CURRICULUM INQUIRY OISE UT

Race, Memory, and Master Narratives: A Critical Essay on U.S. Curriculum History

ANTHONY L. BROWN

University of Texas
Austin, Texas, USA

WAYNE AU

University of Washington
Bothell, Washington, USA

ABSTRACT

The field of curriculum studies has a history of looking at its own past, summarizing and synthesizing the trends and patterns across its foundations. Whether through synoptic texts, historical analyses, or edited collections, the field's foundational retrospection typically traces a lineage of curriculum studies that runs through various official committees, university scholars, textbook designers, and school leaders at the turn of the 20th century and into the first few decades. In this critical essay, the authors draw from the theories of cultural memory and critical race theory, to contextualize how the histories of race and curriculum are portrayed. The authors find that, despite curriculum studies' more recent attention to issues of power and identity associated with race, culture, gender, and sexuality, the voices and curricular histories of communities of color in the United States are largely left out of the selective tradition associated with the narrative of the field's foundations. To challenge what amounts to a master narrative of the foundations of curriculum studies, the authors use Charles Mills's (1998) notion of revisionist ontology to explore the curricular conversations that took place in the African American, Native American, Mexican American, and Asian American communities typically left out of the hegemonic history of the field. In doing so, the authors point to the rich curricular history of communities of color and argue for the field of curriculum studies to challenge its own institutional racism and acknowledge the contributions these communities made to its foundations.

In his rich and detailed reflection on the field of curriculum studies over the past 100 or so years, Schubert (2010) remarks that

two emphases honored for over a century remain at the forefront of curriculum inquiry. One is the expansion of considerations about what is worthwhile from

Curriculum Inquiry 44:3 (2014)
Published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA, and 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
doi: 10.1111/curi.12049

> many different vantage points, and the other is attempts to summarize or to make synoptic the complexity and expansiveness of considerations for busy practitioners and policy makers. (p. 20)

He is saying, in essence, that in looking to the past one finds that the field of curriculum studies has a historical tradition of summarizing and synthesizing curriculum scholarship across time, which has resulted in a genre of books known as synoptic texts. In looking at the present with an eye toward the future, scholars have sought to expand the boundaries of the field of curriculum studies through various lenses (e.g., race, class, gender, sexuality), epistemologies (e.g., Marxist, feminist, postmodern), and politics (e.g., political economy, ecology) (Au, 2012). While this has created some tension around the identity of the field, with some scholars calling for a more pragmatic "return" to a perceived apolitical past (see, e.g., Wraga, 1998, 1999) and others arguing that the field is better served by a diversity of curricular scholarship (Miller, 2005), both synopsis and expansion are simply a reality in curriculum studies.

Indeed, given the number of published synoptic texts, anthologies, and compendia, it would seem that curriculum studies has a particular penchant for self-reflection and analysis (Schubert, 1986). This in itself is not a negative thing; our identity as a field is largely shaped by our understanding of its history. Reynolds (1990) comments on the importance of history in curriculum studies:

> Historical discourse on curriculum is most important in writing synoptic texts in the field of curriculum. Synoptic texts . . . provide encyclopedic portrayals of rapidly proliferating knowledge and introduce students to a field of thought and practice, such as curriculum. . . . Historical sections have always been included in these volumes and rightly so. They help give historical perspective to the field; they help the field to develop and to move forward with the benefit of hindsight and to avoid claims that it has been ahistorical. . . . Thus, understanding curriculum discourse requires understanding past discourse. (p. 189)

Despite Reynolds's focus on synoptic texts, his larger point, that "understanding curriculum discourse requires understanding past discourse" (p. 189), applies to curriculum texts generally. Understanding our past simply helps us understand our present more fully, and our understanding of the history of curriculum studies in turn shapes the types of "expansions" we aim to create as we find gaps and seek to produce new understandings. For instance, as Schubert (2010) notes, curriculum studies has been guilty of exclusion:

> Even if not done intentionally, exclusion is obvious in the dominant curriculum field that has been disproportionately White, male, Western European, and American. Whether this phenomenon has been derived from conscious design or whether it is a function of emergence in a slanted society, critical and contextual curriculum scholarship have clearly revealed this bias in the literature. (p. 61)

Even if his discussion lacks a certain sharpness in terms of how racism functions, Schubert's observation is well taken because it points to one explanation for the shifts and growth in curriculum studies over the last 40 years.

As curriculum scholars, however, we have been left wondering and wanting. Both of us study multicultural education and the history of education. Both of us are intimately familiar with the educational histories of our own communities and generally familiar with the educational histories of communities of color more broadly. Both of us are curriculum scholars and have taught curriculum studies in our courses, engaging with various curriculum studies' texts as a regular part of our work. And both of us have been struck by what appears to be the predominance of whiteness at the center of the narrative arc of the foundations of curriculum studies, as presented through synoptic texts and edited collections. This project addresses the gaps in curriculum history in terms of the striking silences within the field while troubling the notion that there should be a "selective tradition" of curriculum history—even if revisions are made to the narrative. In this critical essay, using Schubert's (2010) terms, we have brought expansion to synopsis by systematically examining major curriculum studies texts and bringing attention to their silences surrounding the early curricular contributions of communities of color. We begin the process of reconceptualization in the curriculum field by providing examples of the early involvement communities of color had in curriculum development and discourse.

We will first explicate the silences in the field of curriculum studies as a way to set the context for the missing tensions and theoretical arguments raised by scholars and activists during the early 20th century. We use the U.S. context to provide a case for examining and making sense of how curriculum metanarratives delimit and render silent particular stories, theories, and curricula. This kind of reconceptualization will be particularly important as various movements emerge that are concerned with the internationalization of curriculum (Gaztambide-Fernández & Thiessen, 2012), and with the theoretical exploration of new curriculum and curriculum history terrain. We hope this essay will prompt further inquiries into other types of exclusions across multiple international contexts, but particularly where historical tensions between dominant groups and the subaltern pervade.

LITERATURE ON RACE AND CURRICULUM HISTORY

There is a long tradition of scholars who are concerned with the kinds of exclusions and inclusions present in curriculum studies and history (Zimmerman, 2002, 2004). Some of the earliest critiques did not necessarily concern the kinds of exclusions applied in the field but, rather, how the

knowledge presented in the official curriculum excluded the histories of people of color (Du Bois, 1935; Reddick, 1934). As the field of curriculum studies continued to develop, concerns surfaced consistently about racial exclusion and the historical trajectory of the field. For example, Watkins's (1993) notion of Black curriculum orientations was introduced in one of the first articles to suggest that other racial curricular projects were taking place within the same period of progressive curriculum discussions. Watkins's (2001) *The White Architects of Black Education* also powerfully argues that the history of curriculum created for African Americans was deeply imbued with ideas of White supremacy and power. In her critique of the scholarship in critical theory and curriculum studies, Beverley Gordon (1993) includes an acknowledgment of the contributions of African American scholars. In recent years, however, scholars have provided a more consistent critique of the field of curriculum studies, and they have explicitly and implicitly expressed their discontent with the field in three central ways.

The first primarily includes scholars and ideas typically left out of the history of curriculum scholarship (Baker, 1996; Brown, 2010; Hendry, 2011; Taliaferro-Baszile, 2010). This body of work refers to race, class, gender, and disability when noting the kinds of gaps that occur in historical scholarship on curriculum. One text that typifies this approach is the edited volume, *Curriculum Studies Handbook* (Malewski, 2010), which highlights ideas typically not addressed in the field of curriculum studies. The second group notes how the history of the field is imbued with discourses of power and ideology. For example, the work scholars such as Baker (2002), Winfield (2007), Fallace (2012), and Carlson (2009) have done on eugenics illustrates that discourses of racial science were not aberrations in the field of curriculum studies but in fact were deeply engrained in the cultural logic of curriculum during that time. Then there is a third group, which suggests that the entire approach to curriculum history must be reconceptualized. These scholars highlight the clear and problematic gaps in historical and epistemological knowledge within the field. Scholars such as Tuck (2011), Gaztambide-Fernández (2006), and Desai (2012), however, caution against a simple revision of curriculum studies and history, suggesting instead that the White supremacist and colonial legacy in the field of curriculum studies, which they argue continues in the present, itself needs to be interrupted.

This essay emerges from this existing body of scholarship. Recognizing that this literature has noted the gaps in curriculum history, this essay seeks to understand the context of exclusions and inclusions across seminal curriculum texts in the United States. What do we know about the history of curriculum in the United States? What is the arc of this historical narrative across different curriculum texts? In the pursuit of answers to these questions, we are trying to get a more detailed account of the history of race and curriculum while offering examples of how

to rethink curriculum history that go beyond simply including forgotten histories.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This article draws from the theoretical frameworks of critical theory and cultural memory. While we understand critical theory to be a broad category that draws from various, sometimes contradictory "critical" traditions (Au, 2012), for the purposes of this article we are using critical theory specifically to interrogate the relationships between education and power (Apple, 1995). We pay particular attention to racialized (Omi & Winant, 1994) silences and marginalization within the textual narratives that focus on the foundations of curriculum studies. In this sense, we rely on critical theory because it explicitly points to the ways institutional power, social context, and history both manifest and maintain unequal power relations, which allows us to undertake a metacritical analysis of curriculum studies itself (Au, 2012).

We also actively draw on cultural memory, which refers to the discourses, texts, and artifacts that shape how we conceptualize and imagine a historical moment or a body of knowledge. Cultural memory contends that implicit and explicit modes of power (discursive and material) inform the way a historical narrative is rendered (Assmann & Czaplicka, 1995; Flores, 2002; Le Goff, 1992). In the context of this critical essay, we argue that the field of curriculum studies has subtly constructed a metanarrative that excludes communities of color from the overarching cultural memory of the foundations of curriculum studies in the United States.

We recognize that by combining critical theory and cultural memory as guiding theoretical frameworks, we are in many ways also addressing the use of critical race theory (CRT) in curriculum studies. While CRT includes many elements, we find ourselves drawn to its guiding presumption that racism is an omnipresent social and institutional force, in that it impacts the development of all things in the sociopolitical realm (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012)—in this case the field of curriculum studies. We also embrace CRT's recognition of the need for revisionist history, which is more immediately applicable to the present essay, in that it

> reexamines America's historical record, replacing comforting majoritarian interpretations of events with ones that square more accurately with minorities' experiences. It offers evidence, sometimes suppressed, that very record, to support those new interpretations. (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012, p. 20)

In many regards, the current article takes up the task of challenging, in Delgado and Stefancic's words, "comforting majoritarian interpretations of events" within the common narrative of the founding of the field of curriculum studies. As we illustrate later in this article, we also suggest that there is evidence to support our new interpretation.

Cultural memory attends to how power is rendered through artifacts and the use of historical revisionism to reshape both the historical record and the historical narrative, which also implies the use of "revisionist ontologies" (Mills, 1998) to understand history and society. Our critical analysis of the foundations of the field of curriculum studies thus recognizes the reality of institutionalized racism within education, whose existence is built on a history of the failure to recognize some groups as fully human or, to use Mills's (1998) terminology, to treat some groups as "subpersons." Consistent with our use of critical theory and cultural memory as our theoretic constructs, the revisionist ontology we take up within the current essay not only pushes back against the predominant racist ontologies but also provides "revisionist challenges to these ontologies by the subordinated population contemptuously categorized as subpersons" (p. 113). Thus, in bringing together critical theory and cultural memory, an act that in many ways embraces some aspects of CRT, the guiding theoretical question for this inquiry, following Apple (2000), was "What official knowledge do curriculum studies texts present relative to the foundations of the field, and what did communities of color contribute to those foundations?" In posing this question, we are essentially following Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández's (2013) call "to brown" curriculum studies, a process that includes "bringing attention" to the racialized practices of the field by "interrupting the dominant narrative by rudely inserting itself, reclaiming academic space, and calling the names of those who have been replaced and forgotten" (p. 83).

APPROACH TO ANALYZING CURRICULUM TEXTS: A CRITICAL REVIEW

For this critical essay, the researchers undertook a critical review of prominent texts in curriculum studies, which included current editions of synoptic curriculum texts currently in print, edited collections, self-identified comprehensive collections in curriculum studies, and books on the history of curriculum development.[1] The intent of this critical literature review was to provide a context of how the histories of race and curriculum foundations are currently rendered in the field of curriculum studies in the United States.

The principal criterion for including a text in this review was that it provided perspectives on the early history of curriculum development and curriculum studies. Consistent with earlier surveys of major curriculum texts (Rogan & Luckowski, 1990), this criterion meant that some volumes were excluded simply because they did not provide a history of the curriculum field (see, e.g., Ornstein, Pajak, & Ornstein, 2007). We initially gathered texts from online databases, but we also conducted a physical inspection of the texts' contents to make our final decision about which to

include in this study, which resulted in 33 texts being used in our analysis (see Appendix A). In addition to our principal criterion, we based our selection of texts on a mix of three more overlapping criteria. First, we selected recent and mostly well-known texts and authors on curriculum that provided detailed narratives on the historical antecedents of the field of curriculum studies. Some of the texts situated the U.S. curriculum within the contested interests of the Progressive Era, while others situated the field of curriculum studies within the longer trajectory of Anglophone philosophy. We then selected texts that situated the origins of the field within the context of its key thinkers. Such texts often referenced particular scholars' ideas and philosophies as being reflective of particular schools of thought or philosophy. Finally, we selected texts that provided detailed narratives on the trajectory of the field of curriculum studies through key meetings and conferences, and ideological conflicts and theoretical turns. Most of the texts we investigated met most of these criteria, and a few met all of them.

Drawing from discourse analysis to read, interpret, and identify patterns of meaning within the textual language (Gee, 2005), we examined the selected texts' discussion of the founding of the field of curriculum studies, including the narrative as relayed by the texts in their attention to (or lack thereof) communities of color.

THE MASTER NARRATIVE IN U.S. CURRICULUM HISTORY

Our findings suggest that despite a few notable examples (e.g., select chapters from Castenell and Pinar [1993], Connelly, He, and Phillion [2008], and Malewski [2010]), the contribution of non-Whites to the foundations of curriculum development and curriculum studies in the United States is nearly nonexistent in the textual narrative of the history of field. A few examples from major curriculum texts illustrate this finding. If we look at the well-known and important curriculum history, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum* (Kliebard, 2004), we are offered a long list of major characters in the early "story" of curriculum, including Charles Eliot and the Committee of Ten, G. Stanley Hall, William Torrey Harris and the Committee of Fifteen, John Dewey, John Franklin Bobbitt, Charles Bagley, George Counts, and Jane Addams, among others; Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois are mentioned only in passing. Similarly, *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (Flinders & Thornton, 2012), which we find to be quite strong in many ways, offers foundational readings by John Franklin Bobbitt, Maria Montessori, John Dewey, Jane Addams, George Counts, and Herbert Kliebard. Looking at the seminal synoptic curriculum studies text, *Understanding Curriculum* (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995), despite a chapter devoted to curriculum as a racial text, the early developers of the field are identified as the Committee of Ten, the Committee of Fifteen,

Herbert Spencer, Charles Eliot, William Torrey Harris, E. Cubberley, Charles and Frank McMurry, Colonel Francis Parker, John Dewey, Edward Thorndike, and John Franklin Bobbitt, among others. Schubert's (1986) foundational text, *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm, and Possibility*, maintains this orientation. In his chapter devoted to curriculum history, despite a promising and quite far-reaching start with the curriculum of Egypt and Mesopotamia, Schubert quickly moves to a European curriculum narrative and then on to the 20th-century United States, where, once again, the history of the curriculum field is told through a mainly White male academic lens. Tanner and Tanner's (1995) *Curriculum Development* provides a similar account of early curriculum history.

The examples above illustrate a troubling narrative of the implicit ways in which race and memory intersect to produce a dominant racial narrative. What strikes us as interesting is that despite the expansion of curriculum studies to include a wider range of politics, cultures, and viewpoints, and even though this expansion has meant the inclusion of more critical perspectives in modern synoptic texts (Kim & Marshall, 2006), communities of color are notably absent from the typical narrative of the founding of the field. In relating the history of curriculum, the field of curriculum studies has seemingly established a foundational canon of mostly White males vis-à-vis a fairly insular and largely Eurocentric metanarrative, thus constructing the kind of master narrative that the field has, ironically, tried to critique in its most recent turn.

Further findings suggest that even when included, the historical contributions of non-White communities to curriculum in the United States are rendered in two common ways. The first is to highlight only a few non-White contributors (e.g., W. E. B. Du Bois or Booker T. Washington) to the discourse of curriculum. The second is that we find either silence (e.g., Flinders & Thornton, 2012) or explicitly limited attention given to race (e.g., Baker, 2009; Schubert, Schubert, Thomas, & Carroll, 2002) across the curriculum discourse. We found this troubling, given the historic role the official curriculum has played in reproducing the discursive meanings of race and racism (e.g., Grant, 2011; Zimmerman, 2002), and how communities of color have responded historically to the mandates of official curriculum.

We should note, however, that race and the experiences of racial groups are sometimes highlighted. Take, for example, some of Pinar's (2006, 2012) recent work on curriculum, which without question includes topics and ideas directly related to race, including discussions on cultural studies and essays on lynching. Nevertheless, this work suffers from its reification of the "origins" of the field. Pinar (2006) draws from typical historical discourse by referring to "our predecessors" in relation to key curriculum scholars of yesteryear, such as Edward Thorndike, Franklin Bobbitt, W. W. Charters, Ralph Tyler, John Dewey, and William James. His chapter on the reconceptualist origins via the Bergamo conference also highlights an

interesting new Eurocentric canon, wherein the most significant voices to emerge are mostly White, despite the wide range of critical and intellectual theories employed to reconceptualize the field. Again, folks of color could not attend "the meeting" and thus were written out of the historical foundations of the field. The one exception is Ted Aoki, whose text illustrates the kind of "absent-presence" (Apple, 1999) that we found commonly across multiple texts. It does include some forgotten voices of curriculum history, yet in the context of curriculum foundations the same old dominant voices pervade.

Pinar's (2012) *What Is Curriculum Theory?* does provide one of the more comprehensive discussions of African Americans and curriculum. Unlike most curriculum volumes, he writes an entire chapter about African Americans' struggle for curriculum revision in 1930s and 1940s—although the chapter draws almost entirely from Zimmerman's (2002) *Whose America?* But this again highlights a pattern found in many new volumes of curriculum history, where new voices are more present but still not positioned as foundational to the field.

MASTER NARRATIVE OF U.S. CURRICULUM HISTORY

Our analysis of curriculum handbooks, curriculum histories, and synoptic texts suggests a very troubling narrative about what constitutes the past of curriculum history in the United States. The histories and the subsequent theoretical turns largely have addressed the struggles of White men (and the occasional White woman) from elite institutions who convened, debated, and wrote about the current state and the future of curriculum in the United States. This metanarrative also conveys a message that within particular cultural contexts of curriculum reform in the United States, curricular struggles that occurred outside mainstream curriculum debates do not matter and have little scholarly or historic value. The metanarrative of U.S. curriculum history as a whole tell the same old stories of curriculum history and curriculum heroes while silencing and overgeneralizing some of the most important curriculum projects of the 20th century. What is even more troubling is that scholars know these gaps exist, yet we keep on relating the same stock narrative of curriculum in the United States. For instance, Marshall, Sears Allen Roberts, and Schubert (2006) concede this awareness of the absence in curriculum history:

> Reflecting on the first 50 years of curriculum work finds racial, intellectual, gendered, and other voices largely invisible—a term used perceptively by the African American scholar W. E. B. Du Bois (1903). Du Bois wrote on a host of curricular topics throughout the period just discussed, yet his work is rarely cited in curriculum literature. Other African American voices (Carter G. Woodson [2000], Benjamin Mays, Horace Mann Bond) . . . [and the] voices of women and children (especially children) remain thin in this history as well. Such marginalized voices

need to be excavated, studied, and integrated fully into our discourse about curriculum. These remain invisible throughout this book not because they are unimportant to the story we tell but because ours is an attempt to portray the intellectual and social history of what *has been* rather than what *might or should have been* a part of the background of contemporary curriculum studies. (p. 13, original emphasis)

This quote illustrates clearly that curriculum studies is well aware of these absences and silences in the field. However, after making this disclaimer, the master narrative prevails and the authors proceed with the same old stories of White men "struggling" for the American curriculum. What is troubling about this rationalization is that the voices of African American, Asian American, Native American, and Mexican American activists and scholars have been part of every period of curriculum discussion in the United States. They might not have been part of the Committee of Ten or the Committee of Fifteen or have given talks at Teachers College or convened meetings at one of the Ivy League universities, but unlike Marshall et al.'s (2006) comments about not telling what should have been, these forgotten histories of curriculum revisions reveal that Black, Latino, Native, and Asian American scholars, activists, and communities were right there, literally and figuratively. They published essays and articles in journals and newspapers, and they convened meetings, protested, lobbied, debated, discussed, and consistently deconstructed Herbert Spencer's (1860) enduring curricular question, "What knowledge is of most worth?"

Furthermore, it strikes us that the canon of the "curriculum field" is delineated historically by who was formally connected to institutions of education (via degrees and positions) and who was not. This raises a critical issue tied to structural and institutional aspects of race. The institutions of higher education in the United States that have had ongoing and persistent issues of racial exclusion and institutional racism reproduced similar racialized exclusions in the field of curriculum studies. Therefore, the question remains, if African Americans, Mexican Americans, Native communities, and Asian Americans were not part of the "documented curriculum history," should they be seen as part of the foundations of the field? Answering "no" to the question suggests a troubling notion that only White male canonized knowledge can be acknowledged as the "foundation." To answer "yes" would require a complete re-visioning of the existing story of U.S. curriculum history. The retelling of this history, then, is not a simple addition of forgotten voices, but is more of a reconceptualization of the foundations of curriculum in the United States as a series of racial projects situated within different and overlapping sociohistorical contexts.

RECOVERING CURRICULUM HISTORIES

Curriculum historians and theorists often reference the late 19th and early 20th centuries when documenting the foundations of curriculum studies

and the history of curriculum in the United States (Flinders & Thornton, 2012; Kliebard, 2004, Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995). As several curriculum scholars have noted, this was a period of crisis and confusion about what the purpose of curriculum should be, particularly in light of changing immigration and migration patterns (Kliebard, 2004; Marshall et al., 2006). The ideological tensions and educational theories that supported different approaches to curriculum brought forth a wide range of ideological and pedagogical interests that converged on the topic of curriculum in the United States (Kliebard, 2004). Within such debates, however, African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and Latinos also challenged curriculum policy and discourse, convened textbook committees, wrote textbooks, and even created schools to address the curricular needs of historically underserved students. In what follows, we offer brief examples of the ways these communities participated in debates and discussions about what knowledge is of most worth for their children, even if these debates and discussions were not acknowledged by academics and scholars within the curriculum field.

Early African American Curriculum Discourse

In the 1940s, local chapters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People organized several textbook committees to challenge the disparaging images of African Americans found in textbooks (Zimmerman, 2002). The critique leveled against these textbooks challenged the ahistorical "Sambo" imagery that presented African Americans as "happy slaves" who were acquiescent to their social reality (Zimmerman, 2004). Few books or curriculum histories even acknowledge this history, although Pinar (2012) has recently documented some of it. But even Pinar's chapter does not necessarily situate African Americans' persistent challenge to curriculum within the origins of the field, and offering the work of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People as an example only scratches the surface of the contributions African American scholars and activists made to the curriculum in the United States. The work of Carter G. Woodson (2000; Woodson & Wesley, 1922, 1928, 1935), Arthur Alfonso Schomburg (1925/1992), and Lawrence Reddick (1934) are rarely, if ever, addressed in the foundational literature we surveyed for this article. What is striking about this absence is that each of these authors wrote extensively and led far-reaching efforts to shift the public discourse around topics of race and curriculum.

Take, for example, the work of Carter G. Woodson, whose body of work on K–12 curriculum spans 4 decades and includes the publication of numerous Black history and African history textbooks that were used in schools (Brown, 2010; Buras, 2014). He also started the *Journal of Negro History,* founded Black History Week, and created the Association for the

Study of Negro Life and History, an organization committed to the development and distribution of Black history curriculum to adults and students. His body of work adhered to the tenets of social reconstructionism, often referred to as the foundation of social justice–oriented curriculum theory (Kliebard, 2004).

Woodson's work parallels the work of curriculum luminaries such as George Counts and Harold Rugg, and, as we argue, conveys a stronger conviction to ideas of "social reconstructionist" curriculum. In fact, King, Davis, and Brown (2012) argue that Rugg's ideas about race and African Americans could hardly be seen as "socially reconstructive" or "progressive"—particularly compared to Woodson's in-depth curricular discourse that challenged every possible argument White historians had made about the importance of Black history and life. However, despite its significance, Woodson's curriculum work is rarely mentioned within the foundational literature of curriculum. For example, the oft-cited synoptic text *Understanding Curriculum* (Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman, 1995), which runs more than 1,000 pages, only mentions Woodson's contributions once, in the context of a quote by Beverly Gordon.

Early Mexican American Curriculum Discourse

Like African Americans, Mexican Americans have a long intellectual history of their struggles to revise the school curriculum (De Leon, 1982; Garcia, 1981). For instance, education historian Guadalupe San Miguel (1987) has thoroughly documented Mexican Americans' persistent efforts to revise and repudiate the official curriculum. These ongoing efforts by Mexican American activists and scholars to implement culturally relevant school materials that aligned with their culture and language provides a powerful counternarrative that addresses the hidden and overt agency of activists to confront and revise the symbolic violence of curriculum in the state of Texas (Salinas, 2005; Urrieta, 2004; Yosso, 2002). The historically specific school practices and policies that focused on Americanization and English-only pedagogies (Blanton, 2012; San Miguel, 1987) have been central to many scholars' analysis of the Mexican American curriculum. As numerous scholars have shown, the struggle for a relevant Mexican American curriculum has always been an issue of preserving culture and language in the face of curricular policies poised to remove and/or problematically construct Mexican American life (Blanton, 2012; San Miguel, 1987; Valencia, 2010).

Throughout the early 20th century, various educational reforms sought to use the school curriculum to assimilate Mexican Americans into mainstream culture. Again in ways similar to African Americans, communities and activists involved in early curriculum reform efforts in the Southwest challenged the stereotypical and derogatory perspectives on Mexican

Americans presented in the school curriculum (San Miguel, 1987). Mexican Americans also consistently shed light on how schools in Texas and throughout the Southwest developed curriculum for their communities that helped to reproduce social and economic stratification (San Miguel & Valencia, 1998). In other words, Mexican American children were placed in schools using a curriculum that prepared them to participate in the economy within the lowest social class. Mexican American curricular history clearly demonstrates that schools and school districts functioned to fulfill a racial contract (Mills, 1997) that included implementing a school curriculum that helped to hold in place a racially stratified social and economic system. However, such practices were never without ongoing challenges to the premise and philosophy behind curriculum for Chicanos in the United States. Nowhere was this sense of advocacy more present than in the work of George Sanchez.

George I. Sanchez (1939, 1940, 1941) is considered one of the most significant Mexican American scholars of the early 20th century. In the words of historian Carlos Blanton (2006), "Sanchez is the most significant intellectual of what is commonly referred to as the 'Mexican American Generation' of activists during this period" (p. 570). At the core of Sanchez's intellectual and activist project was the redressing of deficit perspectives on the culture and history of Mexican Americans and a movement toward educational equity for Mexican American children in U.S. schools. For example, in the 1930s he provided some of the strongest critiques of the IQ tests given to Mexican American children (Blanton, 2006), and much of his scholarship and activism in the 1930s and 1940s challenged the conventional deficit thinking about Mexican Americans. The significance of this kind of advocacy is highlighted in the following quote:

> Remedial measures will not solve the problem piecemeal. Poverty, illiteracy and ill-health are merely symptoms. If education is to get at the root of the problem schools must go beyond subject-matter instruction. . . . The curriculum of educational agency becomes, then, the magna carta of social and economic rehabilitation; the teacher, the advance agent of a new social order. (Cited in Blanton, 2006, p. 575)

Sanchez's (1940, 1941) work challenged a curricular discourse that sought to construct Mexican American culture in deficit ways and to segregate the children in inequitable school settings. But what stands out about Sanchez's project in the early 20th century is that his ideas were so closely aligned with those of other progressive thinkers of that time. However, like Woodson, Sanchez's work in challenging school curriculum has largely been ignored in curriculum history and mostly published in the scholarship of educational history.

The history of Mexican American curriculum helps to contextualize many of the contemporary racial projects in the 1960s, 1970s, and up to the present, to revise the school curriculum—projects such as Crystal City

(Trujillo, 2005) and the Mexican American Studies program in Tucson, Arizona. This history provides an important yet completely overlooked historical narrative within the current story of curriculum history in the United States. What is striking about the telling of these stories is that they all reside outside of the field of curriculum history and curriculum studies. Scholars who have written about this history largely have come from the fields of history, educational history, legal history, and Chicano studies.

Early Asian American Curriculum Discourse

In a similar vein, some of the most important work about Asian American educational and curricular reforms has come from scholarship outside the field of curriculum history. Again, however, it is clear that Chinese Americans and Japanese Americans, for instance, had much to say about matters of curriculum within the context of anti-Chinese and anti-Japanese sentiment in the United States. Chinese scholar Kim-Fong Tom (1941) elaborates on the necessity of Chinese-language schools:

> Chinatown has been described by some American writers as a place of opium dens and gambling houses. The pulp magazines and some motion pictures have served to keep this illusion alive. Even today, many Americans still have the notion that [Chinese] people are inferior and backward. Living in a country where the Chinese have been looked down upon and ill-treated, it is easy for them to develop inferiority complexes. To prevent the children from falling into conviction, it is necessary for them to have a correct knowledge of China and the Chinese civilization. (p. 559)

Tom's observations highlight the point that Chinese-language schools helped to develop in their students a positive appreciation of Chinese culture and identity. Tom argued further that Chinese-language schools helped students negotiate their racial identities within the cultural context of being both Chinese and American.

There were similar discussions within the Japanese American community in the early 1900s about how to best meet the educational needs of their children. The first Japanese-language school was established in Seattle, Washington, in 1902, and others soon followed in San Francisco and other West Coast cities. In 1908, editorials focusing on issues surrounding the education of Japanese American children began to surface in Japanese-language newspapers, such as *Shin Sekai* and the *Beikoku Bukkyo* (Ichioka, 1988). Some of these editorials complained that second-generation Japanese Americans (Nisei) were becoming ignorant of Japan and Japanese culture, while others raised questions about the need to send Nisei children to Japanese-language schools when it was likely they would eventually end up in U.S. public schools (Ichioka, 1988). After a survey conducted in 1908 by the Japanese Association of America found a significant number of school-age Japanese American children living in San

Francisco, a group of Japanese immigrant leaders there convened the Mokuyobikai (Thursday Club) in 1909 to discuss educational issues facing the Nisei.

The Thursday Club became a pivotal organization in the growing debate about the education of Japanese American children, wherein community members contended that Nisei children needed either a more American-like or a more Japanese-like education, and in 1912 the Japanese Association of America convened a statewide conference on the issue in California. This debate continued in the Japanese American community for years, and as anti-Japanese sentiment began to build in California, the state legislature sought to regulate Japanese-language schools, including by requiring that all Japanese-language schoolteachers be certified by an exam that proved their English-language competency and knowledge of U.S. history (Ichioka, 1988). There is certainly more to tell about the curriculum history and the early schooling of Japanese Americans specifically and Asian Americans generally (Tamura, 1994, 2010) but suffice it to say the argument could be made that the Thursday Club deserves to be included in the history of curriculum studies, as these knowledgeable community members considered what curriculum would best serve Japanese American children.

Early Native American Curriculum Discourse

Assimilation was also a central concern in the education of Native Americans historically. However, the curriculum used in the education of Native Americans was different from that of the Japanese, for example, in that it was largely informed by the history of colonization in the Americas of Native peoples by the U.S. government. As Deyhle, Swisher, Stevens, and Galvan (2008), contributors to *The Sage Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction* (Connelly et al., 2008, included in the present study), explain:

> From its beginnings in the 17th century, formal education for American Indians was based on . . . principles of sovereignty and trust responsibilities, which allowed the federal government an opportunity to create an educational system that would attempt to assimilate American Indians into mainstream America. . . . These policies unequivocally called for the complete eradication of the histories, religions, and languages of American Indians. (Deyhle et al., 2008, p. 331)

Thus, by 1900, schooling for Native children in the United States was compulsory, and a network of 81 reservation boarding schools, 147 reservation day schools, and 25 off-reservation boarding schools had been developed (Adams, 1988). Native American authors wrote about their experiences in these schools. Luther Standing Bear's (1933/1978) third book reflected on his experience at the Carlisle Indian School and discussed the fact that despite experiencing the school's curriculum of colonization, he maintained his identity as a Lakota (Lomawaima &

McCarty, 2006). Standing Bear (1978) commented in 1933 on the curriculum he would choose for Native students:

> So today if I had a young mind to direct, to start on the journey of life, and I was faced with the duty of choosing between the natural way of my forefathers and that of the white man's present way of civilization, I would, for its welfare, unhesitatingly set that child's feet in the path of my forefathers. I would raise him to be an Indian! (pp. 258–259)

Furthermore, as Lomawaima and McCarty (2006) point out, Native communities historically struggled for a curriculum that would both prepare them for college and carry forward Native cultures and traditions. Again, even as we recognize that some of this curricular history was included in *The Sage Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction* (Connelly et al., 2008), we also recognize that there is so much more to be written. For instance, the curriculum for the Indigenous peoples of the Americas cannot be relegated solely to the boarding school experience, as dominant as it was. Further, even the boarding school curriculum engendered resistance and transformation by Native peoples themselves, so the telling of the Native curricular history around the founding of the field of curriculum studies requires expansion and nuance beyond what we have offered in our brief historical telling here. Regardless, we feel strongly that these stories must be told and be fully recognized as a part of the foundations of the field of curriculum studies in the United States.

MASTER NARRATIVES AND RECOVERED CURRICULUM IN SUMMARY

The traditional curriculum history and the revisionist histories discussed in this essay reveal both the problems and possibilities for the field of curriculum history. From our critical review of curriculum studies texts, curriculum history is defined by two words: *silence* and *whiteness*. Michel Trouillot (1995) defines *silence* as an ideological construct informed by power. Silence in this context is an act of power where a corpus of knowledge is imposed on a historical narrative, thus producing silence. Our critical review found that certain histories, authors, and ideas were almost completely absent or hardly acknowledged. The 33 texts analyzed in our critical review reflected some level of silence. The other term that characterizes the findings from our critical review is *whiteness*. Critical historians (Roediger, 1994; Wiegman, 1993) discuss the idea of *whiteness* as both the presence and dominance of white skin privilege and as an overarching social construct that implicitly normalizes numerous social contexts (e.g., family, beauty, housing, etc.) including the official school curriculum (Kincheloe, Steinberg, Rodriguez, & Chennault, 2000).

The "predecessors" or founders of U.S. curriculum are a small club of White men who struggled and deliberated over the concerns of

curriculum. We recognize that what constitutes the past or theoretical trajectory of the field must go beyond what Williams (1977) refers to as a "selective tradition," which is "an intentionally selected version of a shaping past and a pre-shaped present, which is then powerfully operative in the process of social and cultural definition and identification" (p. 115), because such a tradition fundamentally maintains hegemonic power relations. As for the origins of curriculum studies, they cannot be relegated to a few elite White men (and occasionally, White women) who were able to attend meetings throughout the 20th century or be part of academia-based intellectual projects. To reconfigure the foundations of curriculum studies, we suggest that the narrative of the past or predecessors in the field must be thoroughly reexamined.

While our analysis offers a rather grim depiction of curriculum history, the counterhistories documented in this essay powerfully illustrate the multiple racial projects (Omi & Winant, 1994) that defined the struggle for American curriculum. These histories convey how scholars and communities of color thoroughly engaged in theory and practice related to the American curriculum—albeit situated in varied spatial, political, and cultural contexts. These histories illustrate the potential and possibilities of U.S. curriculum history.

In the end, however, our essay illustrates that the field of curriculum studies has missed the mark, by holding in place a stable narrative about White American males struggling for the American curriculum, while communities of color are depicted as occasionally speaking to curriculum issues or offering very little historically to the intellectual or political discourse of curriculum in the United States.

Our analysis has challenged us to explore the following question: What made such omissions possible? While there are a number of historically specific issues that informed the current context of the U.S. curriculum metanarrative, in the section that follows we give attention to some of the contexts that reproduced this history.

MAKING SENSE OF THE OMISSIONS

The analyses and arguments in this article collectively reveal a troubling realization that even within a field thoroughly committed to contesting norms surrounding gender, class, culture, sexuality, the environment, and race in contemporary curriculum thought, there is still a troubling silence and undertheorization given to race within the historical understanding of the foundations of the field of curriculum studies. Powerful and important work certainly has been done to reveal the racism of many of the field's "founding fathers," particularly those who subscribed to the Eurocentric racism of "recapitulation theory" (Baker, 2002; Carlson, 2009; Fallace, 2012, Watkins, 2001; Winfield, 2007). Additionally, strong theoretical work

has been done to challenge the role the field of curriculum studies plays in maintaining the racism of colonialism, historically and contemporarily (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). Furthermore, while we recognize that numerous scholars have focused on race and curriculum (Gordon, 1993; McCarthy, 1988, 1990a, 1990b; Pinar, 2012), short of Watkins's (1993) Black curriculum orientations and Pinar's (2012) chapter on race and the textbook controversies of the 1950s, few works have explored the racialized historical foundations of curriculum specifically from the viewpoint of the curricular contributions made by communities of color. It is for this reason that we focused our project on the narrative arc of the foundations in curriculum studies, particularly in relation to issues of race and communities of color.

Indeed, it is notable that there is an almost-complete silence in the field regarding the curriculum history of Chicanos/Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans during the period often associated with the founding of curriculum studies. Moreover, this article points to the penchant for curriculum studies to be conceptualized officially as "living" in academia and scholarly committees, whereas the reality for communities of color that primarily have been locked out of educational institutions historically is that curriculum has historically "lived" in their communities, in community schools, or in direct opposition to the racial formation (e.g., segregation, resegregation, inequitable schooling policies, etc.) of U.S. schools. In taking up such a myopic historical focus on official texts and formal institutions of education, the field of curriculum studies not only signals to marginalized communities that "your curriculum does not live here," but it also fundamentally perpetuates the institutionalized and professional racism that was so present during the field's founding (Fallace, 2012).

The question, then, is, how do we explain the omissions and the negations of other (non-White) contributions to the curriculum field? In engaging this question, we return to theories of racial formation and critical theories of race. One of the most significant critiques provided by recent race theorists (see, e.g., Leonardo, 2009) is that "race" and racism are subtle and implicit practices used to hold racial hierarchies in place without using overtly repressive tactics to sustain White interests. In this sense, racial outcomes endure through the normalization of spatial and material realities. We argue that an implicit racial narrative that has helped sustain the unquestioned stories of America's struggle for curriculum also normalizes the knowledge production of curriculum history in the United States. Therefore, racial exclusion in U.S. curriculum history not only takes form through direct and systematic exclusion, but it also does so insidiously through a process of normalization whereby the unquestioned metanarrative of U.S. curriculum reproduces the context for White inclusion and subaltern racial exclusion.

We also find Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández's (2013) explanation for the racial exclusion within the master narrative of the founding of the field

of curriculum studies quite compelling. They argue that the entire project of mass schooling in the United States and Canada was a project of racist colonialism, particularly from an Indigenous perspective. They assert further that "intimately linked to schools, the field of curriculum studies has played a significant role in the maintenance of settler colonialism. Early curriculum scholars conceived of educational projects through logics of replacement in which the settler ultimately comes to replace the Native" (p. 76). They continue:

> The settler colonial curricular project of replacement seems to happen organically, without intent, even though Indigenous erasure is the arch aim of settler colonialism. It happens generally, through the commonplace tendency of appropriation and commercialization of Indigeneity, but also specifically, through the removal of Indigenous bodies and the occupation of tracts of land by settler bodies. In academe, settler colonial replacement is evident in both disciplinary structures as well as institutional practices. (p. 79)

By framing curriculum studies within the project of settler colonialism, Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013) provide us with a two-layered explanation for the utter absence of communities of color from the narrative of the founding of curriculum studies as a field. Historically, then, this exclusion occurred because those "founding fathers" fundamentally held racist views towards non-White (nonsettler) communities, which prevented those communities from being considered worth including in conversations about what knowledge is of most worth. As we discussed in our theoretical framework, this follows Mills's (1998) discussion of the need for revisionist ontologies because racist ontologies view non-White groups as "subpersons." The second layer of analysis Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013) provide around settler colonialism is that it speaks to the institutional racism or in keeping with CRT, the durability of racial exclusons in the present field of curriculum studies. Despite the progressive politics of contemporary scholarship in the field, including emphasis on identity politics and the exploration of multiple forms of oppression, the continual and persistent erasure of communities of color from the field's official origins has taken place, seemingly organically and without individual intent.

In a sense, then, our discussion here is very much about the nexus between individuals and institutional communities, as well as the overall functioning of institutional racism. Our charge is less to point fingers at individuals in the field, many of whom we know and respect as scholars and colleagues, than to point fingers more generally at the field itself. For as Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013) remind us, "One of the ways the settler-colonial state manages this covering is through the circulation of its creation story" (p. 74). Because it appears, based on the findings of our critical review, that the field of curriculum studies is guilty of continuing a fundamentally racist epistemology and ontology despite its contemporary

commitment to a politics of equality, it is thus up to individuals and institutions in the field to determine what direction to take our scholarly community and to take appropriate steps to rectify their omissions as part of a longer struggle of self-reflection and growth.

RECONCEPTUALIZING U.S. CURRICULUM HISTORY

Redressing the context of silence in the field of curriculum studies is a matter more significant than simply adding stories that have been ignored. Beyond adding narratives and other content, the field of curriculum studies requires a complete conceptual turn from the existing metanarrative of U.S. curriculum history.

We assert that specific ideas should be pursued in making such a conceptual turn. The first idea is to give attention to the question critical curriculum theorists (Apple, 1995; Au, 2012) explored decades ago: What constitutes "curriculum"? Is "curriculum" just textbooks, standards, assessments, and pedagogies in K–12 settings, or are there broader spatial meanings that define it? Scholars (Pinar & Bowers, 1992) since the 1970s have answered this question by theorizing that curriculum is a set of discourses and ideologically driven practices that help to reproduce raced, classed, and gendered realities, which in turn are shaped within a confluence of spaces, including schools, homes, community centers, and popular media. What we find interesting is that the same kind of broad conceptual understanding given to "curriculum" since the 1970s and continuing to the present has not been fully employed within the telling of the story of race and the U.S. curriculum history. Our telling of the past of U.S. curriculum remains restricted by a set of well-known policies, meetings, culture wars, and ideas about curriculum. We do not overlook the fact that some scholars have looked at the curriculum's past and asked interesting and quite powerful questions about power and race (see, e.g., Apple, 2013; Buras, 2014; Fallace, 2012; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). That narrative, however, is typically conceived as part of subaltern movements or other voices, rather than as part of the wider story told about U.S. curriculum.

While we are not arguing that the existing scholarship about U.S. curriculum history intentionally left out important stories, we are suggesting that what constitutes "U.S. curriculum history" has created the conditions for specific stories, movements, philosophies, and ideas to endure—stories that more often than not are dominated conceptually and epistemologically within spaces of whiteness and privilege.

Critical historians (Le Goff, 1992; Lowenthal, 1998; Trouillot, 1995) have argued for decades that once a metanarrative becomes enclosed and normalized by institutional and discursive practices, it is very difficult to conceptualize such histories differently than how they have been constructed. This, however, does not just occur because of the bad intentions of individuals. It

is held in place by the long-term institutional and structural practices that help to reproduce and normalize a metanarrative over time.

In the context of curriculum history, institutions such as universities, publishing companies, research associations, and conferences have helped to further enclose what the past is in relation to the history of curriculum in the United States. The confluence of editorial boards, the tenure process and peer review process also help to hold in place a particular kind of metanarrative defined by an enduring body of knowledge, including the social actors that have the power and influence to sustain an existing master narrative (Gaztambide-Fernández, 2006). This sustained metanarrative becomes equally troubling when those who have power (e.g., tenured professors and editors) are mostly White and have no specific desire or historical knowledge to explore topics that have been marginalized, such as the curriculum histories of communities of color. This lack of study of the curriculum of communities of color again, however, is defined by the racial and structural conditions that have the power and capacity to validate historical knowledge. Carter G. Woodson, for example, spent most of academic career outside of the academy, as well as received much of his funding from beyond the typical philanthropic funding entities (Dagbovie, 2007). As a result, his work was published exclusively in the Black publishing venues that he founded. Thus, given the racial conditions of access and the reproduction of canonized bodies of knowledge in U.S. curriculum foundations, burgeoning curriculum scholars were less likely to learn about curriculum scholarship of George I. Sanchez, Carter G. Woodson, Kim-Fong Tom, and Luther Standing Bear.

Thus, we contend that a conceptual and epistemological turn in curriculum must be considered in the context of curriculum history, one that includes cultural and social movements such as the Harlem Renaissance, Freedom Schools, or the Chicano Arts Movement.[2] These histories must be conceived as one of many contexts in the "struggle" for American curriculum that involved relevant questions, tensions, and critiques. This is critical, because many of the conceptual turns in curriculum around issues of race, culture, knowledge production, and social reproduction can be traced to the historical scholarship of communities of color. For instance, from the late 19th century to the 20th century, numerous scholars of color argued that school knowledge helped to reproduce one's social and racial status in society (Du Bois, 1935; Watkins, 1993; Woodson, 1933/2000). W. E. B. Du Bois's critiques of industrial education (Anderson, 1988) and K–12 history textbooks (Du Bois, 1935) helped to theorize how the official curriculum can enclose and normalize the raced and classed position of African Americans. Through most of the 20th century, scholars of color consistently argued that curriculum is not neutral but has the capacity to reproduce one's personal and material realities. The field, however, has not given full attention to the significance of this body of scholarship within the existing discourse of U.S. curriculum history.

We further contend that vital to reconceptualizing the history of curriculum in the United States, attention must be given to the structural constraints of curriculum history writing within the academy. The significance of this project and of others committed to rethinking curriculum history in the United States (see, e.g., Baker, 2009; Franklin, 2008; Hendry, 2011; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013) is to provide new knowledge about histories, ideas, tensions, and authors that still have received little to no attention in the field of curriculum history in the United States. As we stated earlier in this article, the impetus for engaging in this project was to gain a better understanding of what is missing from the field of curriculum history and to produce new knowledge that further studies will pursue, all in hopes of constructively and critically advancing the field. The way knowledge is produced in the academy and how specific stories recirculate is largely a matter of what stories, theories, and authors endure. Thus we assert that the production of a new kind of curriculum history committed not just to adding to the existing curriculum narrative or replacing one set of histories with another but also to rethinking what constitutes our entire curricular past is relevant to this work. Other scholars have begun to ask similar questions about curriculum history, showing how issues of power, subjectivity, and race made possible the production of curricular knowledge (Carlson, 2009; Fallace, 2012). Some scholars even have started to rethink the curricular discourse of the Progressive Era by giving careful attention to the work of African American scholars (Apple, 2013; Brown, 2010; Buras, 2014; Delissovoy, 2011).

EXPLORING NEW QUESTIONS IN U.S. CURRICULUM HISTORY

The overall point of this project is surprisingly simple: While key meetings, debates, authors, documents, and culture wars occurred within largely White settings, other public spaces such as churches, bookstores, colleges, political organizations, and social movements produced voluminous archives of curricular knowledge that the field has overlooked. The curriculum archives of the Japanese Saturday schools (Morimoto, 1997) of the early 20th century and the curriculum histories of African American bookstores and churches (see Fisher, 2009) are a few examples that would require further historical exploration. The *Journal of Negro Education* and the *Journal of Negro History* from 1930s and 1950s, respectively, also has volumes of substantive theoretical (Daniel, 1932; Horne, 1936) and empirical studies (Reddick, 1934) on the topic of school curriculum. The field of curriculum studies in the United States, however, has not even scratched the surface with tending to such histories.

By extension, this has meant that entire communities have been overlooked. We contend that from this project a new body of knowledge and a new conceptual approach to curriculum history must emerge, one that

thoughtfully engages in questions, ideas, philosophies, narratives, and author studies that provide both depth and comparison to the curricular past of the United States, while also placing forgotten thinkers and ideas within the wider discourse of critical curriculum thought.

In many respects, what we have highlighted in this critical essay is just the beginning. There are numerous questions that can and should be pursued about the historical development of curriculum in the United States and abroad, questions that might trouble what we know about the past of curriculum while also uncovering key intellectual ideas that have been systematically dismissed from the metanarrative of curriculum history. One such example is the prolific philosophical scholarship of Alain Locke (Harris, 1991), who provided key foundational ideas in education about racial essentializing and critical relativism. Studies that consider historical questions across multiple contexts and social positionalities, such as the curricular histories of African and Asian and diasporic African and Asian feminist communities are also needed. We think that in keeping with the recent movement toward internationalization, historical studies should explore curricular projects that consider how curricular ideas and movements traversed continental spaces. Some historians have already explored the ways African and African diasporic communities in the United States employed a shared political discourse to deconstruct Black oppression (Guridy, 2010; Kelley, 1999; Prashad, 2002).

As for the origins of curriculum studies, they cannot be relegated to a few elite White men (and occasional White women) who were able to attend meetings throughout the 20th century or be part of academia-based intellectual projects. To reconfigure the foundations of curriculum studies, we suggest that the narrative of the past or of predecessors in the field must be thoroughly reexamined. We find Paraskeva's (2011) work useful in this regard. In drawing from African and non-Western bodies of knowledge, Paraskeva's work seeks first to decouple the monopoly of Western knowledge in curriculum theory and move toward an itinerant curriculum theory that is always moving and is contextually grounded by histories and experiences that foreground "curriculum." In a sense, curriculum history or foundations of curriculum are never a settled issue or "fixed" through various race, class, gender, and sexual lenses. Thus curriculum history becomes the amalgamation of subject positions that provide no distinct origins or beginnings to the "field." An extension of this work would be to shift the norms of the field in ways that decenter the unspoken universality of recognized early curricular thinkers like Dewey—thinkers whose ideas are often applied universally across time and historical and cultural contexts. Dare we elevate Carter G. Woodson and his extensive and elaborate educational thought to the status of Dewey? What would it mean, for instance, for us to apply a "Woodsian" curriculum[3] to any cultural context in the same way that Dewey is imported and exported so freely? These questions are rhetorical, but we ask them to point out the epistemological

implications of challenging the whiteness of curriculum studies, and to suggest that this epistemological change might shift the meaning of curriculum and curriculum studies relative to communities outside of academia (or locked out of academia, as the case has been historically).

Second is that we aim to broaden the theoretical and disciplinary focus of our field. The context of much of the histories highlighted in this article came from fields other than curriculum studies, such as educational foundations, multicultural education, and historical scholarship. Therefore, we argue that curriculum history must be interdisciplinary and cross disciplinary in order to thoughtfully rethink old curriculum debates, as well as to excavate theories, histories, and scholars that have been silenced from the field.

Numerous scholars have conducted important historical studies on educational reform and curriculum. For example, as discussed above, the work of Jonathan Zimmerman provides some of the most important historical analysis of African Americans and curriculum, as well as the historical contexts of multiple culture wars around curriculum throughout the 20th century. However, his work is rarely acknowledged as "curriculum history" per se. There are numerous African Americanists (Anderson, 1988), Mexican Americanists (MacDonald, 2004; San Miguel, 1987), Native Americanists (Lomawaima & McCarty, 2006), and Asian Americanists (Ichioka, 1988) who provide substantive discussions of the tensions and histories of curriculum within the education of these racial groups. Yet, because this work resides outside the field of curriculum studies, it is rarely discussed in the context of curriculum foundations. The field of curriculum studies should provide theoretical analyses of these forgotten histories in the context of ongoing concerns within the field. This should also include key curricular histories that are often not discussed within the context of curriculum history, including the political struggles of Afrocentrism, multicultural education, and other curricular projects, such as Rethinking Schools, the Zinn Educational Project, and Tucson's Mexican American Studies program.[4] In other words, we not only are calling for a complete retelling of the story of curriculum that includes a more complex range of voices, projects, theories, and histories, but we also are suggesting that curriculum studies needs to actively reconsider the social location of its recognized "founders" as part of a process of opening that distinction to people from other social locations.

Finally, we argue that racial theories must be addressed more prominently in the field of curriculum history. The field of curriculum studies must give specific and detailed theoretical attention to issues of "race" and curriculum that address the material, historical, and discursive processes of "race" and racism across the 20th century (see Brown & Delissovoy, 2011). This would require a deep and substantive historical and theoretical analysis of how both individuals and communities have conceptualized curriculum texts and policies within varied sociohistorical contexts. Taking this

approach would provide historical continuity to enduring issues of race and curriculum that have persisted in the present (Brown & Brown, 2010; Heilig-Valesquez, Brown, & Brown, 2012).

As scholars of curriculum have so aptly shown, the foundations of curriculum studies were explicitly and implicitly tied to issues of race and power (Watkins, 2001; Winfield, 2007). Even the more progressive curriculum discussions of the early 1900s were enclosed within the discourse of whiteness. By employing CRT, racial formation theory, whiteness studies, and racial contract theory, for example, curriculum history can focus more substantively on the material, discursive, and ontological project of curriculum within an enduring racial project. We maintain that, like Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013), racial theories can "intervene upon the settler colonial curricular project of replacement" (p. 80). In this sense, and as illustrated in the revisionist curriculum histories of communities of color, issues of race and power are explicitly and implicitly tied to the history of curriculum in the United States.

We further suggest that the notion of a "foundation" for the field must be considered within the structural and institutional factors that created the conditions for separate curriculum deliberations to surface within various racial groups (e.g., Jim Crow, racist university policies, segregated schooling, and racist immigration laws). In fact, in keeping with the traditions of critical curriculum studies (Au, 2012), our analysis suggests that power and exclusion played a significant role in how groups were able to discuss, struggle, and implement school curriculum. In this sense, a retheorizing of curriculum history would require a reconceptualist approach to documenting the past that has wide-ranging origins, canons, synopses, or theoretical ideas within the contextually specific moments when curriculum was struggled over in the United States.

NOTES

1. See Appendix A for the list of 33 texts used for this analysis. Some of these were also used as references and can be found on Appendix A or on the reference list.

2. The Harlem Renaissance, Freedom Schools, and the Chicano Arts Movement were all social movements that produced volumes of poetry, school curriculum, and writings concerning the raced and classed position of African American and Chicanos. These particular movements resided outside of the academy and weretied to broader cultural and civil right movements.

3. By "Woodsian curriculum" we are referring to the corpus of his work that examined, deconstructed, and revised curriculum through multiple educational spaces such as academic publishing, school textbooks, Black editorials and community education (see King, Crowley, & Brown, 2010).

4. Rethinking Schools, the Zinn Educational Project, and Tucson's Mexican American Studies program are all educational programs that have provided critical and

multicultural curriculum. Rethinking Schools is a nonprofit publisher of educational materials. The Zinn Educational Project is an online resource to help educators use articles and lessons based on the work of historian Howard Zinn. The Tucson Mexican American Studies program is school curriculum produced by a select group of Tucson educators that focuses on issues of critical history and cultural relevance.

REFERENCES

Adams, D. W. (1988). Fundamental considerations: The deep meaning of Native American schooling, 1880–1900. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(1), 1–28.

Anderson, J. A. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Apple, M. W. (1995). *Education and power* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1999). The absent presence of race in educational reform. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 2*(1), 9–16.

Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (2013). Can education change society? Du Bois, Woodson and the politics of social transformation. *Review of Education, 1*(1), 32–56.

Assmann, J., & Czaplicka, J. (1995). Collective memory and cultural identity. *New German Critique, 65*, 125–133.

Au, W. (2012). *Critical curriculum studies: Education, consciousness, and the politics of knowing*. New York: Routledge.

Baker, B. (1996). The history of curriculum or curriculum history? What is the field and who gets to play on it? *Curriculum Studies, 4*(1), 105–117.

Baker, B. (2002). The hunt for disability: The new eugenics and the normalization of school children. *Teachers College Record, 104*(4), 663–703.

Baker, B. (Ed.). (2009). *New curriculum history*. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

Blanton, C. K. (2006). George Sanchez, ideology, and whiteness in the making of the Mexican American civil rights movement, 1930–1960. *Journal of Southern History, 72*, 569–604.

Blanton, C. K. (2012). A legacy of neglect: George I. Sanchez, Mexican American education, and the ideal of integration, 1940–1970. *Teachers College Record, 114*, 1–34.

Brown, A. L. (2010). Counter-memory and race: An examination of African American scholars' challenges to early 20th century K–12 historical discourses. *Journal of Negro Education, 79*(1), 54–65.

Brown, A. L., & Brown, K. D. (2010). Strange fruit indeed: Interrogating contemporary textbook representations of racial violence towards African Americans. *Teachers College Record, 112*(1), 31–67.

Brown, A. L., & Delissovoy, N. (2011). Economies of racism: Grounding education policy research in the complex dialectic of race, class, and capital. *Journal of Educational Policy, 26*(5), 595–619.

Buras, K. L. (2014). From Carter G. Woodson to critical race curriculum studies: Fieldnotes on confronting the history of White supremacy in educational knowledge and practice. In A. D. Dixson (Ed.), *Researching race in education: Policy, practice, and ethnography* (pp. 29–64). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Carlson, D. (2009). Tales of future past: The living legacy of eugenics in American education. *Journal for the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, 5*, 1–10.

Castenell, L., & Pinar, W. F. (Eds.). (1993). *Understanding curriculum as a racial text.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Connelly, F. M., He, M. F., & Phillion J. (Eds.). (2008). *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dagbovie, P. G. (2007). *The Early Black History Movement: Carter G. Woodson, and Lorenzo Johnston Greene.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Daniel, W. G. (1932). The curriculum. *The Journal of Negro Education, 1*(2), 277–303.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: New York University Press.

De Leon, A. (1982). *The Tejano community, 1836–1900.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Delissovoy, N. (2011). Education and volition: Conceptualizing power, domination and agency in the hidden curriculum. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 15*(4), 463–484.

Desai, C. (2012). Do we want something new or just repetition of 1492? Engaging with the "next" moment in curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 8*(1), 153–167.

Deyhle, D., Swisher, K., Stevens, T., & Galvan, R. T. (2008). Indigenous resistance and renewal: From colonizing practices to self-determination. In F. M. Connelly, M. F. He, & J. Phillion (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 329–348). Thousand Oaks, CA Sage.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1935). *Black reconstruction in America, 1860–1880.* New York: Atheneum.

Fallace, T. (2012). Recapitualition theory and the new education: Race, culture, imperialism and pedagogy, 1894–1916. *Curriculum Inquiry, 42,* 510–533.

Fisher, M. T. (2009). *Black literate lives: Historical and contemporary perspectives.* New York: Routledge.

Flinders, D. J., & Thornton, S. J. (Eds.). (2012). *The curriculum studies reader* (4th ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Flores, R. (2002). *Remembering the Alamo: Memory, modernity, and the master symbol.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Franklin, B. M. (2008). Curriculum history and its revisionist legacy. In W. J. Reese & J. L. Rury (Eds.), *Rethinking the history of American education* (pp. 223–244). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Garcia, M. (1981). *Desert immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880–1920.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2006). Regarding race: The necessary browning of our curriculum and pedagogy public project. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 3*(1), 60–65.

Gaztambide-Fernández, R., & Thiessen, D. (2012). Fomenting flows and internationalizing curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry, 42*(1), 1–11.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Gordon, B. (1993). Toward emancipation in citizenship education: The case of African-American cultural knowledge. In L. Castenell & W. F. Pinar (Eds.), *Representations of identity and difference in education* (pp. 263–284). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Grant, C. (2011). Escaping Devil's Island: Confronting racism, learning history. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 14*(1), 33–49.

Guridy, F. (2010). *Forging diaspora: Afro-Cubans and African Americans in a world of empire and Jim Crow.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Harris, L. (Ed.). (1991). *The philosophy of Alain Locke: Harlem Renaissance and beyond.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Heilig-Valesquez, J., Brown, K. D., & Brown, A. L. (2012). The illusion of inclusion: A critical race theory textual analysis of race and standards. *Harvard Educational Review, 82*(3), 403–424.
Hendry, P. (2011). *Engendering curriculum history.* New York: Routledge.
Horne, F. S. (1936). "Dog house" education. *The Journal of Negro Education, 5*(3), 359–368.
Ichioka, Y. (1988). *The Issei: The world of the first generation Japanese immigrants, 1885–1924.* New York: The Free Press.
Kelley, R. (1999). "But a local phase of a world problem": Black history's global vision, 1883–1950. *The Journal of American History, 86*(3), 1045–1077.
Kim, P.-G., & Marshall, J. D. (2006). Synoptic curriculum texts: Representation of contemporary curriculum scholarship. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 38*(3), 327–349.
Kincheloe, J. L., Steinberg, S. R., Rodriguez, N. M., & Chennault, R. E. (Eds.). (2000). *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
King, L. J., Crowley, R. M., & Brown, A. L. (2010). The forgotten legacy of Carter G. Woodson: Contributions to multicultural social studies and African American history. *The Social Studies, 101*(5), 211–215.
King, L. J., Davis, C., & Brown, A. L. (2012). African American history, race and textbooks: An examination of the works of Harold O. Rugg and Carter G. Woodson. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 36*(4), 359–386.
Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893–1958* (3rd ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
Le Goff, J. (1992). *History and memory.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Leonardo, Z. (2009). *Race, whiteness, and education.* New York: Routledge.
Lomawaima, K. T., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). *To remain an Indian: Lessons in democracy from a century of Native American education.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Lowenthal, D. (1998). *The heritage crusade and the spoils of history.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
MacDonald, V. M. (Ed.). (2004). *Latino education in the United States: A narrated history from 1513–2000.* New York: Palgrave.
Malewski, E. (Ed.). (2010). *Curriculum studies handbook: The next movement.* New York: Routledge.
Marshall, D.J., Sears, J.T., Allen, L.A., Roberts, P.A., and Schubert, W. H. (2006). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary American memoir* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
McCarthy, C. (1988). Rethinking liberal and radical perspectives on racial inequality in schooling: Making the case for nonsynchrony. *Harvard Educational Review, 58*(3) , 265–279.
McCarthy, C. (1990a). Multicultural education, minority identities, textbooks, and the challenge of curriculum reform. *Journal of Education, 172*(2), 118–129.
McCarthy, C. (1990b). Race and education in the United States: The multicultural solution. *Interchange, 21*(3), 45–55.
Miller, J. L. (2005). The American curriculum field and its worldly encounters. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 21*(2), 9–24.
Mills, C. (1997). *The racial contract.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Mills, C. (1998). *Blackness visible.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Morimoto, T. (1997). *Japanese Americans and cultural continuity: Maintaining language and heritage.* New York: Garland.
Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From 1960's to 1990's.* New York: Routledge.
Ornstein, A. C., Pajak, E. F., & Ornstein, S. B. (2007). *Contemporary issues in curriculum* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Paraskeva, J. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Pinar, W. (2006). *The synoptic text today*. New York: Peter Lang.
Pinar, W. (2012). *What is curriculum theory* (2nd ed.)? New York: Routledge.
Pinar, W., & Bower, C. A. (1992). Politics of curriculum: Origins, controversies, and significance of critical perspectives. *Review of Research in Education*, *18*(1), 163–190.
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.
Prashad, V. (2002). *Everybody was Kung Fu fighting: Afro-Asian connections and the myth of cultural purity*. Boston: Beacon.
Reddick, L. (1934). Racial attitudes in American history textbooks of the South. *The Journal of Negro History*, *19*(3), 225–265.
Reynolds, W. M. (1990). Perspectives and imperatives: Comprehensiveness and multidimensionality in synoptic curriculum texts. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, *5*(2), 189–193.
Roediger, D. R. (1994). *Towards the abolition of whiteness: Essays on race, politics, and working class history*. New York: Verso.
Rogan, J. M., & Luckowski, J. A. (1990). Curriculum texts: The portrayal of the field. Part 1. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *22*(1), 17–39.
Salinas, C. (2005). A generation of defiance and change: An oral history of Texas educator and activists Blandina "Bambi" Cárdenas. In L. M. Burlbaw & S. L. Field (Eds.), *Explorations in curriculum history* (pp. 227–240). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
Sanchez, G. (1939). *The equalization and educational opportunity—Some issues and problems*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
Sanchez, G. (1940). Education. *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *208*, 144–152.
Sanchez, G. (1941). Cultural relations within the Americas. *Childhood Education*, *18*(1), 339–342.
San Miguel, G. (1987). *"Let them all take heed": Mexican Americans and the campaign for educational equity in Texas, 1910–1981*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
San Miguel, G., & Valencia, R. (1998). From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to *Hopwood:* The educational plight and struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. *Harvard Educational Review*, *68*, 367–377.
Schomburg, A. (1992). The Negro digs up his past. In A. Locke (Ed.), *The new Negro: An interpretation* (pp. 231–237). New York: Arnon. (Original work published 1925)
Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
Schubert, W. H. (2010). Journeys of expansion and synopsis: Tensions in books that shaped curriculum inquiry, 1968–present. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *40*(1), 17–94.
Schubert, W. H., Schubert, A. L. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.
Spencer, H. (1860). *Education: Intellectual, moral, and physical*. New York: D. Appleton.
Standing Bear, L. (1978). *Land of the spotted eagle*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (Original work published 1933)
Taliaferro-Baszile, D. (2010). In Ellisonian eyes, what is curriculum theory? In E. Malewski (Ed.), *Curriculum studies handbook: The next movement* (pp. 483–495). New York: Routledge.

Tamura, E. (1994). *Americanization, acculturation, and ethnic identity: The Nisei generation in Hawaii*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Tamura, E. (2010). Value messages collide with reality: Joseph Kurihara and the power of informal education. *History of Education Quarterly, 50*(1), 1–33.
Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1995). *Curriculum development: Theory into practice*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Tom, K. F. (1941). Function of Chinese-language schools. *Sociology and Social Research, 25*, 557–571.
Trouillot, M. (1995). *Silencing the past: Power and the production of history*. Boston: Beacon.
Trujillo, A. (2005). Politics, school philsophy, and language policy: The case of Crystal City Schools. *Educational Policy, 19*, 621–654.
Tuck, E. (2011). Rematriating curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, 8*(1), 34–37.
Tuck, E., & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. A. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 29*(1), 72–89.
Urrieta, L. Jr. (2004). Dis-connections in "American" citizenship and the post/neo-colonial: People of Mexican descent and whitestream pedagogy and curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 32*(4), 433–458.
Valencia, R. R. (2010). *Chicano students and the courts: The Mexican American legal struggle for educational equality*. New York: New York University Press.
Watkins, W. H. (1993). Black curriculum orientations: A preliminary inquiry. *Harvard Educational Review, 63*, 321–338.
Watkins, W. (2001). *The White architects of Black education: Ideology and power in America, 1856–1954*. New York: Teachers College Press.
Wiegman, R. (1993). The anatomy of lynching. *Journal of the History of Sexuality, 3*(3), 445–467.
Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Winfield, A. G. (2007). *Eugenics and education in America: Institutionalized racism and the implications of history, ideology, and memory*. New York: Peter Lang.
Woodson, C. G. (2000). *The miseducation of the Negro*. Chicago: African American Images. (Original work published 1933)
Woodson, C. G., & Wesley, C. H. (1922). *The Negro in our history*. Washington, DC: Associated.
Woodson, C. G., & Wesley, C. H. (1928). *Negro makers of history*. Washington, DC: Associated.
Woodson, C. G., & Wesley, C. H. (1935). *The story of the Negro retold*. Washington, DC: Associated.
Wraga, W. G. (1998). Interesting, if true: Historical perspectives on the "reconceptualization" of curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 14*(1), 5–28.
Wraga, W. G. (1999). "Extracting sun-beams out of cucumbers": The retreat from practice in reconceptualized curriculum studies. *Educational Researcher, 28*(1), 4–13.
Yosso, T. J. (2002). Toward a critical race curriculum. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*(2), 93–107.
Zimmerman, J. (2002). *Whose America? Culture wars in the public schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Zimmerman, J. (2004). Brown-ing the American textbook: History, psychology and origins of modern multiculturalism. *History of Education Quarterly, 44*(1), 46–69.

APPENDIX A: TEXTS ANALYZED FOR THIS STUDY

1. Baker, B. (Ed.). (2009). *New curriculum history.* Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
2. Beyer, L. E., & Apple, M. W. (Eds.). (1988). *The curriculum: Problems, politics, and possibilities.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
3. Bullough, R. V., Holton, J. T., Kridel, C., & Schubert, W. H. (1994). *The American curriculum: A documentary history.* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO Praeger.
4. Castenell, L., & Pinar, W. F. (Eds.). (1993). *Understanding curriculum as a racial text.* Albany: State University of New York Press.
5. Connelly, F. M., He, M. F., & Phillion, J. (Eds.). (2008). *The SAGE handbook of curriculum and instruction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
6. Doll, R. C. (1996). *Curriculum improvement: Decision making and process* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
7. Eisner, E. W. (2001). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
8. Ellis, A. (2003). *Exemplars of curriculum theory.* Larchmon, NY: Eye on Education.
9. Flinders, D. J., & Thornton, S. J. (Eds.). (2012). *The curriculum studies reader* (4th ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
10. Glatthorn, A. A., Boschee, F. A., & Whitehead, B. M. (2005). *Curriculum leadership: Development and implementation.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
11. Joseph, P. B. (2012). *Cultures of curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
12. Kliebard, H. M. (1992). *Forging the American curriculum: Essays in curriculum history and theory.* New York: Routledge.
13. Kliebard, H. M. (1999). *Schooled to work: Vocationalism and the American curriculum, 1876–1946.* New York: Teachers College Press.
14. Kliebard, H. M. (2002). *Changing course: American curriculum reform in the 20th century.* New York: Teachers College Press.
15. Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893–1958* (3rd ed.). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
16. Malewski, E. (Ed.). (2009). *Curriculum studies handbook: The next movement.* New York: Routledge.
17. Marsh, C. J. (2009). *Key concepts for understanding curriculum.* New York: Routledge.
18. Marsh, C. J., & Willis, G. (2006). *Curriculum: Alternative approaches, ongoing issues* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
19. Marshall, J. D., Sears, J. T., Allen, L. A., & Roberts, P. A. (2006). *Turning points in curriculum: A contemporary American memoir* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
20. McNeil, J. D. (1996). *Curriculum: A comprehensive introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Harper-Collins.
21. McNeil, J. D. (2008). *Contemporary curriculum: In thought and action* (7th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
22. Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2008). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
23. Pinar, W. F. (2006). *The synoptic text today and other essays: Curriculum development after the reconceptualization.* New York: Peter Lang.
24. Pinar, W. F. (2012). *What is curriculum theory* (2nd ed.)*?* New York: Routledge.
25. 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.

26. Reynolds, W. M., & Webber, J. A. (2004). *Expanding curriculum theory: Dis/positions and lines of flight*. New York: Routledge.
27. Schiro, M. S. (2007). *Curriculum development: Conflicting visions and enduring concerns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
28. Schubert, W. H. (1986). *Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
29. Schubert, W. H., Schubert, A. L. L., Thomas, T. P., & Carroll, W. M. (2002). *Curriculum books: The first hundred years* (2nd ed.). New York: Peter Lang.
30. Slattery, P. (2006). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
31. Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (1995). *Curriculum development: Theory into practice*. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
32. Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (2010). *Curriculum development: A guide to practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
33. Willis, G., Schubert, W. H., Bullough, R. V., Kridel, C., & Holton, J. T. (1994). *The American curriculum: A documentary history*. Westport, CT: Praeger.