cal as well as intellectual. Especially in this time of pervasive anti-intellectualism, not only inside the broad field of education but across American society and specifically in government, theoretical research becomes a political undertaking. Akin to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's characterization of philosophy, curriculum theory is the creation of "untimely" concepts in Nietzsche's sense of this term, by "acting counter to our time, and thereby acting on our time and, let us hope, for the benefit of a time to come" (1983a; quoted in Patton 2000, 3). Optimistic by profession, innocent by design, we teachers resist facing the fact that the historical present is an educational nightmare haunted by right-wing reactionaries and business-enamored politicians.

In acknowledging the historical present, we curriculum theorists do not imagine that we represent the vanguard of a movement which foreshadows social change. Even if significant social change seemed a possibility, the position of the vanguard is a discredited one, implying, as it does, an intellectual and political elite who "know better" than their fellow citizens and colleagues. The labor of curriculum theorizing today can be understood more precisely by invoking Deleuze's conception of theory as a relay of practice, a conception, as Paul Patton points out, that is closer to the idea expressed by Nietzsche's distinction between academic philosophers in uncritical service to the State, and those "true" philosophers who must remain "private thinkers" (see Nietzsche 1983b; Patton 2000, 5).

To remain a private thinker means that one's scholarship, one's thinking, teaching, and writing, are engaged in self-overcoming, the surpassing of the historical, sedimented "self" one has been conditioned and, perhaps, required to be. In working to overcome the "self" conceived by others, one "works from within," from one's interiority, which is a specific configuration of the socius and therefore, by definition, a public project as well. This apparent paradox—that one's private self is necessarily public—is clarified in Patton's characterization of Jean-Paul Sartre, in many ways the preeminent private-and-public intellectual of the 20th century, at least in the West. Patton (2000, 5) describes Sartre "as a modern paradigm of the private thinker who spoke and acted on his own behalf rather than as the representative of a political party or social class." Such thinkers "seek to align themselves with the unrepresentable forces that introduce disorder and a dose of permanent revolution into political and social life" (Patton 2000, 6). Such thinkers I designate, then, as "private-and-public" intellectuals. They are private in Nietzsche's sense of self-overcoming while publicly declining to employ their intellectual labor in unquestioning service to the State and in complicity with the political status quo. They work from "within." Curriculum theory, then, constitutes a public and political commitment that requires autobiographical excavation and the self-reflexive articulation of one's subjectivity in society.

Private can imply isolation from historical forces and social movements. Such an implication would be mistaken here, as I am suggesting that histori-

cal forces and social movements are both the sources of interiority and the provocations of theorizing and teaching. But a certain solitude—a "room of one's own" in Virginia Woolf's famous phrase—is a prerequisite for that "complicated conversation" with oneself without which one disappears onto the social surface, into the maelstrom that is the public world. Without a private life, without an ongoing project of autobiographical understanding, one's intellectual "practice" too often tends toward the miming of what is fashionable or profitable. A public intellectual who is not also a private intellectual risks the convoluted expression of private emotion projected onto the social surface, as interiority not self-reflexively grasped can disappear into, and be misrecognized as, "the world." An "organic" intellectual's relation to the "multitude" (Hardt and Negri 2000, 61) necessarily includes one's relationship with one's self, one's self-reflexive articulation of one's subjectivity. It is through subjectivity that one experiences history and society, and through which history and society speak.

III
"TOO LITTLE INTELLECT IN MATTERS OF SOUL": ON THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

Teaching is essentially social, moral, and political.
—Landon Beyer, Walter Feinberg, Jo Anne Pagano, and Tony Whitson (1989, 19)

To the devil with the practical sense, which leads only to the temporary success of one's own egotistical purposes.
—Wassily Kandinsky (September 9, 1905; quoted in Izenberg 2000, 173)

We do not have too much intellect and too little soul, but too little intellect in matters of the soul.
—Robert Musil (1990 [1922] 131)

Curriculum theory understands teacher education as engaging prospective and practicing teachers self-reflexively in interdisciplinary study, study often located at the intersections of self and society, the local and the global, the school subjects and everyday life. Examples of such interdisciplinary study include autobiography, multiculturalism, women's and gender studies, postcolonial studies, popular culture, postmodernism, psychoanalytic theory, cultural studies and those scholarly efforts to understand globalization.

Moreover, both schooling and education (intersecting but hardly identical terms) are studied at their organizational and intellectual center, the curriculum. They are also studied historically, in part to enable teachers to appreciate how they came to be working under current conditions, among them di-

minished academic freedom, including the loss of control over the means by which teachers assess students' study and academic accomplishment.

Curriculum theory understands teacher education not as learning a new language for what teachers already do, although the language we employ to understand what we do structures, as well as represents, professional conduct. After Huebner (1999), we understand the limitations of the language of "learning," embedded as that term is in academic psychology, rather than in psychoanalysis (see Britzman 1998). British-born and -educated Canadian curriculum theorist Robin Barrow (1984, 97) is blunt: "I shall argue, however, that there is very little of importance for educators that can be gained from the study of such things as learning theory, child development and personality."

After Huebner, we appreciate the significance of employing ethical, religious, and aesthetic languages to depict and structure our professional activities as educators. Curriculum scholars are rightly suspicious of rhetorical bandwagons such as "competency-based" or "outcome-based" or "standards" and immediately go to work to situate them historically, in terms of the discourse systems in which they operate, especially in politicians' obfuscating rhetorics.

In studying curriculum theory, then, teachers are not being asked to learn how to do something "new" in the classroom, although their conduct there may well be altered, perhaps even transformed, as a consequence of studying curriculum theory. How it will be altered or transformed one cannot predict, however. We curriculum theorists do not regard our task as directing teachers to apply theory to practice, a form of professional subordination, in positions (as Southern Baptists once described wives' relations to their husbands) of "gracious submission."

Rather, curriculum theorists in the university regard our pedagogical work as the cultivation of independence of mind, self-reflexivity, and an interdisciplinary erudition. We hope to persuade teachers to appreciate the complex and shifting relations between their own self-formation and the school subjects they teach, understood both as subject matter and as human subjects.

Skeptical of "business thinking" (or the business metaphor, "one in which curriculum producers offer something to curriculum consumers" [Aoki in press]) and of military discipline, both of which continue to be invoked as corrective to the supposed lack of "rigor" in schools (a gendered and racialized as well as academic judgment), curriculum theorists appreciate that the profession of teaching requires us—as faculty, that is, as private-and-public intellectuals—to understand and participate collaboratively in the school, including in the governance of the day-to-day life of the institution *and* in the administration of academic matters such as curriculum content, teaching styles, and the assessment of students' study.

Participating in the governance of the school requires us to remain (or to become) self-aware of the multiple functions and potentials of the process of education and of the institutions which formalize them. This means becoming articulate about and exercising influence over curriculum content, including interdisciplinary configurations (such as women's and gender studies), theories of pedagogy, and the various means of assessing student study. How all this gets worked out, including how teachers' already overburdened schedules (too many students and too many classes continue to characterize teachers' underpaid and unprofessional lives in too many schools), is outside the purview of curriculum theory, but its scholarly understanding is not.

Curriculum theory is a form of practical-theoretical reason. As such, it is not subject to the scientific norms of reason and truth (see Kohli 1995). Curriculum theory can be best understood as extension and reconfiguration of theory in the humanities and the arts (including arts-based research [see, e.g., Barone 2000]). Curriculum theory is significantly informed as well by social and autobiographical theory, themselves (as we see in chapter 2) intersecting domains.

Why is autobiographical theory key in social analysis? As Joe L. Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg (1993, 300) suggest: "Power manifests itself not through some explicit form of oppression, but via the implicit reproduction of the self." I might amend the observation by inserting "only" after "not," but the point is well taken. As Elizabeth Ellsworth (1997, 42) has observed, an exclusive emphasis upon the social in educational research is "impoverished." What is required in teacher education might be the study of what Megan Boler (1999, 142) terms "emotional epistemologies," by which she means "a public recognition of the ways in which the 'social' defines the 'interior' realm of experience, and vice versa."

Curriculum theory, then, is a form of autobiographical and theoretical truth-telling that articulates the educational experience of teachers and students as lived. As such, curriculum theory speaks from the subjective experience of history and society, the inextricable interrelationships among which structure educational experience. The role of language—first articulated by Dwayne Huebner in the 1960s (see his collected works: Huebner 1999)—in such "truth-telling" is key. As the legendary Canadian curriculum theorist Ted Aoki (in press), has warned: "the danger . . . is that we become the language we speak." In psychoanalytic (rather than phenomenological) terms, the point is the same: "[t]here is no language without desire and no desire which is not itself language" (Silverman 2000, 55–56).

If we employ, for instance, that bureaucratic language in which teaching becomes not an occasion for creativity and dissent and, above all, individuality, but, rather, the "implementation" of others' "objectives," the process of education is mutilated. Whatever language we employ, we "become" the language. In "becoming" the language of "implementation," Aoki (in press)

notes, "we might become forgetful of how instrumental language disengages us form our bodies, making of us disembodied, dehumanized beings, indifferent to the nihilistic drying out of inspiritedness." "Instead of 'curriculum implementation'," Aoki asks, "how about 'curriculum improvisation'?" Such a shift in theoretical articulation, he notes, "provokes in us a vitalizing possibility that causes our whole body to beat a new and different rhythm."

Such a "new and different rhythm" is very much needed in teacher education, one that makes audible the generative roles of creativity and individuality in teaching. As Elizabeth Ellsworth (1997, 137) has observed: "Our improvisations are performative, they are culture-in-the-making." But teacher education today threatens to become culture-in-the-unmaking as it is deprofessionalized by anti-intellectual interventions by government and by presumably professional organizations such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (see chapter 9, sections II and III). In this "business-minded" or "technological" present, theory is severed from practice. In Musil's analysis of European culture, quoted to start the chapter, the problem of the age is the severance of intellect from soul.

When the legendary Ted Aoki recalled working as a public school teacher, his teaching seemed to reflect, rather than challenge, this cultural crisis in which work is split off from play, mind from body, soul from intellect (where it is, presumably, merely a matter of "faith"). "What I was teaching," Aoki concludes, reflecting on his own practice as a public school teacher for 19 years, "was a way of life that sees thinking as theorizing and doing as practicing." The title of the textbook he used to teach reading—*We Think and Do*—represents, he suggests, "a mundane version of what could be entitled *We Theorize and Practice*." "For educators," he notes, "it is a way of life that regards teacher preparation in education curriculum and instruction courses as theorizing and the practicing of theories as *practicum*."

"Must we be caught up totally in the linearized form of from theory into practice? Aoki (in press) asks? Must we? The answer, in the United States at least, is "yes," as government and its enforcers—such as NCATE—position teachers and those of us who teach teacher into positions of "gracious submission." This subjugation—rationalized by a rhetoric of "accountability" that, judged by the Enron and WorldCom scandals of 2002, even American business does not practice—is presumably in service of "learning."

Presumably. But, as Linda McNeil (2000, xiv) understands, "by increasing bureaucratic controls, these reforms inadvertently strengthened the very forces that are known to undermine teaching and learning, as teachers and students react against controls by limiting their own work." "Accountability" is not about "learning," but about controlling what we teach to our children. It is about controlling the curriculum. To achieve this control—which is, finally, control of the mind—the public schools are severed from both the social and the subjective. Teachers are reduced to technicians, "managing" student productivity. The school is no longer a school, but a business.

IV
THE SCHOOL AS A BUSINESS

No doubt there is a certain measure of inherent dissonance between business enterprise and intellectual enterprise.
—Richard Hofstadter (1962, 233)

We may say, of course, that it is a primitive view of life, which thus confuses intellectuality and business ability.
—Jane Addams (2002 [1902], 15)

The various institutions of modern society should be viewed as an archipelago of factories of subjectivity.
—Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000, 195)

While the point of the American public schools has not changed much over the past 100 years, the economy schools were designed to support has. The consensus view is that the American economy is less and less industrial and more and more "service oriented," strongly "information based," increasingly organized around technological developments, including the Internet. It is said to be international or global in character. Rather than the assembly line of the early automobile factory, the major mode of economic production today is semiotic (i.e., production of signs, symbols, and other information), and it occurs not in factories but in committees and in front of computer screens in corporate offices.

Most American schools, however, still tend to be modeled after the assembly-line factory. Modeling schools after the contemporary corporation (that "profoundly undemocratic institution" [Lasch 1984, 51]) represents, presumably, an improvement. So-called "smart schools" tend to be versions of the corporate model (Fiske 1991). In this corporate model, however, the economic function of schools remains unchallenged, and the modes of cognition appropriate to even corporate schools are fewer and narrower than intelligence more broadly understood.

Because the organization and culture of the school are linked to the economy and dominated by "business thinking," the school and the American curriculum field have traveled different paths over the past 30 years. For the foreseeable future, most teachers will be trained as "social engineers," directed to "manage" learning that is modeled loosely after corporate work stations. Certainly some segment of the American curriculum field will devote