
ONE

Values and Politics in the Curriculum

Landon E. Beyer and Michael W. Apple

Over the past few decades, educators have witnessed a slowly growing but significant change in the way they approach their work. This change is only visible over the long haul, yet few things have had such an important impact. We are referring here to the transformation of curriculum theory and practice from a concern with *what* should be taught and *why* we should teach it to problems associated with *how to* organize, build, and above all now, evaluate curriculum and teaching. The difficult ethical and political questions of content, of what knowledge and which forms of experience are of most worth, have been pushed to the background in our attempts to define technically oriented methods that will “solve” our problems once and for all. Professional curriculum debate now tends to be over procedures, not over what counts as legitimate knowledge. This shift is occurring not only in education. As a number of commentators have documented, in many areas of our cultural and political lives, technique is winning out over substance.¹

The concern with technique is not inconsequential, of course. “How to’s” play a valued role in curriculum design and teaching. However, in the process, the field itself and the people who make decisions about what happens inside schools have become increasingly subject to the dynamics of what is best

called *deskilling*. The sensibilities and skills that were and are so very critical for justifying our educational programs, for understanding why we should be doing x rather than y , and for building a more democratic set of educational institutions, atrophy and hence are ultimately lost.²

This is especially serious today because, as we will note later, public education is under a concerted attack from right-wing forces that wish to substitute an ethic of private gain and an accountant's profit-and-loss sheet for the public good. What education is for is shifting.³ In the face of such a well-financed and well-organized attack, many committed and hard-working educators often no longer have the resources (neither monetary nor conceptual) to argue back effectively. In this way, schools become more like miniature factories dominated by concerns for input and output, efficiency, and cost savings. The more democratic visions of education and the multitude of creative strategies educators have developed over the years to put them into practice wither. We are now in danger of having them eliminated from our collective memory.

The *Curriculum: Problems, Politics, and Possibilities* wants to preserve that collective memory and wants to build on that memory to provide a set of resources so that those educators who are deeply concerned with what is happening to curricula, teachers, and students in schools can better act on the questions of what, why, and how to. It aims at reintegrating the ethical, personal, and political into curriculum discourse and decision making. In order to do this, the volume must be both critical of some existing and long-lasting tendencies (for there is currently a good deal of negative pressure on education and no small amount of less-than-exciting school practices) and at the same time be supportive of the more thoughtful and democratic tendencies that exist or are currently emerging.

One of our major goals in this volume is to stimulate thoughtful practice and more politically sensitive curriculum inquiry. Many people in the field with a good deal of experience will undoubtedly agree with this, for the literature abounds with material on the "reflective practitioner," and some of it is very good. However, we wish to go further. Our objective is perhaps best embodied in the concept of *praxis*. This involves not only the justifiable concern for reflective action, but thought and action combined and enlivened by a sense of power and politics. It involves both conscious understanding of and action in schools on solving our daily problems. These problems will not go away by themselves, after all. But it also requires critically reflective practices that alter the material and ideological conditions that cause the problems we are facing as educators in the first place.

As we have argued elsewhere to do this we need to think about education relationally.⁴ We need to see it as being integrally connected to the cultural,

political, and economic institutions of the larger society, institutions that may be strikingly unequal by race, gender, and class.⁵ Schools embody and reproduce many of these inequalities. They may alleviate some of them, in part due to the committed labor of so many teachers, administrators, community activists, and others. However, as the literature on the hidden curriculum and on “cultural reproduction” has demonstrated, schools unfortunately may recreate others.⁶ Because of this, part of our concern in curriculum must be with these connections between our educational institutions and differential cultural, political, and economic power.

Even though stressing the political nature of curriculum and teaching is essential, not all of our curriculum dilemmas can be totally understood this way. The problems associated with selecting from that vast universe of possible knowledge, of designing environments to make it accessible, of making it meaningful to students, all of these *are* political in fundamental ways. But an array of other crucial and complementary ways of thinking about the dilemmas we confront needs to be fully integrated into our relational and political sensitivity if we are not to lose our way.

In thinking about curriculum, a number of general issues confront us if we take the importance of thoughtful practice seriously. While no list can ever do justice to the complexity of curriculum deliberations, the following gives some flavor of the complex questions about which we have to make decisions.

1. *Epistemological*. What should count as knowledge? As knowing? Should we take a behavioral position and one that divides knowledge and knowing into cognitive, affective, and psycho-motor areas, or do we need a less reductive and more integrated picture of knowledge and the mind, one that stresses knowledge as process?
2. *Political*. Who shall control the selection and distribution of knowledge? Through what institutions?
3. *Economic*. How is the control of knowledge linked to the existing and unequal distribution of power, goods, and services in society?
4. *Ideological*. What knowledge is of most worth? Whose knowledge is it?
5. *Technical*. How shall curricular knowledge be made accessible to students?
6. *Aesthetic*. How do we link the curriculum knowledge to the biography and personal meanings of the student? How do we act “artfully” as curriculum designers and teachers in doing this?
7. *Ethical*. How shall we treat others responsibly and justly in education? What ideas of moral conduct and community serve as the underpinnings of the ways students and teachers are treated?

8. *Historical.* What traditions in the field already exist to help us answer these questions? What other resources do we need to go further?

The last set of historical questions is something to which the two of us have given considerable thought. We are very conscious of the work that has made it possible for the current generation of critically minded curriculum people to become more sophisticated in raising the issues on the preceding list. Many past and continuing efforts have been made to bring these issues to our attention by a number of significant figures in the field. Among the most important of these individuals have been Dwayne Huebner, James Macdonald, Maxine Greene, Elliot Eisner, and Joseph Schwab. Be it Schwab's emphasis on the ultimately deliberative nature of curriculum, Huebner's eloquent insistence that we focus on language, environment, and politics, Macdonald's struggles to put the person first, Eisner's attempts to provide an aesthetic approach to curriculum, or Greene's impassioned advocacy of a curriculum theory based on literature and the poetics and politics of personal knowing—all have provided a foundation and resources for the quest for a more adequate, and more humane, grounding for curriculum theory and practice that so many people concerned with curriculum are now undertaking.⁷ All recognize the inherent complexity of education and reject the comforting illusion that we can ever find the one right set of techniques that will guarantee certainty of outcome. Finally, all of them take education seriously, as worthy of our very best thought. Education is a process that must embody the finest elements of what makes us human, that frees us in the process of teaching us what is of value. For all of them, it is not something that is reducible to techniques of standardized testing, systems management, behaviorism, and competency-based instruction, to being a mirror of economic and industrial needs defined by the few, and so forth.

Our attempt to integrate contemporary thought in the curriculum field within the larger social whole has a democratic as well as historical context that needs to be respected, even cherished. The hallmark of too much curriculum reform work has been its insistence on a hierarchical, top-down model of conceptualization, development, and implementation that we find intellectually and politically dishonest. In most cases, "new curricula" and standardized techniques of teaching, management, and accountability have been developed by academics in higher education, research and development agencies, and state and federal departments of education that are then superimposed on the work of teachers so as to "improve" classroom practice and curriculum deliberation.⁸ As opposed to such a stratified model, this volume argues that meaningful curriculum reform must occur within those institutions, and by those people, most intimately connected to the lives of students: teachers, administrators, students, and community members

whose work in schools aids the process of genuinely transforming educational practice.⁹

One of the connecting threads of this volume is the extent to which the authors included here are involved not just in the production of critically oriented theory and research—although surely this is not to be taken lightly or undervalued—but in the concrete, daily political and educational struggles in teaching, curriculum development and design, the preparation of future teachers and administrators, and the like. As educators and political actors, the authors included in this volume are keenly aware of the responsibilities they bear in helping effect substantial changes in the lives of teachers and students and of those most oppressed by current social inequalities—especially as they occur on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity, age, social class, sexual orientation, and cultural affinity. The chapters included in this volume are eloquent witness to the position that scholarship, aesthetic awareness, ethical obligation, and political involvement can be separated only at the expense of a more just, humane, and decent school environment and social order.

By asking all of us to see education relationally, to recognize its intimate connections to the inequalities in the larger society, we are self-consciously aligning ourselves with a program aimed at what Marcus Raskin has called “the common good.” This program of criticism and renewal asserts the political and ethical principle that “no inhuman act should be used as a short cut to a better day,” and, especially, that at each step of the way any social program—be it in the economy, in education, or elsewhere—“will be judged against the likelihood that it will result in linking equity, sharing, personal dignity, security, freedom, and caring.”¹⁰ This means that those pursuing such a program “must . . . assure themselves that the course they follow, inquire into, [and] analyze . . . will dignify human life, recognize the playful and creative aspects of people,” and see others not as objects but as “coresponsible” subjects involved in the process of democratically deliberating over the ends and means of all of their institutions.¹¹

Compare this language—the language of equity, sharing, personal dignity, security, freedom, and caring—with the dominant educational discourse today. The language of efficiency, standards, competency, assessment, cost effectiveness, and so on impoverishes our imagination and limits our educational and political vision. It also, and very importantly, distances us from the more personal and situational language of teachers who must make informed, flexible, and humane decisions in very uncertain and trying circumstances. One should inquire, in fact, into the possibility that such attempts at bureaucratizing and rationalizing the work of curriculum and teaching is part of a much longer history in which the paid labor that has been defined as largely women’s work (we should remember that 87 percent of elementary school

teachers and 67 percent of teachers overall are women) has been constantly subject to pressures to bring it under external bureaucratic control and to eliminate the elements of connectedness and caring that such work has often embodied.¹²

And, finally, the dominance of the language of efficiency cuts us off from a significant part of our own past in curriculum work. One cannot read Dewey, Rugg, and other men and women who helped form a more socially sensitive tradition in curriculum without recognizing the utter import that the impulse toward the common good, toward a democratized polity and a democratizing culture, played in their own educational theories and proposals.¹³ While a number of the authors in this volume rightly wish to go beyond some of the political limitations of the positions advocated by these earlier educators, there can be no doubt that the same impulse provides the impetus for their own efforts. Without such a critical and democratic impulse, one becomes a trainer not an educator.

The substantiation of alternative ideas, forms of language, and images of possibility are central components of the personal and political issues that form the core of this volume. Thus, while celebrating and building on the ideas and struggles of those who preceded us, we also share a commitment to what Raymond Williams has called “the practice of possibility” as this may be realized in democratically organized practices in schools.¹⁴

What sets this volume apart from others is something else as well, however. An interest in the historical antecedents of the curriculum field and the development of alternatives that are at once politically informed and educationally appropriate has also prevented this volume from unilaterally dismissing those areas of curriculum scholarship that some critics might regard as traditional, conventional, or in the mainstream. Much of this scholarship is, to be sure, in need of critical interrogation, political analysis, and conceptual clarification. Yet we do not wish to follow totally a disturbing tendency toward rejecting the whole of the mainstream literature in the field—perhaps especially by some of those who have correctly sought to develop alternative theories and practices. This rejection, although partly correct and certainly understandable, is questionable on at least two grounds. First, such rejectionism uniformly dismisses all previous work when this is clearly not justified. Even though portions of it need to be challenged and superseded, we still have much to learn from those writing in this mode, as this volume amply attests. Second, this tendency to reject what has come before is itself symptomatic of the ahistoricism that tends to characterize our field. Although we may reject the aims and values of a good deal of conventional work in curriculum, we discount and overlook it at our own peril.

If curriculum design, and all educational decisionmaking, is to be a democratically based deliberative practice that is both critical of existing in-

equalities and powerful in envisioning alternative possibilities, then it should be open to the best of conventional work. Simply because a good deal of current educational research may have an interest in technical control and certainty,¹⁵ this does not mean that we cannot learn something from it, for we are dealing with very complex institutions, and good empirical work (conceived of in its very broadest sense) can be essential. As Schwab insightfully states, the work of curriculum design and implementation is complicated. Sounding quite Deweyan, he states, "It treats both ends and means and must treat them as mutually determining one another." For him, then, deliberation

must try to identify with respect to both [ends and means] what facts may be relevant. It must try to ascertain the relevant facts in the concrete case. It must try to identify the desiderata in the case. It must generate alternative solutions. . . . It must then weigh alternatives and their costs and consequences against one another, and choose, not the right alternatives for there *is* no such thing, but the best one.¹⁶

Now Schwab may see the process of curriculum debate as more "rational" than it really can and should be. He may also underplay the growing recognition that "facts" are not there simply to be found. They are constructed by the educational and ideological agendas of the people who ask the questions that generate such data. Yet his points about being open to as much, often contradictory, information as possible and weighing this in regard to *both* ends and means are not to be dismissed. Not all past and current "conventional" curriculum work is wrong and some of it may be very helpful in our attempt to "generate alternative solutions" and "weigh alternatives and their costs and consequences against each other." What is crucial here, of course, is that this "weighing" is done with regard to the values we noted before, the values of equity, sharing, personal dignity, security, freedom, and caring. And this can only be done if we look honestly and openly at the kind of society in which we now live, the patterns of differential power and benefits that now exist inside and outside of education, and the ways some of our current perspectives make it increasingly difficult for us to face this reality.

Perhaps this point can be made clearer if we reflect on the ways slogan systems tend to dominate our work in education. We have seen, for example, in the last several years, the phrases "back to basics," "effective teaching," "authentic assessment," and so on, paraded as the definitive cure for whatever educational ailments allegedly plague us at the moment. Currently, the main slogan vying for popular approval seems to be a commitment to "excellence," and the provision of programs and materials committed to its realization.

Such slogans are used in an attempt to garner support for the particular points of view or interests embodied by the group promoting them. In the current conservative climate, “excellence” has often served as an excuse to cut budgets, tighten centralized controls, and attempt to redefine the goals of the schools as primarily those needed by business and industry. It does contain progressive possibilities. After all, none of us would object to schools doing “excellent” teaching. However, in the social struggle over the means and ends of “excellence,” over its very definition, the voice of women, people of color, labor, and others seems to have been muted. The voice of “efficient management” has been heightened.¹⁷

The chapters in this volume provide the sort of analytic sophistication necessary to think through the issues, ideas, and values that attend the development of such slogans, so that we might see more clearly what these overused, often amorphous language forms actually mean. At the same time, the authors included herein are concerned with uncovering the personal, political, social, and ideological roots of such slogans, so that educators and others may make more informed and reflective judgments about the political interests that guide educational policies and practices.¹⁸

For those looking for a “how to” book that sets out the universal aims, processes, and orientations that should guide curricular deliberation and classroom practice, this volume may not be entirely satisfying. We have not attempted to set out such a complete and directive work for several reasons. First, such an attempt would belie the very commitment to democratic participation and organization that lies at the heart of this book’s political sensibility. While the authors whose work appears here do offer suggestions for ways of thinking about curriculum design and development, the restructuring of classrooms, enlivening teaching practices, and so on, they cannot go much further than providing such suggestions. The actual work involved in redesigning curriculum and teaching practices, the details of how and where this is to be done, must be worked out *collaboratively* with those teachers, administrators, community members, and students with whom most of us interact every day. Second, “how to” questions—for logical and political reasons—can only be dealt with after the sort of “why” questions explored here are addressed and at least tentatively resolved. How we go about the concrete activities involved in curriculum and teaching will be affected by our answers to the critical questions raised in this volume. Because, as we noted, all too often educators have assumed that “how to” questions can supplant more normatively oriented investigations and inquiries, this volume seeks to redress this mistaken notion by highlighting the importance of the “prior questions” raised in the ensuing chapters.

This is not, of course, to suggest that the kinds of issues represented here are more important, or more valuable, than the more concrete, physical, and

intellectual work engaged in by teachers and others. Indeed, the political nature of our commitments demands that we actively collaborate with others in the exploration of alternative practices. Only through such collaboration can the principle of the integration of theory and practice, of educational praxis, be actually implemented.

Because the curriculum field is one of those areas that contains representative, perennial questions and areas of inquiry, *The Curriculum: Problems, Politics, and Possibilities* is organized around these major thematic issues that tend to characterize the field, issues that themselves respond to the list of questions and concerns we introduced earlier. This volume suggests ways in which the progressive and critical perspective that has informed a good deal of recent curriculum thought can be harnessed in formulating alternative responses to the characteristic problems of our field. Within each of the six major divisions comprising this collection, we show how this more critical perspective can provide ways of thinking about a central issue that not only offer real choices, but that make clear the valuative, political, and ethical dimensions of those choices. In providing a more contextual and progressive analysis of the defining issues of curriculum studies, this book will extend the range and viability of that body of inquiry in a way that broadens the parameters of the curriculum field generally. And by including a diversity of views within the divisions of this work, we acknowledge the important questions and perspectives raised by such a diverse body of writing.

These perennial issues include: (1) the nature of curriculum as a field of study, both historically and within the current social and political context; (2) the problems posed in thinking about how to plan and organize curricula for schools; (3) the criteria with which to include specific content areas within the formal curriculum; (4) the constraints on curriculum development and theory imposed by the workplace of teaching; (5) the influence of technology on curriculum work; and (6) the problems involved in curriculum evaluation. These issues are largely constitutive of curriculum inquiry today and form the major divisions of this collection.

The Organization of This Book

Part I: Curriculum: Its Past and Present

In chapter 2 of this volume, Herbert M. Kliebard outlines the general history of the curriculum field, indicating those interest groups, values, and assumptions that have historically struggled for control of the school curriculum. This chapter serves as a reminder of the historical legacy of our field and situates the more particular debates that follow.

Yet, the history of the field is not only represented in these major “professional” interest groups. There were other, lesser known and even more politically active, segments of the community who attempted to build alternatives to the dominant models of education. Among the most important of these was the Socialist Sunday School Movement, a group of teachers and parents who believed that only by creating different institutions could more democratic visions be taught to their children. In chapter 3, Kenneth N. Teitelbaum explores the more particular political history of this lesser known part of curriculum, indicating the ways in which nonmainstream groups have sought to frame curriculum form and content in ways that further their own commitments. The general aim of this chapter is to provide a historical example of what has been done by committed groups of people who have recognized the inherently political nature of curriculum and teaching.

Only parts of this past have lasted and made an impact on schools today. What *are* schools like today? Summarizing recent investigations of the typical classroom in the United States, Kenneth A. Sirotnik indicates the current situations in classrooms in chapter 4. He gives us an empirical picture of some of the realities of curriculum and teaching. This reality provides some of the basis for the criticism and prospects for renewal that follow.

Part II: Curriculum and Planning

Chapter 5 outlines the central models and theories of curriculum planning. In it, George J. Posner provides an analytic discussion of the major ways of thinking about curriculum planning we have inherited and their implications for teaching. Beyond this, Posner provides a basis for the exploration of alternative theories and models that may be necessary for future, more progressive, curriculum work.

Beyond the conceptual boundaries of curriculum planning, we must become more sensitive to the politics of organizing and planning and to the history of curriculum making especially for marginalized students. Chapter 6, by Susan E. Noffke, focuses on issues related to multicultural issues in curriculum and the contexts of teaching. She brings to the fore the vital question of children’s relationship to knowledge and how that relationship affects the role of teachers and their efforts to create novel curriculum projects.

The possibilities for an integrated approach to curriculum, and its relationship to democratic classrooms, is explored in chapter 7. Barbra Brodhagen, Gary Weilbacher, and James A. Beane make clear that the quality of the interactions among teachers and students is vitally related to the kinds of issues and questions that can be considered in the classroom. Such interactions change the nature of classroom experiences for both teachers and students.

Part III: Curriculum and Knowledge Selection

While curriculum and teaching are political matters, they are at the same time intensely personal and theoretical ones. Our notion of self in this context is fluid, effected through the experiences we have that constitute our environment. As Thomas E. Barone and Donald S. Blumenfeld-Jones suggest in chapter 8, the emergence of personal narratives forms a central part of our notion of self. The narrative of teaching as always becoming links the teacher with past and present, and to an ethical conception of teaching and living.

Much curriculum continues to be designed and marketed by textbook publishing houses with their own internal "narrative," as it were. If we are to fully understand the meaning of the curriculum in use in our schools, we must understand the political economy of culture and how it effects the dynamics of the textbook publishing industry. These dynamics have important implications for the kinds of knowledge that are sanctioned in school curricula and the effects they have on students. These and related issues are explored in chapter 9 by Michael W. Apple.

Once we raise the issue of the importance of personal meaning, of increasing our responsiveness to other forms of knowing, we need to ask why it is that the forms of knowledge that curriculum designers employ and that we teach to students as most important *are* so limited. This is a question about power. Because of this, chapter 10 explores the politics of content selection in curriculum. While the previous two chapters in this section outline important conceptual and humanistic concerns regarding the formal curriculum, here George H. Wood discusses the linkages between knowledge and larger patterns of influence, status, and power. It provides one of the important boundaries within which curriculum as knowledge selection must be articulated.

Part IV: Curriculum and the Work of Teachers

Gloria Ladson Billings's interest in what culturally relevant pedagogy might mean leads her to consider various explanations for student performance, and to outline some of her own research activities. In chapter 11 she critically analyzes the deficit paradigms that have prevailed in the literature on African American students, and also provides examples of committed teaching for those students. Her work, like those of others included in this volume, involves a shift toward looking in the classrooms of those teachers through their own experiences.

Chapter 12 documents the ways in which teachers' work is caught in larger transformations that are changing the nature of the workplace. It is written by Sara E. Freedman, a leader of the Boston Women's Teachers' Group. These changes have important social class and gender connections

and are related to the deskilling, depowering, and depersonalizing of teaching. This has special relevance for this book, because changes in the teacher's workplace are part of a larger social and cultural dynamic that is affecting all levels of education.

The final chapter in this section, by Landon E. Beyer, looks at the contours of teaching and curriculum through the various ways in which education for democracy has been conceptualized. He analyses the meaning of democracy and related ideas and values that have been put forward by the new right. After critiquing that conception of democratic life, he offers a progressive alternative for reconstructing the school and rebuilding the school curriculum.

Part V: Curriculum and Technology

Curriculum, as Huebner reminds us, is about the accessibility of knowledge, about making traditions available to students.¹⁹ How is knowledge often made accessible to students? This is usually done through texts, teacher talk, and increasingly through technology. The first chapter in this section outlines some of the problems associated with the technicization of curriculum work. Douglas D. Noble provides a detailed history of the growth of certain aspects of educational technology, especially the computer. Here again we see the importance of understanding where we have come from, of knowing why certain things are made available, if we are to know the limits and possibilities of our actions in education.

Of equal import are the ways in which a variety of forms of technology may be reasonably and productively employed in schools. This is the task of Michael J. Streibel. While the previous chapter raises a number of important questions about the history and legitimacy of technology in education, such questions do not imply that technology is always and uniformly determined by this past. Although he is critical of some of the uses to which computers are put in schools, Streibel looks specifically at some of the more educationally productive and humane ways in which technological forms have been and could be incorporated into school practice.

Even with what Streibel tells us, however, we still confront differential power and social pressures to use technology in specific ways in school. The computerization of schooling needs to be seen in its current economic and political context if we are to be realistic about who will benefit from its use in classrooms. In chapter 16, Michael W. Apple addresses some of these economic and political dynamics. Linking growing technicism in curriculum with what is happening to people's jobs in the larger society and to teachers themselves, Apple broadens the sort of debate that must go on in thinking about how computers should be employed.

Part VI: Curriculum and Evaluation

Chapter 16, by George Willis, outlines some of the more humanistic problems involved in programs of evaluation. Particular perspectives on evaluation embody presuppositions about those who are the subjects in evaluative studies. The use of statistical analysis, for example, promotes a view of the participants that is decidedly different from that prompted by case study or ethnographic methodologies. Questions explored by Willis include the picture of humanness that is embedded in evaluative activities, the role of value orientations in deciding evaluative possibilities, and the relevance of the information that evaluations provide.

The possibilities of evaluation are further explored by Helen Simons as she considers the relationship between curriculum and evaluation in schools. The development of effective curriculum, Simons reminds us, should empower students and teachers to evaluate their own efforts, in the process providing feedback that can be instrumental in creating local curriculum development activities. Such emphases would serve to resist the tendencies toward national norms and standards for curriculum and evaluation that are removed from the day-to-day activities and lives of teachers and students.

In the final chapter in this book, Landon E. Beyer and Jo Anne Pagano return to the question of how values—in this case, aesthetic and ethical ones—are central to the process of evaluation. Through the use of aesthetic experience, narrative, and a sensitivity to the politics of schooling, teachers can further the pursuit of democracy by creating new forms of educative evaluation.

Notes

1. For further discussion of this, see Michael W. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum*, 2d ed. (New York: Routledge, 1990).
2. The concept of deskilling is elaborated in greater detail in Michael W. Apple, *Education and Power*, 2d ed. (New York: Routledge, 1995), especially chapter 5, and Michael W. Apple, *Official Knowledge* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
3. See Michael W. Apple, *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education* (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986); and Landon E. Beyer and Daniel P. Liston, *Curriculum in Conflict: Social Visions, Educational Agendas, and Progressive School Reform* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996).
4. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum*, 2d ed., op. cit.; and Landon E. Beyer, "The Relevance of Philosophy of Education," *Curriculum Inquiry*, 27 (Spring 1997): 81–94.
5. For empirical information on these inequities, see Michael W. Apple, *Cultural Politics and Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996), chapter 4.

6. See Michael W. Apple and Lois Weis, eds., *Ideology and Practice in Schooling* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1983); for some of the complex debates about this issue, see Apple, *Education and Power*, op. cit.; Michael W. Apple, ed., *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982); and Henry Giroux, *Theory and Resistance in Education* (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey, 1983).
7. A representative sampling of these works can be found in the essays of Huebner, Macdonald, and Greene collected in William F. Pinar, ed., *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists* (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1975). See also Joseph Schwab, "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum" in Arno Bellack and Herbert M. Kliebard, eds., *Curriculum and Evaluation* (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1977); and Elliot Eisner, *The Educational Imagination* (New York: Macmillan, 1985).
8. Arthur Wise, *Legislated Learning* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1979).
9. Some of the best routes toward such a transformative practice are outlined in Michael W. Apple and James A. Beane, eds., *Democratic Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1995); and Landon E. Beyer, ed., *Creating Democratic Classrooms: The Struggle to Integrate Theory and Practice* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996).
10. Marcus Raskin, *The Common Good* (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986), p. 8.
11. *Ibid.*
12. See Apple, *Teachers and Texts*, op. cit.; Madeleine Grumet, *Bitter Milk* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988); Nel Noddings, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984); and Jo Anne Pagano, *Exiles and Communities: Teaching in the Patriarchal Wilderness* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990).
13. The best single source for some of this history is Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, 2d ed. (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1995).
14. Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961). Compare this to the nicely articulated distinction between the "language of critique" and the "language of possibility" made in Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, *Education Under Siege* (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey, 1985), pp. 6-7.
15. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum*, op. cit.; and Landon E. Beyer, *Critical Reflection and the Culture of Schooling: Empowering Teachers* (Victoria: Deakin University Press, 1989).
16. Schwab, "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum," op. cit.
17. See Ira Shor, *Culture Wars* (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986); and Beyer and Liston, op. cit.
18. See, for example, Apple and Weis, ed., *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, op. cit.; and Landon E. Beyer, "Uncontrolled Students Eventually Become Unmanage-

- able': The Politics of Classroom Discipline," in Ronald E. Butchart and Barbara McEwan, eds., *Classroom Discipline in American Schools: Problems and Possibilities for Democratic Education* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998); and "Teachers' Reflections on the Struggle for Democratic Classrooms," *Teaching Education* 8, 1 (1995).
19. Dwayne Huebner, "Curriculum as the Accessibility of Knowledge," paper presented at the Curriculum Theory Study Group, Minneapolis, Minn., March 2, 1970.