., Slattery, P., Taubman, P. M. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Schubert, W. H. (2009). "Possibilities, recommendations, and suggestions for the AAACS project to advance curriculum studies through disciplinarity."
- Schubert, W. H., Lopez Schubert, A. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. *Curriculum books: The first hundred years*, 2nd Ed. New York: Peter Lang.