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The thoughts in this paper were prompted by a reconsideration of my book *Thinking about the Curriculum,* which was published in 1978. As I looked at it again, my feelings were both positive and negative. Positive in that the book seemed more coherent than I had suspected in terms of the message it carried, but negative in that from a vantage point 10 years later, that message appeared to be seriously incomplete. Before venturing on an analysis of the incompleteness, which is my present agenda, I'll first of all say something about what the text was attempting to do at the time of its composition.

*Thinking about the Curriculum* was an invitation to the field of curriculum studies to adopt a certain kind of identity—which I will expand upon shortly—and to look at this identity in terms of a variety of facets of curriculum activity—research, planning, policymaking, and so on. I suppose the neatest way to sum it up is to say that it offered an exegesis of Schwab's pregnant remarks in "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum" that the field of curriculum was moribund, that what was needed was a redirection toward "the practical," and that deliberation was the method of the practical. My puzzle, which I tried to answer in the book, was about what moving to the practical would mean in terms of the activities of the curriculum—that is, research, which is the subject of my chapter 3, planning or decisionmaking (chapter 4), and curriculum innovation (chapter 5). These, it is to be noted, are the traditional commonplaces of curriculum text-writing (though with the omission of implementation) because I felt that respect for the idea of the practical meant it should not be separated from planning and evaluation.

---


because it, too, took its place in the practical view of planning, which saw it as the cyclical revision of proposals rather than the production of finished blueprints.

But first I had to say why my puzzle was an important one because, if you think the idea of the practical is significant, you should have practical reasons for believing that. My practical reason was that, in the late 1970s, I felt that education in general, and curriculum in particular, was beginning to assume a different place in the estimation of governments, nations, and publics. The first chapter of *Thinking about the Curriculum* began “The 1970’s are the decade of curriculum crisis. what could previously be left to the bureaucrats and the professionals is now a matter of acute public concern.” What was the nature of this crisis? From the vantage point of the 1980s we can, of course, see much more clearly what the issues were. At the time, attention was focused on the immediate problems for educators that arose from falling student enrollments and a withdrawal of apparently impoverished governments from provision of the lavish resources that had characterized the earlier postwar period. Now, however, we are better placed to discern some of the deeper movements that lay behind the obvious operating problems of school systems, and we can appreciate in a more fundamental way why, in the 1970s, the work of education and curriculum ceased to be the prerogative of bureaucrats and professionals and moved into wider and different arenas of discussion and decisionmaking. We can also appreciate why these discussions and decisions were targeted on questions of curriculum.

Anyone whose education took place in the 1960s or earlier grew up with the idea that state education systems were fundamental and important expressions of national consciousness and national identity. In fully fledged form, they were still the carriers of the kind of mission given to the infant systems by U.S. state constitutions: “to preserve democratic ideals and the revolutionary spirit.” Because, by definition, schools and education systems were a public good, the policy imperative was essentially a simple one. how to make education available to more and more children for more and more years. The postwar national reports in the U.K.—Crowther, Robbins, and Newsom—made much reference to enrollment but little to curriculum, while projects in the U.S., such as Headstart, which were designed to check student dropout, asked few fundamental questions about what it was good to learn, focusing instead on ways and means of making existing curriculums more accessible.

Only a few years later, however, the first signs began to appear that the foundations of the system—its very status as a public good— were beginning
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to be questioned. Gallup polls in the U.S. showed declining confidence in the public schools. In the U.K., the emerging voice of the New Right, through publications such as the “Black Papers” began to cast doubt on the desirability of funding schools that were not publicly accountable for the curriculums they taught. These deeper issues were being pushed to the fore by the transient phenomena of economic stringency and falling enrollments. If schooling was no longer one of the central means by which the modern nation state affirmed its character and ambitions to its own citizens and to the world at large, if it was now to be seen more as a delivery system for a product, then questions had to be asked about the nature of that product. This, of course, put the spotlight on curriculum and ensured that issues of what should be taught, how, and to whom could no longer be the sole preserve of teachers and administrators on the inside of schools and education.

As I said in 1978, “Crisis is creating a new arena for the resolution of curriculum problems. An arena which will offer new roles to public and to professional alike. But to invite public discussion and debate is one thing. To see what kind of a debate is relevant to curriculum problems and to provide the situations and skills that enable it to be adequately conducted is another.” This was the practical context in which I was led to try to see what applications of the practical might mean for the activities of curriculum.

In pursuit of my goal, I wrote my essays and hoped that they added up to something. The critics were kind and came out with messages of wholeness rather than complaints about yet another collection of disparate papers. If they were right, their verdict probably owes more to the solid groundwork of “A Language for Curriculum” and the other “Practical” papers than it does to my own skills. In those papers, Schwab truly provides a tool of great strength and wide utility for thinking about the problems of curriculum. In a great Chicago tradition, he recreates for curriculum the idea of a discipline as art or method rather than field of study or body of knowledge, just as Wayne Booth did for literary criticism, Richard McKeon for philosophy, and R. S.
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Crane for the humanities generally. The method is both widely applicable and integrating: Not only can it be applied to problems of planning and evaluating, teaching and assessing, and researching and policymaking, but it also shows how what we are led to do in those areas of curriculum activity can be part of a self-consistent project of educating. It does this because the choices Schwab made in arriving at his method were not simply intellectual choices but also moral ones. The practical is not a program for pragmatic action, it is a program for principled action.

If we understand this, and if we accept the general philosophical character of the practical as something more than just the elevation of practice to the dignity of the core concern of curriculum, then the tool or method that Schwab provides is a dependable one for analyzing problems of curriculum in any context or at any level. Using it, we can conceptualize the debate about curriculum in terms of deliberative problem solving in the classroom, the principal's office, the local community, or the state legislature. What kind of character would these debates have? Again, I return to ideas expressed in the first chapter of Thinking about the Curriculum:

- They would equate practical problem solving with a process of learning.
- They would ground their discussion in a variety of knowledge seeking procedures, not only those claiming to be scientific in nature.
- They would recognize that activities and situations have different meanings for different people. There is not simply one correct view of things.
- They would not assume that universally applicable, "right" solutions can be found.
- They would recognize that neither means nor ends can be used as fixed principles in the search for solutions.
- They would assume that the solution to practical problems comes only in action: They would not imagine that a blueprint or plan for action is all that is needed.

Briefly, then, my argument was that fundamental change in attitudes to schools and education was about to raise the need for new kinds of deliberation about curriculum, and that therefore the whole question of the nature of curriculum discussion had to be faced. The idea of the practical provided me with a program for analyzing discussion, or deliberation, and for identifying the issues that should be the concern of all the publics and professions actually and potentially involved in it.

---


II

Now, from our privileged position 10 years later, we can ask how accurate this appraisal of the position was and what in fact has happened to curriculum deliberation. First, I think we can agree that the diagnosis was correct. The curriculum has indeed moved away from being the exclusive concern of professionals on the inside and occupies the center stage of public policy. I can illustrate this change with two quotations. The first is taken from Schools Council Working Paper 53, The Whole Curriculum 13-16, published in the U.K. in 1975.

In the constitution of the Schools Council it is asserted that all its curriculum development work shall be governed by "the general principle that each school should have the fullest possible measure of responsibility for its own work, with its own curriculum and teaching methods based on the needs of its own pupils and evolved by its own staff." We welcome the decision taken by the Schools Council's Programme Committee to develop programmes of curriculum development which address themselves to the problems of teaching and learning faced by practising teachers in their own classrooms and schools. We see this as representing a shift from curriculum development administered from the centre. . . .

The second quotation is taken from the Education Reform Bill brought before the U.K. Parliament in the fall of 1987:

In relation to any maintained school and any school year, it shall be the duty of the local education authority and the governing body to exercise their functions with a view to secure, and the duty of the head teacher to secure that the National Curriculum as subsisting at the beginning of that year is implemented.

The contrast is dramatic: In 1975, a national body projected the curriculum as essentially a professional matter; 12 years later, the first chapter in a major piece of legislation is headed "Curriculum," and the effect of the legislation is to create and enforce a national curriculum.

In the United States, I see a story with some parallels, despite the federal government's lack of central powers over schools. The most talked-about report on education of the last few years was produced by a presidential commission and had for its title A Nation at Risk—not schools at risk or children at risk, but a nation at risk. The nation was imperiled, claimed the report, by the failures of the professionals. "Secondary school curricula have been homogenized, diluted and diffused to the point that they no longer have a central purpose." The remedy lay in emphasis on the "new basics" of
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12House of Commons, Education Reform A Bill to Amend the Law Relating to Education (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1987) pp 1 and 4
English, mathematics, science, social studies, and computer science. On this point the report is echoed in clause three of the U.K. Education Reform Bill, in which the core subjects are defined as mathematics, English, and science, while the other "foundation" subjects give priority to history, geography, and technology. And, following *A Nation at Risk*, the curriculum has become a prime concern of state governors and legislatures.

But what of deliberation? The scope of debate on the curriculum has been vastly widened—surely a healthy development. But the new arenas into which discussion has moved—politics and business—have not shown themselves hospitable to the skills of deliberation. However, before I pursue that point, I should make an important distinction between the deliberation that goes on at the level of major national and state governmental administrations about the curriculum of the schools and the deliberation that goes on in the schools themselves and to some extent in local areas and school districts. My sense is that, at the school level, teachers and principals have become more skilled in and committed to curriculum deliberation than they were 10 years ago. (I say this mainly on the basis of my own experience of teaching advanced students in the U.K. and visiting schools there.) I don't attribute this to the appearance of *Thinking about the Curriculum*, though I think the book was, perhaps, symptomatic of a wider professionalism that was growing up among practitioners through the 1970s and 1980s. More practitioners were taking part in discussion of the curriculum, more were following courses in colleges and universities, and more were meeting curriculum problems in schools that outside agencies were doing little to solve. This would be an interesting line of investigation to pursue in relation to curriculum deliberation. However, my present concern is not with the place where deliberation is (or at least may be) doing well, but with the sphere in which its principles are little in evidence.

In policy arenas beyond the school, the entry on the scene of interests outside the professional world of education has not, as we might have hoped, signaled a more wide-ranging reflection on questions of what should be taught, but an intrusion into teaching and curriculum planning and policy-making of attitudes and approaches stressing top-down control and short-term goals. The situation in the U.K. echoes the remarks of an editorial writer in *Phi Delta Kappan* in 1986:

> The current situation is strangely familiar. Eighty years ago, during a period of feverish reform, the schools—short on resources, as always—were called on to prove their efficiency to a society dominated by the interests of business. Today, too, the key words are *effective* and *efficient*. If you doubt that, read the recommendations of the National Governors' Association... Education has become politically important to the nation's governors—and that's good. It's what educators have long hoped for. Yet it also signals a reassertion of political control of the public schools—and that's ominous. This time around, the education community is playing ball with the big boys of the political and business communities—and the big boys are making the rules. ¹⁴

---

In the U.K., as in the U.S., the curriculum is coming increasingly under the influence of a business lobby, backed by politicians, which appears sadly ignorant of those recent best-sellers In Search of Excellence and A Passion for Excellence, which argued that the most successful businesses were those that applied principles very like those urged by Schwab in his analysis of deliberation. The debate is not a process of mutual learning, it is not interested in knowledge, it does not take account of a multiplicity of views. It does believe in "right answers," in ends as fixed principles, in blueprints as solutions to problems. Whatever success has been achieved, and I believe it is considerable, in raising the quality of deliberation in schools and among teachers, we must admit that educators have so far failed to address questions of the quality of curriculum deliberation involving broader communities. And here the deficiencies of Thinking about the Curriculum have to be faced. The diagnosis may have been right, the remedies may have been right, but in some centrally important ways, the book failed to follow through the logic of its position.

III

The book's deficiencies stemmed, as I see it, from the familiar problem of putting new wine in old bottles, the problem Schwab discusses in "The 'Impossible' Role of the Teacher in Progressive Education." There he points to the difficulty that Dewey faced in communicating his vision of education. Dewey seeks to persuade men to teach a mode of learning and knowledge which they themselves do not know and which they cannot grasp by their habitual ways of learning. It is the same problem of breaking the apparently unbreakable circle which Plato faces in Meno and Augustine in his treatise, On the Teacher.

If the enterprise is to be successful, it is the new logic and not some radically mistaken version of it which must be tried. Yet this is the unlikeliest outcome. For, if the new logic be described in its own new terms, its hearers must struggle hard for understanding by whatever means they have. These means, however, are the old modes of understanding, stemming from the old logic. My exercise in communicating the nature and implications of the practical was hobbled by my inability to throw off the assumptions of the old logic. The problems I saw were the problems of an enterprise in the process of being ejected from its familiar and comfortable territory and sent to fend for itself in unknown regions. But the commonplaces of my curriculum text were little changed from the commonplaces of all such texts. curriculum planning, curriculum research, and curriculum innovation, understood in ways not very
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different from those hallowed by long usage. But, to adapt the metaphor of the editorial in *Phi Delta Kappan*, were these not the concerns of the little league? Where was the discussion of politics, of government, of interest groups, of national institutions—in short, of the field inhabited by the major league players? In a sense, government and the community are right to make greater and more specific demands on educators. We have suffered in the past from too much isolation in the comfortable, if demanding, world of schools and colleges. The intrusion of the outside world has found us unprepared. I am reminded of a phrase of Francis Cornford, written at the beginning of this century when the older English universities were truly ivory towers. "The Great World," he said, was "a distant and rather terrifying region, which it is very necessary to keep in touch with, though it must not be allowed on any account to touch you." We have all in one way or another been touched by the Great World in recent years, and there is every sign that educators will continue to live in its shadow—or its spotlight. The choice of metaphor marks the pessimists and the optimists among us.

IV

I don’t believe, however, that any of this negates the basic agenda of *Thinking about the Curriculum*. The possibilities that ideas of the practical and of deliberation have for giving direction and purpose to the activities of curriculum continue to demand our attention. But we must think with renewed vigor about how these ideas can be brought into contact with and made relevant to the new arena of public debate about what should be taught in schools. In *Thinking about the Curriculum*, I said that the conception of the practical introduced “a fresh and more appropriate climate of metaphor into curriculum theory and practice” by stressing key words like action, judgment, deliberation, appreciation, criticism, responsibility, argument, and justification. But those are not the words we immediately think of when we see what has been done, in the U.K. at least, in national curriculum policymaking in recent years. Is it the case, as some have charged, that these ideas of deliberation and practical reasoning emerged in protected academic environments and are not adaptable to life in the Great World? Are such virtuous notions best kept within the communities that can nurture them, so that, as Dewey put it in an unusual outburst of eloquence, we can avoid “the pathos of unfulfilled expectation, the tragedy of defeated purpose and ideas, the catastrophes of accident”? Indeed, this theme of virtue versus accident, or virtue
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versus corruption, is one that haunts the "Practical" papers, though only seldom does it surface in an explicit way. We see it most clearly in "The Practical 4," in which teachers in their small communities are put forward as the repositories of virtue and pitted against "Moscow," which symbolizes the corrupting influence of centralism and bureaucracy in American life.

I explored a similar theme myself in a recent paper on the language of reports on professional education. In reading a number of documents—mainly in the area of medical education—I was struck by the frequent juxtaposition of virtuous language embodying metaphors of caring and concern with the language of power status and control, which represents the other side of the coin. I tried to explain this by reference to Maclntyre's *After Virtue*, in which he analyzes the relationship of practice to institution.

Practices must not be confused with institutions. Chess, physics and medicine are practices; chess clubs, laboratories, universities and hospitals are institutions. Institutions are characteristically and necessarily concerned with external goods. They are involved in acquiring money and other material goods; they are structured in terms of power and status, and they distribute money, power and status as rewards. Nor could they do otherwise if they are to sustain not only themselves, but also the practices of which they are the bearers. For no practices can survive for any length of time unsustained by institutions.

In this passage, Maclntyre draws our attention not only to the potential conflict between practice and institution, but also to their mutual dependence. Institutions are able to lay claim to society's resources on the promise that what they use those resources to support is good and worthwhile. Government, even of the most rigidly centralized and hierarchical kind, claims credit for its support of education, not on the basis that it exhibits and promotes centralism and hierarchy, but because it is a public good and fosters a virtuous population—even when good and virtue are narrowly construed. On the other hand, education as practice will survive only with the greatest difficulty if it is not in some sense institutionalized.

To bring the argument closer to the concerns of curriculum, deliberation about it—at any level—is only to the point if we accept the fact that results can flow from that deliberation through the involvement of institutions as they exist with their necessary commitment to styles of life other than those with which deliberation, as conventionally construed, might feel comfortable. I rely here on the definition of curriculum decisionmaking put forward by Scheffler. We consider decisions on educational content to be responsible.

---

or justifiable acts *with public significance*  

We must think about curriculum, then, not simply as practice but as institutionalized practice. The rather inchoate commonplace of milieu—the only commonplace that directly refers to the world beyond the school and classroom—has to be given shape and sharpness.

V

If we are to clarify our thoughts on these matters, we have a number of directions in which we can go. My own route has taken me along pathways of history and sociology, so those are the directions I will briefly consider. I recognize that many other disciplines and fields of inquiry touching on public policymaking should also claim our attention.

*Thinking about the Curriculum* offered very little in the way of exploration of history, which at this distance I find strange, since history presents instructive examples of how the practice/institution relationship has been managed in the past. It also shows us how the whole idea of curriculum was, from the outset, embedded in the development of institutions. Curriculum, in Europe, emerged as an organizing concept in the late 16th century. Prior to that, learning had taken place piecemeal, on an ad hoc basis. For example, students at medieval universities such as Paris or Bologna attended to whatever learning they pleased, came and went as they pleased, and received no final degree or testimonial. The context of education was "a loose-textured organizational form where student absenteeism or the fact that enrolment did not match attendance was not so much a failure (or breakdown) of organisation as a perfectly efficient response to the demands that were placed upon it." Use of the word curriculum signaled the arrival of a more closely knit structure of educational activities, and particularly of moves to make them sequential and capable of completion. "Method" was invoked to systematize teaching and learning and clear up the apparently ragbag nature of medieval scholarship. All of this depended on a closer alliance between institution and the emerging practice of curriculum. Administration became an important part of university life, and students and teachers ceased to regulate their own affairs. The new statutes were no longer content simply to fix the general conditions of student life (prohibitions against playing noisy games, for example, or bringing women into college "unless they are so respectably escorted that the Prior of the house and the scholars are convinced that no evil suspicion..."
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can result." Now they went into details of everyday life, laying down a routine and a timetable of study. Henceforth, the gap between student and teacher widened. A chain of command was established from principal or bursar to teacher and student. The drive toward a modern conception of curriculum was encapsulated in the statement of Ramus in his *Dialectic* that "method is the disposition by which that enunciation is placed first which is first in the absolute order of knowledge, that next which is next, and so on." And this had its counterpart in the rise of recognizably modern institutions, marshaling and distributing resources and built around structures of power, hierarchy, and control.

Here, then, is one thing to think about as we try to extend the utility of the idea of deliberation: that decisions on the curriculum as the outcome of "responsible or justifiable acts with public significance" are historically interwoven with the growth of public institutions; first with organized and regulated schools and colleges, and later with local and central governments and bureaucracies.

But within a strictly historical frame of reference, some of the significance of this interplay of curriculum and institution still eludes us. Why did the experience of school and college begin to assume such importance? How did widely shared meanings become attached to the study of classical texts, enrollment in secondary schooling, or the possession of degrees and diplomas? What has made educational practices definitive of national character? The genesis of this paper was an invitation to reflect on something written 10 years ago. What was special about the number 10? Objectively, nothing. A number is simply one in a sequence, and the way it gets written is an accident of the code we happen to use. Yet we do think there is something special about 13, 21, and the Bicentennial. The comparison is not frivolous. Why, in England, do we choose the age of 11 to mark the transition from the primary to the secondary curriculum? There is no demonstrable logic to this, yet 11 has become an age invested with huge significance for all English children. Ariès, in *Centuries of Childhood*, presses the analysis much further. All curriculums were, at one time, poorly associated with the age of the students enrolled in them. Even in the early 19th century in France and England, when a hierarchy of classes had been established in secondary schools, a student of 14 might be found in any class from the lowest to the highest. The immense significance of enrollment in age-related classes has to be seen as a kind of social accident. No doubt, with some exercise of ingenuity, we can suggest why some accidents were more likely to occur than others, but what is surer, and more practically

---
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important, is that once such things achieve social and cultural significance, they acquire a life of their own. They become institutionalized in a dual sense. They need institutions to preserve them, but they also become institutions in the more elusive sense of an idea that is integral to a culture and seen as significant by most of its members. Being in the 3rd grade becomes an important defining characteristic of a person—as does being a 3rd grade teacher.

In *Thinking about the Curriculum* I quoted, approvingly, McKinney and Westbury's comment that the curriculum “is an idea that becomes a thing.” The point of the remark was to stress one aspect of the relationship between curriculum and institution. As they put it: “Development and renewal are only meaningful notions in so far as they are embedded in structures.” Thus, deliberation, to be effective, must concern itself with the nature of those institutions within which renewal is aspired to. However, I now think we should also consider the opposite proposition: A curriculum is a thing that becomes an idea. Once it has been institutionalized in the first sense, it also has to be institutionalized in the second sense. It must become culturally significant. Otherwise external support will be lacking, and it will fail. Many examples could be given. Following the Education Act of 1944, technical secondary schools were set up in England. Curriculums and examinations were devised and teachers trained. But the technical curriculum was never institutionalized in the public mind. The idea of the grammar school was too powerfully entrenched, and technical high schools disappeared. Today we see traditional ideas, institutionalized in society in this latter sense, still at work. Indeed, as curriculum debate extends beyond the sphere of the professionals, it becomes more open to the influence of basic and unexamined archetypes: The new Education Bill repeats, almost to the letter, the curriculum specified in the 1904 grant regulations for secondary schools, and the conclusions of the Committee of Ten live on in the proposals of *A Nation at Risk*. But these are not matters to be dismissed as unworthy of the attention of better informed commentators; for we err if we see the curriculum too much as thing or object (which is the pitfall of the professional) and give too little consideration to the curriculum as idea, as symbol, as cultural institution. Meyer, in his discussion of the role of the teacher, illustrates the point I am trying to make:

From a technical point of view, teachers are almost unrelievably authoritarian; they talk all the time, dominate the agenda completely, and so on. Yet students rarely experience education in this way: they experience the larger invisible reality of education. . . . Because they are attending to [this] larger reality of “teacher” as an institutional category, students are often surprisingly inattentive to the particular character-
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Perhaps effective teaching requires less the creating of a distinctive local world in the classroom than the actuation of the larger institutional one—and perhaps this requires the partial concealment of the individual identity of the teacher behind the general role. It seems possible, even, that a teacher who blandly plays the conventional role has found the most effective educational strategy.

VI

These are my thoughts on the gaps that exist in our conception of the practical and my suggestions for places in which to find ideas to repair them. Basically, what is needed is a way of understanding institutions as the necessary context for curriculum deliberation and curriculum action— institutions as the partners of practice, institutions as the vehicles through which curriculums become real, and the curriculum itself as a social and cultural institution. Without such understanding, it will be hard for the study of the curriculum to establish its position as a relevant and integral part of the new, enlarged debate on schooling and education.

Schwab, as is well known, identified five crucial commonplaces that need to be represented in curriculum deliberation—teachers, learners, the milieu, subject matter, and curriculum-making. The special responsibility of curriculum scholars is for curriculum-making. A few years ago, we thought we knew what that meant. Now, as the milieus change, our understanding needs modification. I have, I think, in my discussion of neglect of ideas of institutions and institutional contexts, identified the kind of modification that has to be looked for. What I have not done, and what remains as work to be accomplished, is to show how such a modification could be brought about. Can we do it simply by opening up new lines of inquiry, by seeing the subject matter of curriculum as much broader than the professional techniques traditionally associated with curriculum-making—planning, implementation, and evaluation? Or do we need to move out in some way from the restrictions imposed by the very definition of our work as professional? (It has been said that when an intellectual activity becomes a profession, its conception of the public interest is bound to become distorted.) Or, finally, is it the case that we ourselves have to become political in a more overt and self-conscious way? The one constant in the present flux that is engulfing education as well as many other public endeavors is government itself. While other sectors of national life bear the burden of adjustment to change, government resists it. Government alone seems able to carry into the 21st century structures evolved to deal with the 19th. Should curriculum scholars abandon the limits imposed by scholarship and professionalism and join in a general movement to have
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the core assumptions of the apparatus of government itself subjected to greater scrutiny? There are, as yet, no answers to such questions. They are matters for other papers and other authors.13
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Boulding, Elise *Building A Global Civic Culture Education for an Interdependent World* New York: Teachers College Press, 1988 208pp $18.95

This volume discusses extending the concept of civic culture to the whole world, thus developing a sense of world public interest. The author stresses the need to develop skills of communicating and functioning that will facilitate the development of a world civic culture. The first part of the book emphasizes the history, structural changes, and conflict management involved in civic culture. Part two establishes a framework that portrays reflective human beings making choices to bring about a peaceful, interdependent world.

—A Kay Mevers


This volume presents a rationale and a curriculum for democratic citizenship. The authors portray a set of ideas about the nature and importance of social studies for citizens in a democratic society. They discuss the dynamics and complexities associated with decisions people make as citizens and their impact on the development of democratic institutions. The curriculum proposed will help expand the intellectual powers of citizens as they face environmental, institutional, cultural, and social problems.

—Bangalone R. Rama

13This is a revised version of a paper given as an invited address to the Professors of Curriculum Meeting, April 7, 1988, New Orleans, Louisiana.