1. Methodology and the Power of the Personal

Our aim in this section is to explain as exhaustively as we can the methodological tools that we used to support our research. In so doing, we try to explain how our own lives, marked by so much political havoc served positively to push us not only to the educational field, but also, and this is quite important, to end up studying what we call Michael Apple’s long political and pedagogical [r]evolution. It is in this section that we try to build evidence that the power of the self undeniably drove us to a methodological framework that takes a critical approach with complementary qualitative forms which combine different kinds of data such as archival and textual analyses, long term and continuous informal interviews both with Michael Apple and Huebner gathered over a three-year period, and historical work on the history of the curriculum. Informal notes that we took in Michael Apple’s doctoral courses were also considered. In this section we also reveal the way we built the chapters that structures our work. Finally, we take a few paragraphs to explain some of the dilemmas we faced during our research.

1.1 Flying Inside the Bottle or Topography of the Self

For Lourenzo Marques, the dawn of April 24, 1974, began like any other day. It was the beginning of a “normal” day for some. For many others, it was just “another” day. Yet another day of school at the ‘Liceu Normal Salazar’ faced the little boy, born in the then ultramarine province of Mozambique, the son of a Greek father and a mother of Greek-descent.

On his return from school, after some lost battles and a couple won in the field of mathematics - for he increasingly demonstrated an inclination towards languages, especially for literature - he listened inadvertently to an animated conversation between two neighbors: ‘There is something serious going on in the Metropolis - Portugal (...) it looks like the terrorists (FRELIMO 1, he immediately came to understand the very next day) have won the war’.

---

1 Mozambican Liberation Front.
Although the matter had been discussed at dinner (his parents had always had a sharpened political awareness), for the little boy, the importance and the effects of what he had heard would only be felt the following day. On the April 25, 1974, there was a *coup d’état* in Portugal, provoked by - as he would come to understand much later - not only decades and decades of struggle and resistance against the dictatorship of Salazar and Caetano in Portugal, but also and above all, stimulated by the armed forces which were formed by the various anti-colonial liberation movements from the beginning of the 1960s, thus giving full expression to a feeling of liberty and anti-colonialism that emerged immediately at the beginning of the long and complex process of decolonialization.

From this date on, everything in the little boy’s life was to undergo change, transformations were to follow each other at a dizzying speed in the period of the government’s transition to independence headed by Crespo and Chissano, as a result of the Lusaka “accord” signed by the Portuguese government. Thus, and quite naturally, the provincial government of Mozambique led by Dos Santos fell.

Needless to say it was not a peaceful transition, as the bloody events of September 7, 1974, among others, attest. On this day, a group of elite troops from the colonial army, the Commandos, refused to capitulate. It was during this transitional year that the little boy would come to feel, as others must have, the dramatic transformations occurring all around him. From the advent of a new language (though part of it was already familiar from his parents’ conversations, for the little boy, to use an expression by Trouillot2, “grew up in a family where history sat at the dinner table”), through the turbulence of the revolution, the conflicts at his school almost always exploded in a disproportionately violent way. A period of constant struggle between the *Selfs* of the past and of the present resulted in the anxious attempt to affirm oneself in terms of the new reality. Long-established friendships whithered away gradually. Not even sports, at this point in their lives treated as free of the dynamics of race, class and gender, especially football and basketball united them any longer. The wounds of racial segregation rose to the surface of society with all its disproportionality and vigor, after centuries of being smothered. Little by little he came to see that there are no peaceful revolutions.

---

Contrarily to the scenario in South Africa, the racial segregation in the then ultramarine province of Mozambique was more “dissimulated”. However, this did not mean that it did not exist. For the little boy, as he would come to understand, it was the beginning of a diabolical and complex process of introspection and attempts at understanding the social and political transformations that were successively taking place with an apparent commonplaceness after the centuries of cruel segregation. It was also the beginning of him questioning his own education and the emergence of a certain political awareness. After all, although society in general was undergoing profound radicalization, he spent the majority of the day at school and it was at school that, for him, the great transformations, the great debates, and the great conflicts took place. He wondered, ‘What type of education has driven us to this school?’

At home, the atmosphere was no less complex for the little boy. His parents explained that the ‘terrorists were not terrorists’ and that his uncle, whom he came to meet only at the end of 1974, was a member of FRELIMO and that he was in Tunduru in Tanzania. His uncle had been arrested in 1961 by the PIDE, the secret police of the Portuguese regime, and soon after having been released, he had run away together with another anti-fascist rebel in a small Cessna, hijacked from the Portuguese armed forces, to join those who (no longer) were terrorists. The two, were among the founders of FRELIMO, and in fact, would later come to assume the posts of Minister of Agriculture and of Security respectively, in the Peoples Republic of Mozambique. After the imprisonment and consequent escape of his uncle, his parents, so as not to be bothered by the PIDE had burnt and buried in the garden of their Matola home books and documents belonging to his uncle. The little boy understood now why the old man Castanheira, although apparently peaceful, was the number one enemy of the family. He was the PIDE officer who had arrested his uncle.

The ambience in the house was one of euphoria and anxiety. Euphoria, because according to his parents, independence was the best thing that could happen to them. Segregation, they explained, was much more complex than skin color; the (true) power, the (true) wealth, the great social and economic benefits and privileges had always been at hand for those born in the Metropolis. The great majority of the whites born in the then ultramarine province of Mozambique were considered Portuguese citizens of secondary status, while the Indians, coloreds and blacks systematically
faced inhumane conditions of survival. Since they had been the ones who had always wanted independence, they expected much of the newly independent Mozambique.

It was in the turmoil of all these events that the little boy began to negotiate his new surroundings, to wholeheartedly struggle for an understanding of the conflicts that assailed him on a daily basis. Progressively, he came to understand with clarity that his formal education had failed to prepare him for all that. To interpret that reality was now a constant challenge. To this day, he remembers what he felt when the FRELIMO troops entered the capital, and above all, when Machel arrived in Maputo after a trip that began in Rovuma, celebrating the victory over Portuguese colonialism.

Naturally and as consequence not only of the armed struggle for national liberation begun by the liberation movements, but above all as a result of the first movements in opposition to colonialism, in which the figure of Gungunhana stands out, June 25, 1974, the day of national independence, was celebrated in what was then called Salazar Stadium, now the Stadium of Machava. Among the more than sixty thousand spectators who proudly witnessed the event was the little boy, also feeling euphoric and proud. To this day, words fail him to describe what he felt when he saw the Portuguese flag lowered and the Mozambiquan flag raised, when the hands on the clock struck zero hours. Thus was the People’s Republic of Mozambique born, and for the boy, an increasingly clearer ideal thanks largely to the explanations of his parents and, most especially, from his uncle, who returned after more than a decade of exile. At school, a teacher – Rosário - told him that he was part of a privileged generation, because he had witnessed the independence of his country. He increasingly felt more like a Mozambiquan and he increasingly understood what it was to be Mozambiquan. He was proud of this especially since, despite his Greek heritage, he had never visited Greece (or even Portugal). Nothing connected him to Europe. Absolutely nothing.

But with independence, everything changed. For example, streets were named after Vladimir Lenin, Karl Marx, Frederich Engels, Julius Nyerere, Keneth Kaunda, Patrice Lumumba, Mao Tsé Tung, Kim Il Sung, Kwane N’khruma; the names of suburbs, of schools, of hospitals, of the cities Maputo, Pemba, Manica were altered. The state nationalized everything, fixed property, health, education, air, maritime and land transports, airports, and ports. However, for the little boy, the major
transformations took place in his school. He had the same classrooms, the same desks, and mostly the same classmates—some Chilean, Bulgarian and Hungarian pupils had arrived—however, in the classrooms, the crucifix was replaced by two large picture frames. One with the photograph of Mondlane, the first President of FRELIMO who had been assassinated by a letter bomb at the beginning of the 1960s in Dar-es-Salam, Tanzania, and another with the photograph of Machel, President of FRELIMO and of the Republic. The little boy would come to participate in school cleaning sessions, and on the holidays, the students had to work in factories or in the fields. The social role of the student was not limited to the school. He was now considered more of a creator of the revolution, a socially active being who should participate in a dynamic way in many spheres of society. He was, in fact, a most valuable actor in the revolution. He retains all these memories and the power and the role they had in the construction of his social being, namely, his experience working in the collection of garbage, in the beer factory, in the pineapple plantations and even in helping flood refugees. Actually the life of a student was a much fuller and more global one since one did not learn only from books. What emerged out of the mouths of the teachers (male and female), what the teachers wrote on the blackboard, and what was in the textbooks, was a significant part towards the construct of knowledge, but sometimes merely a pale construct.

However, the transformations that he would come to know in a much more acute way were the changes in the teachers and above all, in the programs. The classes were now dominated by Cuban, Soviet, Chinese, Bulgarian, Chilean, and Swedish teachers. Besides drastic transformations within the actual content - de Albuquerque was now a villain and Gungunhana (up till then a bandit) was now studied as a national figure, and as a hero of Southern Africa, now there was the need to consider Marx and everything that was related with Marxist theory; in prose and in poetry the works of Neruda and Brecht were highlighted. This issue would come to be intensified when at the Third Congress of the Liberation Front of Mozambique, which took place in Maputo—the first to take place in independent Mozambique—the Central Committee converted the “Front” into the FRELIMO Party of Marxist-Leninist orientation and, consequently, the Republic too. The reactions were not long in coming.
This measure would prove to be one of the most determining in the future of the young sovereign state and, clearly, in the life of the little boy. All this took place when instability reigned in the region. South Africa, the then Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Malawi, were undergoing complex political events. Given the fact that Mozambique had assumed its position of a Marxist-Leninist Republic, the United States administration placed the country on its blacklist\(^3\). Its “jackals” (that was the term that was used at that time) in the region (namely, South Africa, the then Southern Rhodesia, Namibia and Malawi) were progressively strangling Mozambique with politics of economic suffocation, or with military incursions to “strategic targets” of the ANC\(^4\) and SWAPO\(^5\), now based in Maputo and in Matola, and of the ZANU-PF\(^6\) and ZAPU\(^7\), in Manica, and even with armed bombs, as was the case with First, the wife of Slovo, who was leader of the Communist Party in South Africa and the case with Sachs, who would come to lose one of his arms. Both First and Sachs, like many South Africans, Zimbabweans, Chileans, and East Timoreans were exiles in Mozambique. Mozambique was steadily coming to be known as one of the safe areas in the struggle against Imperialism and towards the construction of a socialist world.

At school, the little boy was now learning the necessity and the urgency of the internationalization of the struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism orchestrated by the U.S. external politics and the total dismantling of the colonization mechanisms. This was in contrast to his recent past when he had learned about Portugal, its rivers and tributaries, its plains, valleys and hills, its railways, and its regions. Instead he heard, ‘Africa will only be free when all its African peoples acquire their total and unconditional independence’. There was the need to ‘make the school into a basis for the people to assume power’. The revolution was far from finished. On the contrary, it had just begun and the students were now nominated to be the ‘continuers of the revolution’. It was in the school that he initially came into contact with the key

\(^3\) In this regard vide the research conducted by Austin, K. and edited by W. Minter (1994) *Invisible Crimes. US Private Intervention in the War in Mozambique*. Washington: Africa Policy Information Center. The correspondence between the Jett Dennis Charge d’ Affairs in the US Embassy in Malawi to the US State Department gives undeniable evidence of US involvement in the Mozambican process. As one can see from this report, the US government through ‘soldier of fortune’ MacKenzie’s Freedom Inc. and Hein’s religious strategy did finance and support the FRELIMO ‘contras’. As one can perceive from that research, the US position towards Mozambique’s one party rule was anti-communist and pro-religious.

\(^4\) African National Congress.

\(^5\) South West Africa People’s Organization.

\(^6\) Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front.

\(^7\) Zimbabwe African Peoples Union.
‘slogans’ of Marxist theory that he will never forget: ‘consciousness does not determine life, life determines consciousness’; ‘men make their own history, however they do not make it just as they please, but under circumstances chosen by themselves, under circumstances directly encountered, given, and transmitted from the past’; ‘class struggle will lead to the dictatorship of the proletariat which is the transition to the abolition of all classes to a classless society’; ‘the ideas of the ruling class are, in every epoch, the ruling ideas’; ‘religion is the peoples’ opium’; ‘there is no need to interpret reality, instead we need to transform reality’. These key concepts he would later come to duly recognize in the works of Marx.

The problem was not actually to forget what he had learned in the past, it was not actually to substitute one truth with another, and luckily it was not so. The dilemma was the shock between what he had previously learned and what he was learning now as well as the very distinct realities presented. He would come to understand this dilemma, all of it legitimate since, for example, at the level of the textbooks—and education in Mozambique was heavily dependent on textbooks in the colonial period—it was increasingly becoming clearer that they had participated in the construction of a particular knowledge by omitting some knowledge and crafting a certain image of history. As presented by Griffen and Marciano, “within history textbooks […] the omission of crucial facts and viewpoints limits profoundly the ways in which students come to view history events [in other words] textbooks offers an obvious means of realizing hegemony in education”⁸. Nevertheless, and using Chomsky’s thinking, both the schooling acquired in the colonial period, and the one acquired in independent Mozambique served as mechanisms of indoctrination in which the objective was to “keep people from asking questions that matter about important issues that directly affect them and others”⁹. After all, “you don’t just learn content in schools”¹⁰, and “facts that [were] inconvenient to the doctrinal system [were] summarily disregarded as if they [did] not exist […] they [were] just suppressed”¹¹. In both the colonial schooling and in that of independent Mozambique,

---
the teachers, male and female, functioned, not as actual intellectuals, but as political “commissars”\(^\text{12}\).

At the time, for the little boy, this created an indescribable intellectual violence, as indeed it must have for many. He would absorb however and whatever he could, not even aware many times of the profound transformations that he was going through intellectually, politically, ideologically and culturally. The refuge, in his attempt to understand this whole complex of events was to be found, often, by means of reading books that the Soviet publisher Novosti, which had based itself in Maputo, distributed on a free basis. To his despair, the readings would only come to guarantee him some conquests at the level of comprehension of reality and, frequently, as they could not fail to do, established parallels with what he had learned in the past that had left him right there at the turn of the corner. Nevertheless, he would come to value this whole experience greatly in later years.

The President of the Republic frequently led rallies, which the ‘continuers of the revolution’, the teaching class and the general population attended, where the key concepts were repeatedly and incessantly heard. It was very important to attend the rallies since it was there that the President launched the major guidelines for the nation. It was, in fact, in one of these rallies that the Chief of State would come to announce the nationalization of everything. Hours and hours of motivational incentives were heard in the square of independence, as the leader spoke to the masses, explicitly and severely challenging the power of Botha in South Africa and that of Ian Smith in the then Southern Rhodesia, harshly criticizing Banda for the fact that Malawi was a safe haven for imperialist and colonialist politics, denouncing the reactionaries of the revolution on an internal level, the so-called ‘xiconhocos’\(^\text{13}\) — many of them shown and judged in public and sent to reeducation camps and even exterminated. The city responded to the euphoria of the revolution and decorated itself with posters and badges alluding to the revolution. The advertising posters for Pepsi-Cola and Coca-Cola, Fanta, Palmar, GT, 365, and Caravela cigarettes disappeared and enormous slogans of the revolution appeared: ‘The Struggle Continues’, ‘Independence or Death, We Shall Win’, ‘No to Imperialism’, ‘No to Apartheid’, ‘Viva FRELIMO’, ‘Viva Scientific Socialism’, ‘No to Polygamy’, ‘No to


\(^{13}\) ‘Xiconhocos’ were the traitors and enemies of the revolution.
Obscurantism’, ‘No to Tribalism’, ‘No to ‘lobolo’’14, ‘Viva Samora Machel’, along with big and appealing murals of figures such as Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Min, Mondlane, Machel, and Josina.

The strategy of Machel and the so-called hard-core line of the FRELIMO party, brave and laudable in some aspects, would progressively throw the country into difficult moments. The answer from the ‘enemy’ was not long in coming. The charge from the United States of America and its ‘jackals’ (that was how he learned to think of them at school) was extremely heavy for a nation that was taking its first steps. As the crisis intensified, Mozambique was highly productive but it experienced difficulty in finding markets open to its exports. The agrarian reform and communal villages, the two great triumphs of Machel, had their days numbered. Nevertheless, if the social and political policies delineated by the capitalist states were clearly perceived, the fact is that the people were beginning to experience difficulty in understanding for what reason ‘our natural brothers’ - that was how the countries of the Eastern bloc were named—could not constitute a market for the Mozambiquan products. There existed the conviction, and increasingly so, that they, and especially the Soviets, were more interested in gathering the dividends of the investment spent during the armed struggle.

The scarcity of goods worsened diabolically and the government, progressively more militarized, handed out vouchers per family to be used in the so-called shops of the people. The instability increased and the discontentment spurted forth from the midst of the Party, and from the midst of the armed forces. For the greater majority of the Mozambiquan people, the price of the Revolution was beginning to be unbearable. Quite naturally, a civil war began with the explicit support of both Smith’s and Botha’s minority governments, as well as that of Banda’s government, not to mention some governments of the West and the East.

For the little boy, once more, it was at school that everything became increasingly complex. He saw the enormous differences, not only between what he was learning in the ‘Marxist texts’ and what was, in reality, happening, but he was also coming to grips with the various fault lines within Marxist theory that were manifested in the

---

14 It’s a quite powerful ritual tradition in Africa. In Mozambique, for example, the family of the groom has to ‘give’ something to the family of the bride before the wedding day.
distinctive ways in which the various Cuban, Soviet, Chinese, and Swedish teachers dealt with Marxist theory. It had nothing to do with the reality that was being lived at the time. For the little boy, the teachers who seemed ‘more Mozambiquan’ were the Cubans. It was his final-year Cuban mathematics teacher, Mannes Garrido, who helped him to understand not only some of the Sino-Soviet divergences, but also the clear differences between Castroism, Maoism and Stalinism. For him, nothing that was being lived had to do with Marxism. In fact, he believed that Mozambique was being converted into a pure Stalinist laboratory.

The deeper the country was beset by crises, the more the government radicalized its position. Difficulties multiplied. The shops were empty. Even with consumption vouchers, there was no guarantee of obtaining food. It was known as the period of ‘the little sardine’, but it was also one of great solidarity among the people. For the little boy, it was the beginning of a new life. He got up early in the morning to wait in line for food and then went on to school. However, this necessity and struggle was not felt by the members of the Party and of the government, which had access to so-called special shops, where nothing was lacking. In fact, he thought, the revolution was for only some. Yes, he thought, what kind of revolution is this, in which the majority suffer on a daily basis while the members of the government had a hospital only for them, shops only for them, and suburbs in the best areas of the cities, only for them? What kind of revolution was this, full of paradoxes in which, for example, the Soviets and the Chinese had a school inside their embassies for their children to attend? Why should they not mix with the Mozambiquans? On a more complex level, what kind of revolution was this that denied the existence of races and classes in Mozambiquan society? What kind of revolution was it that which had created a school in which the power of dictatorship of the proletariat as learned by the student was not at all in harmony with reality? More importantly, what kind of school was it in which nothing was learned about democracy except for the exaltation of a democratic centralism, which, when translated into practice, ended up leading to the empowerment of a dangerous new bourgeoisie that had emerged?

In fact, almost everything was returning to the way life had been before independence. Even at school. It was true that pre-independence, everything about Portugal had had to be learned, but now little, or nothing at all, about Mozambique
was being learned. While it had been forbidden to speak indigenous languages, in places such as school since the use of the Portuguese language was obligatory, the use of the Portuguese language remained compulsory, justified on the basis of the need for national unity. Language was now one of the mechanisms to lessen (or even obliterate) the differences between tribes such as Macondes, Macuas, Senas, N’daus, Rongas, and Xanganas, among too many others. It was a powerful weapon in the struggle against tribalism.

However, for the little boy, the assumed continuer of the revolution and member of the party cell of the suburb in which he lived, despite all these contradictions, despite everything, the independence was still seen as a major conquest. At school and in the gatherings with his friends, all these complexities and paradoxes were understood as part and parcel of the revolutionary process. There was, furthermore, a certain trust in the leader of the party, although the same could not be said for the majority of the members who made up the Central Committee, such as the Political Bureau of the party whose credibility of which was weakening on a daily basis. Perceivable, too, was the divergence between Machel—increasingly tired and disillusioned by the state of the party and that of the nation—and the marrow of the party and of the government. One of the great dilemmas, if not the most serious, was that the state, the party and the government were confounded into a single entity.

It was clearly understood that the crisis had internal and external motives and that both were being generated, paradoxical as it seemed, by the charismatic condition of the leader. After all, the independence of the country had been won largely due to him. His courage in confronting, simultaneously, the major regional and international powers—namely the South African and Rhodesian regimes of apartheid—would not only place national issues on a secondary level, but it also necessarily forced the country into policies of austerity, as well as bringing about deadly antipathy on the part of the United States and its allies in Europe, in Asia, in the Middle East and in Africa. Nevertheless, Machel’s charisma was profoundly contagious. The way he spoke, the joy, the vigor, the confidence, the manner in which, in the midst of a speech, he sang with the people captivated and galvanized them during his three- and four-hour speeches. Up to today, the little boy remembers many of the revolutionary
songs, among them one of the President’s favorites, the *Ife ana Frelimo*\(^{15}\) and *Kanimanbo Frelimo*\(^{16}\) - which inspired total credibility and, thus, no one doubted the promises, even the most ambitious ones, like the appeal made to all the people to go and ‘eat turkey in Pretoria’, for Christmas in 1978.

Nevertheless, the civil war accelerated. Not even the independence of Zimbabwe lessened the armed struggle in Mozambique. The armed bandits - that are what the little boy learned at school and that was how the Chief of State labeled them - gained more and better support from South Africa. Thus, they intensified their actions, systematically destroying strategic Mozambiquan targets, avoiding placing into danger foreign interests. For example, the Cahora Bassa dam, at the time the largest in Africa and the fourth largest in the world, as a nevralgic undertaking in terms of the economy of South Africa, was never hit. Furthermore, Zimbabwe, once independent, would prove to be a profound disillusionment for all Mozambiquans in terms of its political tendencies or compromises.

With the on-going crisis, lived by those who did not hold high places in the party and in the government, gradually the civil society became disconnected and distanced from the ideal outlined by the party. The government had the power but slowly it began to lose it. The crisis created the conditions for a new and very dangerous enemy that had emerged in the meantime: corruption. The government tightened the measures of austerity and security. The prisons multiplied. Some were fair some were unjust. It was a struggle for survival. Maputo, despite being a small city, suffered like all the other district capitals from the influx of people who had run from the countryside to the city because of the war and the hunger. While many of those who were imprisoned were unknown to the little boy, the fact is that many of his friends were incarcerated too. He will never forget a summer afternoon in which he was sitting in front of his school, the ‘Escola Secundária Josina Machel’ – used to be ‘Liceu Normal Salazar’ -, and saw a crowd of imprisoned, shoeless people passing on barefoot, surrounded by family, and recognized among them a friend’s father who was being hit on the back with the butt of a gun? How could this misfortune fall on one who is today considered the best Mozambiquan author and who had always been one of the strongest voices against Portuguese colonialism and fascism? The little boy

\(^{15}\) Long Live Frelimo.

\(^{16}\) Thank you Frelimo.
would not forget the imprisonments, the disappearances and the deaths of many friends.

Nevertheless, the worst was still to come. He would certainly never forget his own imprisonment and that of a friend, and the spectacle in which it had taken place, conducted by military men on an infamous spring afternoon on Kwane Nkhruma lane, before been taken to Headquarters of the Armed Forces. He would not forget that he was only freed after the intervention of a member of the Central Committee and of the Party’s Political Bureau, the same one who had run away with his uncle at the beginning of the 1960s. Had it not been for that intervention, he would certainly have landed, at best, in a reeducation camp. It was, after all, one of the more undesirable destinies of the Mozambiquans who were detained and who lacked good connections.

When others were arrested or killed, one might be forgiven for thinking that maybe there had been a good motive. But with him? What type of danger could he constitute for the country, to be arrested in a spine-chilling spectacular military show, with soldiers armed to their teeth? He, who was a simple continuer of the revolution, who attended secondary school, who was a member of the party cell in his suburb, who spent his afternoons and nights there, who religiously attended the meetings, who gave classes, on a free basis, at night in the adult literacy courses promoted by the Ministry of Education, was now being arrested and beaten, accused of being a reactionary, accused of living under the guise of Imperialism. He would never forget the unjust accusations proffered with a mixture of hate and cynicism during the questioning: ‘xiconhoca’, ‘the enemy has no sizes’, ‘the enemy has no colour’, ‘the enemy has no race’, ‘the enemy uses young racist people like yourselves [you] to destroy the revolutionary process’, ‘infiltrator’, and ‘this is not for whites’. How could the little boy reply as to who he worked for and what plan he had if he did not work for anyone and he had no plan whatsoever?

Actually he had never had any plan whatsoever. But he began to form one. After being freed, he did not forget the words of Mannes Garrido, his mathematics teacher. For the little boy, like so many others, had been a victim not of the Marxist theory—which for him failed to exist in Mozambique, and which had not existed anywhere in the world—but of an atrocious Stalinism that had developed in Mozambique. His mathematics teacher had told him that Stalin had butchered about 20 million peasants
and that he had believed he had reason and motive for such barbarism. According to the teacher, it was necessary to resist and he would recount the story of Trotsky, among others.

In the meantime, Machel, becoming aware of the tension and discontentment that was worsening day by day, attempted a *volte face*. Justice be done, he had always defended his people, not sparing, in fact, even the Ministers or Secretaries of State of public criticism or destitution and he signed a pact of non-aggression with the Mozambiquans’ mortal enemy. A phrase used in preparing his people for this *volte face*, was to become famous: ‘we can choose our friends, but we cannot choose our neighbours’. He signed the Nkomati deal with South Africa, an act that by the manner in which it was strategically conceived and conducted managed not to injure the dignity of the Mozambiquan people. Thus, Machel once more had the people on his side, but this step contributed to the tragic and unjust end that he had. Machel, as a true statesperson, on the one hand, won the people over one more time, but on the other hand, he forced his internal enemies to position themselves for or against him. The crisis failed to ease up and the situation became increasingly aggravated.

After much pondering and conflict—after all, who wants to abandon his homeland? - the idea to abandon his country began to germinate in the head of the little boy. But how? To where? He was a Mozambiquan with no passport, and at the time, it was not easy to obtain a passport. He also had not completed his military service. With the help of a friend who had a brother in Denmark, he decided to go to Denmark. However, problems with the entry visa into Denmark forced him to disembark in Lisbon and he was unable to proceed on his trip. Once in Portugal, and not wanting to return to Mozambique, he attended secondary school and, at the advice of a teacher, sat for the exam in Portuguese Literature and Philosophy for an Honors Degree in Humanities—requiring Greek, Latin and Portuguese—at the ‘Universidade Católica Portuguesa’. His schooling experience in Mozambique had placed at the forefront of his memory teachers like do Rosário, teacher of Portuguese, and Manes Garrido, teacher of Mathematics, and likewise his schooling experience in Portugal would place him with various professors who would decisively leave their mark on him: Oliveira, Pinho, Ribeiro, Pereira, and Pulquério. He is especially indebted to
Fonseca and, most especially, to Soares Marques, a professor that the then young man considers one of his greatest mentors of all time.

It was with Soares Marques that he resumed many of the complex themes and conversations he had held with his teachers in Mozambique and other friends. It was Soares Marques who initiated him into the readings of ‘another left’, who perceived the existence of ‘a new left’, which criticized the exaggeration of Stalinism and the audacity and the desolation of the Maoist cultural revolution. It was Soares Marques who led him to read Williams, Eagleton, Thompson, Barthes, and Kristeva among others. The courses of Literary Studies and Literary Literature that he took, allied to his recent schooling experience in a Marxist country was for the now young man a powerful theoretical resource. It was beginning to take on greater meaning for him. It was the theoretical cement that he needed on which to base a whole experience, which had been, at all levels, proficuous. Nevertheless, the adaptation to Portugal was not easy. In Portugal those who came from the old colonies were (almost) nameless. They were the ‘returnees’ and even today are viewed this way. He had to work to guarantee his subsistence, since the help he received from his parents proved insufficient. Having concluded his Honors Degree and feeling increasingly unassimilated to Portugal, he decided to go to South Africa where he taught Portuguese Language and Culture in two schools in the suburbs of Johannesburg, while also working for the SABC17, on Channel Africa, as reporter/producer, and lastly, occasionally, for a national Portuguese language newspaper.

If the experience in Mozambique was fruitful, the one in South Africa would prove no worse. The now young man, besides having had the privilege of witnessing the fall of the apartheid regime, the liberation of Mandela, and the first multiracial elections in South Africa, would come to relive also, with very few differences, the revolutionary process of which he had been a part in Mozambique.

If the experiences lived in Mozambique in the colonial period and in the post-colonial period would prove for the boy to be determinant in awakening a certain political conscience—where education occupied a crucial place—his schooling in South Africa, along with the extremely enriching experience in Portugal, would prove

---

17 South African Broadcasting Corporation.
profoundly decisive for the deconstruction of his identity. South Africa was, is (and will continue to be, especially at a time when the tentacles of neoliberal politics perceive the country as a perfect starting point for dominating all of the south African region) a veritable keg of gunpowder. How could he forget his images as a young boy from his train trips to South Africa, when he saw different buses for whites and for colored people, toilets for whites and for colored people, ambulances for whites and for colored people, water fountains for whites and for colored people, doctors for whites and for colored people, hospitals for whites and for colored people, schools for whites and for colored people, suburbs for whites and for colored people. How could he forget that the blacks and the ‘colored people’ could not try on clothes in the same shops? How could he forget the Pass Laws, whereby from 6 o’clock in the evening, the blacks had to return to their townships. At night, only whites were to be seen in the streets.

His memory was again assaulted by these images, during the time South Africa was going through the most important moment of its history. South Africa forced him to review the revolutionary process in Mozambique, even though a revolution had not taken place in South Africa, in the true sense of the word. International and regional perspectives taken on this issue were completely different. The ANC had opted for a non-radical transformation, which was marked by some of the most dangerous aspects of neoliberal policies, especially in the Mbeki era. The fall of apartheid was his personal victory, as well as a victory over the Mozambiquan people. For, after all, Mozambique had not only been a constant and safe backdrop for South Africa’s revolution, but it had also paid a high price for the unconditional support to the ANC, SACP18, and PAC19. As the revolutionary process in Mozambique had placed the figure of Machel in the forefront, the South African process was to foreground another great figure of incontestable value: Mandela. Mandela, due to internal, regional and international contingencies, the extremely rich experience of the Mozambiquan revolutionary process, and the profound segregation in South Africa, opted for deep reform rather than a revolution. Mandela knew that, unlike Mozambique, South Africa would not opt for a single party regime, and strategically

---

18 South Africa Communist Party.
19 Pan African Congress.
created a powerful alliance between the ANC, the SACP and COSATU\(^{20}\), which ended up winning the first multiracial elections in South Africa with an absolute majority. It also managed to get the Inkatha Freedom Party, a party that evinced a complex social and political force in South Africa, to adhere to electoral scrutiny. For Mandela, it was fundamental to create political space for the social forces, thus warding off attempts at social rebellion. After all, not doing so was an error that Mozambique had committed. Except for the radical wing of the white minority, and certain radical black, Indian and ‘colored’ groups, Mandela inspired trust and credibility. He was a very different leader from Machel but driven by the same objectives. His anti-racial and anti-class stances were largely misunderstood among the radical whites as well as black, Indian and colored radicals, from whom he had clearly distanced himself. Like Machel, Mandela gathered enemies among members of these radical spheres. However, the moderation adopted by Mandela would come to captivate a certain radical white wing, one which assassinated Hani of the SACP, seen by many as the potential successor of Mandela. While the entrance of Mbeki into power, as the successor to Mandela, was “peaceful”, it cannot be dissociated from this bloody act.

Just as had happened in Mozambique, in South Africa too it was at school that the greater transformations took place. From monoraciality to multiraciality—instated by law and, thus, a symbol of South Africa’s complex reality—the typical conflicts of a growing society and the signs of which had been completely silenced by the schooling of the past, the South African process would be an extremely enriching social framework of learning for the young man.

In fact, by establishing constant parallels between the Mozambiquan reality and that in South Africa, the young man could understand that, despite notable discoveries in the scientific field, South African schooling had always been in crisis. A segregationist society capitalizes on its selectivity and imbues this selectivity into its institutions, as was the case with the school. The school and its agents were not prepared for the new reality. Once again, the same conflicts, the same complexities, the same shock between the past and the present, marked by an indescribable violence

\(^{20}\) Congress of South African Trade Unions.
that had been part of Mozambique’s revolutionary experience could be found in South Africa.

To make the process even more complex, South Africa repeated one of Mozambique’s mistakes. Although the New Constitution made official an almost endless list of indigenous languages, the fact is that the English language was enforced as the official language in schools. Just like the Portuguese language in Mozambique, the English language in South Africa was rejected by the majority of the South African people, although it was promoted as a vehicle of national unity.

The Mozambiquan revolution had awakened in him the will and the conviction to be a teacher, but the South African process would end up awakening in him a conscience—and how he remembered Marx here—and an awareness of the need to make a turnabout in his professional career and to follow the field of Social Sciences, more precisely, Education. Here, was his immediate future laid out and the old dream of the specialization in Linguistics was buried, a decision that was not easy given the deep respect for and influence that was exerted on him, and still is exerted, by Fonseca and, most especially, Soares Marques.

He returned to Portugal to do his Master’s Degree in Education, with a specialization in Curricular Development at the ‘Universidade do Minho’ and, at the same time, worked in the international coop at the ‘Universidade Católica Portuguesa’ having organized some training projects in the ambit of the Mozambique-Portugal cooperation. As the curricular part of the Master’s Degree proceeded, he was more convinced that he wanted to analyze the issues that were the subtext to the curriculum. Formosinho, one of the Professors of his masters program at ‘Universidade do Minho’, referred him to specific literature, emphasizing above all the work *Ideology and the Curriculum* by Michael Apple. Some of the missing pieces that the young man needed had finally been found. Upon reading the book, he perceived that it answered many of his questions and it led him to further readings of other texts by the author. Among other things, the work of Michael Apple, by denouncing the way curricular texts constructed history, offered the young man not only a solid theoretical explanation for a whole historical process of which he was a participant, but it also opened the door to the concept of historical engineering put forward by certain
intellectuals such as Chomsky\textsuperscript{21} and Zinn\textsuperscript{22}. One day, and still at the initial stage of the writing of his MA dissertation writing, he discovered Michael Apple’s e-mail on the Internet and decided to send him a note. The worst that could happen would be that Michael Apple might not answer it. In the e-mail, he put forward some questions to Michael Apple related to ideological and cultural issues that were the basis of the curricular field, but also and, above all, to the role performed by the State in those same dynamics. After two weeks, Michael Apple\textsuperscript{23} answered in the following way:

Dear Mr…

(…) I have been in Latin America giving a series of lectures and have only recently returned. While your dissertation sounds very interesting and the questions you asked are important, the depth of your questions would require a more detailed answer than is possible for me to give in an e-mail response.

For example, there can be no doubt that the state itself has its own interests and has its own historical dynamics that are not reducible to simply reflections of political economy or class relations. First, it is a gendered and racial state, not only a class state. Second, as Foucault points out, the state has its own interests in normalization and creating subject positions. Thus, to answer your questions, one would have to deal with the epistemological and social – as well as political – issues involved in trying to understand the state through both neo-Gramscian and poststructural theories. As I argue in my newest book, *Cultural Politics and Education*, we need to let both theories rub against each other, knowing that there will be tensions between their varied understandings. Thus, trying to answer only one of your many questions is a complex task.

Thank you for sending me your material. Perhaps, when I come to Portugal again in the future, we shall be able to have a more detailed discussion of the many issues you raise.

Sincerely

Michael W. Apple


\textsuperscript{23} Apple, Michael (1997) *E-mail Reply*. Tuesday, March 18.
In effect, this e-mail was to mark the beginning of a relationship that would gradually come to develop and deepen. In the completing his MA dissertation, the young man interviewed Michael Apple. His dissertation was groundbreaking in the curricular field in Portugal. He defended the dissertation, and already an Assistant Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Technology at the Institute of Education and Psychology at the ‘Universidade do Minho’, he translated into Portuguese some of the most significant works by Michael Apple, namely Ideology and Curriculum, Education and Power, Democratic Schools, and Cultural Politics and Education. After much deliberation that emerged not only from his readings of Michael Apple’s works and other authors in the field of curriculum critical theory, but also on the advice, above all, of Torres Santomé, Full Professor of the ‘Universidade da Coruña’ and at the invitation of Michael Apple, he spent two weeks in 1998 and a month in 1999 in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin - Madison, where, besides attending some of the classes of the doctoral program and attending for the first time the Friday Seminar, he had frequent work meetings with Michael Apple related to the doctorate project.

The young man’s future plans crystalized. He would proceed with the work initiated during his M.A. program but make it into an original and complex project, analyzing the impact of the thinking and the work of Michael Apple on the curriculum field. In 2000, he left for Madison, as Honorary Fellow of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin and began to work on his doctoral proposal, attending some of the doctoral courses given by Michael Apple as well as by other professors, and participating in some independent reading groups with other doctoral students, reading, analyzing and discussing works by Marx, Gramsci, Williams, Jameson, Chomsky, Zinn, Hall and Du Gay, De Certeau, Carspecken, Gee, Bourdieu, Foucault, Torres Santomé, Bakhtin, Spivak, Wright, Cohen, and Michael Apple. Returning to Mozambique years later, he remarked with profound sadness that, with a few rare exceptions ‘the ones who were Marxist’ have surrendered now to the neoliberal project, everything that Machel would certainly never have accepted.
The character in this story, as you might have gathered, is me, the author, and the question might be raised here as to the scientific character of the autobiography, although it is of strategic importance in this type of research. As far as its scientific character, and not withstanding the debate conducted between literature and science having been overcome in many countries and academic circles, namely, the United States, England, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, France, and Spain, we understand that given the specificity of the research that is proposed by us, it might be necessary to refer the analysis that Barthes gives on the contention between literature and science. Barthes, assuming as point of departure the listings of the degrees conferred by the departments of French Universities, remarks that “it is possible to become a doctor of Aesthetics, Psychology or Sociology, but not [of] Semantics or Victimology”\(^{24}\), concluding that in fact it is “the institution which directly determines the nature of human knowledge, by imposing its own needs of division and classification on it, in exactly the same way that a language, with its compulsory headings, obliges us to think in a certain way”\(^{25}\). In other words, and according to Barthes\(^{26}\), science:

\[\text{is defined not by its content (often ill determined and labile) nor by its method (this varies from science to science: what do historical science and experimental psychology have in common?) nor by its ethic (science is not alone in being serious-minded and rigorous) nor by its mode of communication (science is printed in books, like everything else), but simply by its status, that is it is determined by society; the subject-matter of science is everything that society deems worthy of being handed on. In short, science is what is taught. (…) Literature has all the secondary characteristics of science, that is, all those attributes which do not define it. Its contents area is exactly the same as those of science; there is certainly not a single scientific topic that has not been dealt with at some point in the world’s literature. The world of literary work is a total one, in which all knowledge, social, psychological or historical, has a place, with the result that for us literature has that great cosmogenic unity which the ancient Greeks enjoyed but which we are denied today by the fragment state of our sciences. Moreover, like science, literature has its method; it has its programmes of research, which vary from school to school, and age to age (again like those of science) its rules of investigation and sometimes even its pretensions to experiment. Like science, literature also}\]

has its ethic, a certain way of extracting the rules governing its practice from the view it takes of its own nature and, consequently, of submitting its projects to a certain sense of the absolute.

Moreover, drawing from the very meaning of the word \( \lambda \omega \gamma \omega \zeta \)\(^{27}\), Barthes highlights that “science and literature have a characteristic that both unites and divides them”\(^{28}\). They are both discursive. However, while science sees language as simply “an instrument which profits it to make as transparent and neutral as possible”\(^{29}\), for literature “language is [its] own being, its very world”; that is to say, “the whole literature is contained in the fact of writing and no longer in those of thinking, portraying, telling, or feeling”\(^{30}\). In other words, while scientific discourse “believes itself to be a superior code, [literature] aims at being a total code, including its own forces of destruction”\(^{31}\). The volatile character of the concept of science is also witnessed by Williams who not only dissociates it from the same complexities suffered by the concept of ideology, but also from the actual concept of ideology itself. Thus, for Williams, besides the problem of translation of the concept of science from language to language, yet another was raised: in fact, scientific knowledge is not bared of “ideological bias”\(^{32}\), that which aims to assume itself as “positive scientific knowledge”\(^{33}\). In essence, and as highlighted by Mannheim, “scientific method [...] is an attitude, a way of thinking about and approaching a problem, characterized by persistent criticism and skepticism regarding arguments, in the light of accepted rules for assessing evidence”\(^{34}\).

Thus, by understanding that the conflict between science and literature is a false distinction, we are able to use a small autobiographical excerpt as a tool to justify the reasons that have led us to the objective of our research. In fact, it was not a random occurrence that, from the beginning, we have proposed to conduct a research project

\(^{27}\) Cf. \( \lambda \omega \gamma \omega \zeta \) - from the Ancient Greek, ‘word’.  
\(^{33}\) Op. Cit., p., 64.  
with these characteristics. Our youthful experiences, especially as a student in a Marxist-Leninist country of which we are very proud, were profoundly decisive in the firm decision to be a teacher and in the turn that we took in our professional career from being a teacher of Portuguese, Greek, and Latin Language and Literature to opting for Educational Sciences. There was also a rapid adherence to the thinking and work of Michael Apple, since it was in synchrony with many of the issues important to me, the constant and complex struggle, although increasingly clearer, to the comprehension of the core concepts that mold educational phenomenon, in general, and curricular phenomenon, in particular. However, it was not difficult for us to decide to adopt a methodological strategy of providing our personal and historical background, which we believe is fundamental to this research and which has a long tradition in the curricular field. Like Eisner\(^\text{35}\) so clearly highlights, the use of this method is, in essence, both epistemological and political. Thus, and with Gramsci, we reiterate that an “autobiography can be conceived ‘politically’ [that is to say] one knows that one’s life is similar to that of a thousand others, but through ‘chance’ it has had opportunities that the thousand in reality could not or did not have, [so] by narrating it, one creates this possibility, suggests the process, indicates the opening”\(^\text{36}\).

It is in this context that our autobiography is to be understood. Although, for some, the true historical processes should not or cannot be narrated by researchers themselves, which we believe to be nonsense, the truth is, it was a specific set of historical processes that compelled me, not to a trivial reading of the works and thinking of Michael Apple, but to a profound and detailed reading of his work. Contrary to Casey, “I was [not] genetically determined to be a teacher”\(^\text{37}\). On the contrary, and in a deeply Marxist sense “[reality] determined [my] consciousness”\(^\text{38}\). However, and like Casey\(^\text{39}\), if one asks us why this type of research, ‘we [also] can answer with our life’, knowing that, like Barthes so clearly highlights, “politically, it is by professing and illustrating that no language is innocent, by practicing what might


be called integral knowledge that literature is revolutionary"\textsuperscript{40}. This perspective has a long tradition in the history of the political Left. In fact, according to Lenin\textsuperscript{41}, there is no neutrality in writing. However, the absence of neutrality should not be confused with the “smell” of factionalism. On the contrary, and from a profoundly Marxist perspective, the author:

need not foist his own political views on his own work because, if he reveals the real and the potential forces objectively at work in a situation, he is already in that sense partisan. Partisanship, that is to say, is inherent in reality itself; it emerges in a method of treating social reality rather than in a subjective attitude towards it\textsuperscript{42}.

By assuming this, we also assume both a Trotskyian\textsuperscript{43} and Jamesonian\textsuperscript{44} perspective; that is to say, one has to admit not only that every artistic form is the product of social content but one also has, and this is very crucial, to understand literature as a socially symbolic act. This perspective leads us to the political dimension of interpretative phenomena. It is this political interpretation that we claim both for the previously described autobiography and for the whole paper undertaken here, along the lines of what Jameson defends as “a political interpretation of text [in which the political perspective is conceived] not as some supplementary method, nor as an optional auxiliary to other interpretative methods—the psychoanalytic, or the mythocritical, the stylistic, the ethical, the structural—but rather as the absolute horizon of all reading and all interpretation”\textsuperscript{45}. After all, as Ong, Reinhart, Grice and Kress mention, “all discourse is ideologically and textually determined [and also] institutionally determined”\textsuperscript{46}, especially since, as is highlighted by Eagleton, “ideology pre-exists the text, [however] the ideology of the text defines, operates and

\textsuperscript{43} Trotsky, L. (1957) \textit{Literature and Revolution}. New York: Russell and Russell.
constitutes that ideology in ways unpremeditated, so to speak, by ideology itself. That is to say that “the text itself is not a terminus; [...] it exists in some complex relation to history which has yet to be determined; [in other words] history one might say, is the ultimate signifier of literature, as it is the ultimate signified.” Moreover, and this is quite important, “the text does not merely take ideological conflicts in order to resolve them aesthetically, for the character of those conflicts is itself overdetermined by the textual modes in which they are produced, [that is to say] the text’s mode of resolving a particular ideological conflict may then produce textual conflicts elsewhere … which need in turn to be processed.” That is why in “every text something happens” in such a way that it forces a reaction, from both sides. Given the political option that we made, we cannot hope for anything else to happen to all those who had contact with this research. More important than its content, the autobiography is precisely that which permits the interpretation as a socially symbolic act, especially since, as Eagleton reiterates, “ideology is [also] present in the text in the form of its eloquent silences.” Having unveiled the tensions within ‘objectivity vs. subjectivity’ it will be prudent now to turn our attention over the pertinent imperative of the autobiographical framework within the field.

The importance, the basis and the peculiarity of the autobiographical narrative as work methodology in the field of social sciences dates back to the beginnings of the last century, as is demonstrated by, among others, the work of Thomas and Znaniecki. However, this methodological option was to become more frequent and to acquire greater notoriety in the field, from the second half of the last century when intellectuals and other researchers largely associated with the theories of social resistance and transformation would come to understand it as a viable and trustworthy manner of giving a voice to those who were less favored and silenced. In the field of education, in general and in that of curriculum, in particular, many have been the researchers who have come to analyze the autobiography as a crucial methodological

---

tool for the comprehension of a specific combination of issues that are at the basis of the field. As a noteworthy example, one cannot minimize the autobiographical approach that, say, Pinar and Grumet put forwarded in 1976. In their analysis Toward a Poor Curriculum, both Pinar and Grumet claimed that an accurate understanding of curriculum matters could not obliterate the intricate interface between school knowledge and life history. Both of them undeniably play a key role in the multifarious process of intellectual development, instigating a non-stop process of what one might call self (des)(re)construction. Taking the Portuguese curriculum field, for example, autobiography, as a methodological tool, wasn’t neglected either, as both Nóvoa and Pacheco approaches testifies. However, one might say that in the Portuguese case, we are before perhaps a quite uncommon methodological approach.

As is defended very well by De Certeau, “each individual is a locus in which an incoherent (and often contradictory) plurality of […] relational determinations interact”. Since we are unable to read reality in all its profundity and complexity, given the numerous conflicts of which it is simultaneously the source and the mouthpiece, sometimes, it is useful to anchor ourselves on a whole past of which we were actors and even protagonists. This anchoring helps us to understand a whole present and past, and through that same process, to review the filters—ideological, political, cultural, economic—and discover many others, to help us to better understand, in this concrete case, not so much the existence of an educational phenomenon in itself, but rather the complex dynamics that are its basis. That the “plurality of […] relational determinations interact” by being narrated, to use an expression by De Certeau, and assume a novel-like dimension, should not be interpreted in a negative way or as being less scientific. According to Eisner and Peshkin, “there is no reason […] why […] the academy might not accept Ph. D. dissertations in education that are written in the form of novels”. These scholars

further reiterate that resistance to this type of methodology in what concerns the construct of viable knowledge is unfounded since “for centuries novels have helped people more sensitively and insightfully understand the world in which they and others live”60. Furthermore, “what we consider a legitimate research procedure is a product of our judgment and our judgment is influenced by our professional socialization”61.

In fact, and as Pinar highlights, “we are not mere smudges on the mirror [and] our life histories are not liabilities to be exorcised but they are the very precondition for knowing”62. Thus “understanding the self is not narcissism; [on the contrary, and above all] it is a precondition and a concomitant condition to the understanding of others”63. We are faced here by a dialectical process that is constantly unfinished in which the unity (and fragmentation) of the “self” with the context that determines it and which determines the space and time, permit evolutive and permanently conflicting processes “from ego-centric to the de-centered, from provincial to broadminded, from ignorant to knowing human beings”64. In other words, as Clandinin & Conneley refer, “life—as we come to it and as it comes to others—is filled with narrative fragments, enacted in storied moments of time and space, and reflected upon and understood in terms of narrative unities and discontinuities65”. For Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery and Taubman, there is a crucial need to highlight the power of life histories as a methodological tool, since “political theory [became] abstract and obliterate the individual”66. In fact, as one can draw from Casey’s67 critical analyses, autobiographical lenses, by ‘allowing’ ‘space’ and ‘voice’ to the self would end up making the ‘political’ even more powerful.

Pinar, Pinar and Grumet as well as Clandinin and Conneley, although the latter in a more fully developed manner, do not ignore the thinking and the preponderance of the work of Dewey for whom day-to-day experience could not be dissociated from educational and curricular practices. In fact, according to Clandinin and Connelly, “Dewey transforms a commonplace term, experience, in our educator’s language into a inquiry term, and gives us a term that permits better understandings of educational life”\textsuperscript{68}. In fact:

> Both the personal and the social are always present. People are individuals and need to be understood as such, but they cannot be understood only as individuals. They are always in relation, always in a social context. The term experience helps us think through such matters as an individual child’s learning while also understanding that learning takes place with other children, with a teacher, in a classroom, in community, and so on\textsuperscript{69}.

Notwithstanding having acquired greater prominence from the second half of the twentieth-century, the aesthetic dimension of the curricular construct was not insensitive to names like Schwab and Tyler. Actually, if for the former\textsuperscript{70}, the eclectic tendency was to be understood as an essential basis for a practical inquiry, to the latter, “aesthetic values [were] important both as interesting qualities for the student and also as experiencing very significant life values in the same category with the highest ultimate values of life”\textsuperscript{71}. Neither were oblivious to the dimensions and preponderance of human experience, via the aesthetic perspective, in the foundation of the curriculum, which leads us to certify that neither Schwab nor Tyler marginalized from their analyses the Dewey phenomenon.

However, both this Deweyan notion of experience as well as the defense of the human being as a holistic and complex agent who should not, and may not, be dissociated from his surroundings, emerge more in depth and complex in the works of

\textsuperscript{68} Op. Cit., p. 2.
\textsuperscript{69} Op. Cit., p. 2.
Greene, Huebner, Macdonald and Eisner, not to mention Bourdieu and Michael Apple, whom we shall analyze further when dealing with the ethical and political issues of this research, recognizing in all of them a strong Deweyan influence.

All of them, in one way or another, have created a notable arena for diminishing the conflict between the defenders of subjectivity and objectivity, highlighting the necessity for understanding the dynamics that surround subjectivity without, however, belittling the importance of objectivity in the dominion of research.

Eisner, by opposing the dichotomy objective – subjective, proposes a third plan, labeled as transactive, and understood as “the locus of human experience, [that is to say] it is the product of the interaction of two postulated entities, the objective and the subjective”72. As he put it:

Since what we can know about the world is always a result of inquiry, it is mediated by the mind. Since it is mediated by mind, the world cannot be known in its ontologically objective state. An objective world is postulated both as a general and a particular entity. Since what we know about the world is a product of the transaction of our subjective life and a postulated objective world, these worlds cannot be separated. To separate them would require the exercise of mind, and since mind would need to be employed to make the separation, anything “separated” as a result of its use would reflect mind as well as what was “separated” from it. Hence what we have is experience—a transaction, rather than independent subjective and objective entities73.

It is this landing of permanent, dialectical and conflicting transition, between the subjective and the objective that is at the root of what Eisner calls “educational connoisseurship”74. In other words, “the ability to make fine-grained discriminations among complex and subtle qualities is the art of appreciation (...) it can be displayed

---

in any realm in which the character, import, or value of objects, situations and performances is distributed and variable, including the educational practice”75.

This perspective was also argued by Greene. In fact, to Greene the “curriculum has to do with the life of meaning with ambiguities, and with relationships [and yes] it has to do with the fluidity of change”76. Drawing from one of the many metaphors that we can get from Stevens’s blue guitar, Greene refuses to accept the curriculum as a linear reading of what is there and demands us to “throw away the lights, the definitions, and say what [we] see in the dark”77. This is a process that must be understood as permanent, richly filled with conflicts, especially since, as highlighted by Greene, “[we] are what [we] are not yet”78, and that is “why the art of teaching is an existential project”79. It is, furthermore, in this context that Greene defends that “autobiography is something indispensable both to the educational and curriculum field”80 and that we “should understand that autobiography more than solving anything gives us both the crucial tools and the way to go beyond the box”81.

Huebner places himself along the same lines of thought, for whom, as we shall have the opportunity to analyze in a more detailed manner later on, human beings should not be reduced to the mere condition of learners. On the curriculum, there converge [and depart] an infinite number of constantly unfinished interactive processes, complex practices of significance, such as we discuss elsewhere82. The curriculum, for Huebner, is a locus of pure art, and its agents may not be limited to

automatisms. Since it does not occur in a cultural vacuum (or, we might add, bereft of ideological, political, racial, gender, and class influences), the substantive curricular agents, teachers and students, work “within a tradition influenced by the media, style, or problems of [their] time”\textsuperscript{83}. They are in constant search for new social and political meanings and the major educational issue is not actually “to relate or not to relate to others [on the contrary, and in an even more complex, and thus, more thrilling dimension]; the problem is not to relate to others, but to find a mode of relationship, and a way of talking about that relationship, which offers a great meaning today”\textsuperscript{84}. Huebner, thus, does not dissociate the human being from his/her surroundings, from his/her whole experience, acquired and lost, a process that is understood as dynamic and it is by opposition to this symbiosis between humans and the social and political contexts of which they are a part, that Huebner puts forward the idea of “dialectical materialism as a method of doing education”\textsuperscript{85}, as we shall have the opportunity to observe in the next chapter.

The impossibility, of the dissociation between humans and reality and the specific context of which they are a part was also widely defended by Macdonald. According to him, “the danger of using technological rationality in human behavior is that, in our desire to gain control, understand, and predict, we may (and perhaps already have) come to see ourselves as objects or the representation of these objects that we find useful for our purposes”\textsuperscript{86}. It is in the sequence of this analysis that Macdonald stresses that the full understanding of knowledge may not be dissociated from the symbolism that human beings construct within the midst of their own cultural practices. The clarity and sharpness of his analysis deserve to be emphasized:

Gaining knowledge (...) is not quite the simple matter of mastery of man’s statements about reality, no matter how well organized these statements may be for pedagogical purposes and social issues. The very form of man’s symbols are creations of the culture in which he lives

and predispose him to limit and shape his awareness of the *to be known* in the forms of his symbolic structures. Yet the abstracting of experience through symbolic forms does not encompass all of what is to be known with reference to the statements of reality\(^87\).

It is in this train of thought that Macdonald stresses that the major preoccupation of theoreticians should rest not on the search for a technological rationality, but for “aesthetic rationality”\(^88\), which as we will have opportunity to find out later on, consists of the “capacity to cope rationally with the world on an intuitive basis”\(^89\).

In the form of synopsis, Greene, Huebner, Macdonald, and Eisner, explicitly or implicitly draw on the *Deweyan* postulate of the cruciality of experience as the primary force in the daily construction and deconstruction of the human being. For Dewey, experience was also a state of permanent criticism, stressing that “the aim of criticism is the re-education of the perception of the work of art”\(^90\). If we resort to the thinking of Langer—which, in turn, is based on Dewey—this dimension of the personal as something indissociable from curricular theory and practice becomes even clearer. Langer maintains that there is differentiation between the act of creating and that of producing. According to Langer, “a painter ‘creates’ a painting (…) a dancer ‘creates’ dance, a poet ‘creates’ a poem [and] if he slumps and gets nothing done he is apt to worry about not being ‘creative’”\(^91\). Unlike a car or to a brick, which is produced, the painter, the dancer, the poet, “create works of art”\(^92\). Langer goes on to state that there is a difference “between creation and other productive work [given the fact that] an ordinary object, say a shoe, is made by putting pieces of leather together, [in other words] the pieces were there before [while] a picture is made by deploying pigments on a piece of canvas, but the picture is not a pigment-and-canvas structure”\(^93\). That is to say “the picture that emerges from the process is a structure of space [and we can add time] and the space itself is an emergent whole of shapes,
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visible colored volumes, [in other words] the picture is (...) an apparition". This image explains well what is, in fact, the process of curriculum development, as well the centrality of experience in the development of that social process of negotiation of symbols, and it is precisely in this domain, that “lies a new conception of ‘mentality’ that may illumine questions of life and consciousness, instead of obscuring them as traditional ‘scientific methods’ have done”.

Returning now to Clandinin and Connelly, and an analysis of narrative as a research methodological tool in the field of education, in general, and in curriculum, in particular, these scholars not only sift through Dewey’s argument, but also advance a proposal how narrative investigation should be structured.

For these scholars, and bearing in mind that the concept of experience is one of the leitmotivs of Deweyan thinking and practice, critical practice always implies “the personal and social (interaction) [...] past, present, and future (continuity) [...] combined with the notion of place (situation)”. Thus, and according to them, “this set of terms creates a metaphorical three-dimensional narrative inquiry space, with temporality along one dimension, the personal and social along a second dimension, and place along the third”. Clandinin and Connelly go on to state that any research (should) align itself along these dimensions: “studies have temporal dimensions and address temporal matters; they focus on the personal and the social in a balance appropriate to the inquiry; and they occur in specific places or sequence of places”.

It is furthermore on the basis of this analysis (above all in the Deweyan notion of interaction) that Clandinin and Connelly defend the existence of four directions in the whole research process that is worth noting:

Inward and outward, backward and forward. By inward, we mean toward the internal conditions, such as feelings, hopes, aesthetic reactions, and moral dispositions. By outward,
we mean toward the existential conditions, that is, the environment. By backward and forward, we refer to temporality—past, present, and future. [...] To experience and experience—that is, to do research into an experience—is to experience it simultaneously in these four ways and ask questions pointing each way.99

Thus, and quite naturally, when the researcher positions him/herself in this framework, irrespective of what the research may be, he/she formulates “questions, collects field notes, derives interpretations and writes a research text that addresses both personal and social issues by looking inward and outward, and addresses temporal issues by looking not only to the event, but to its past and to its future”100.

The cruciality of the temporal, and consequently the spatial dimension is made even more evident by Rosenwald and Ochberg, for whom “life stories draw a connection between the events of yesterday and today”101 and it becomes important to understand that “not only does the past live in the present, but it also appears different at every new turn we take”102. As a result, and as is stressed by Pinar, the autobiography permits a “divestment [which] does not represent retreat from the affairs of the world, from the classrooms, politics and conflicts [but] represents [a] reflexive awareness of one’s participation in the affairs of the world”103. The autobiographical method permits “such awareness as it reconstructs the past, as it lays bare the relation between self and work, self and others, which has prevailed in the past”104.

The temporal as well as the spatial dimension of the autobiographical narrative should not, however, be dissociated from the practices of construction and

deconstruction of identities. In essence, as De Certeau\textsuperscript{105} assures us, the social structure allows for conditions—social and temporal—so that human agency functions and goes on sculpting both the actual subjects and the reality in which they constantly intervene. In other words, and as Haug suggests, “the day-to-day struggle over the hearts and minds of human subjects is located not only within social structures, the pre-given forms into which individuals work themselves, but also in the process, whereby they perceive any given situation, approve or validate it, assess its goals as proper and worthy, repugnant or reprehensible”\textsuperscript{106}. Therefore, Haug continues, “what emerged in our analysis as a particular way of processing the social world, as it is appropriated by individuals, has to be seen as a field of conflict between dominant cultural values and oppositional attempts to wrest cultural meaning and pleasure from life”\textsuperscript{107}.

It is along this line of thought that Gómez stresses that, through the narrative process of the autobiography “[she] has found a way to reconsider [her] pedagogy and [her]self”\textsuperscript{108}; that is to say that “life stories play a significant role in the formation of identity [and] that these stories may be constrained by oppressive cultural conditions, and that these stories—and the lives to which they relate—may be liberated by critical insight and engagement”\textsuperscript{109}. This identity, also achieved eventually through the “unity of self and situation”\textsuperscript{110} must be understood as the complex and conflicting process of permanent construction and deconstruction in which, as Rosenwald indicates, “the storyteller’s identity is reaffirmed or even altered”\textsuperscript{111}. Therefore, the autobiographical process as much confirms that “[the] social influence shapes not only public action, but also private self-understanding”\textsuperscript{112}, as it depends on an extra-narrative context that

may not be dissociated from power relations. As a result, and because “culture [also] ‘speaks itself’ through each individual’s story”, we should agree with Gergen and Gergen that the narrative construct “can never be entirely a private matter”. Quite naturally and as is proposed by Butler, “the deconstruction [and construction] of identity is not the deconstruction [or construction] of politics (...) rather, it establishes as political the very terms through which identity is articulated.

It is in this context that Gee, in an excellent article, puts forward the notion of identity as “an analytic lens for research in education”. According to Gee, and although the term identity “has taken on a great many different meanings in the literature”, it is possible to identify four perspectives related to identity, namely “nature identity, institution identity, discourse identity and affinity identity”. In his words, “we are what we are primarily because of our ‘natures’, we are what we are primarily because of the positions we occupy in society, we are what we are primarily because of our individual accomplishments as they are inter-actionally recognized by others, and we are what we are because of the experiences we have within certain sorts of affinity groups” and our forms of “Being” and “Becoming” should not be understood as fixed compartments. On the contrary, they affect each other mutually and in profoundly complex ways that cross the rhythms and dynamics of space and time.

Intimately related with the temporal and spatial dynamics, Gergen and Gergen, along the previously analyzed train of thought of Clandinin and Connelly, advance the concept of “self narrative—individuals’ account of the relationship among self relevant events across time”, connecting such a concept with two temporal

characteristics, “progressive—the individual may link together experiences in such a way that (...) increments [...] characterized movements along the evaluative dimension—[and regressive]—the individual may link together experiences in such a way that (...) decrements [...] characterized movements along the evaluative dimension”\(^\text{122}\).

Before proceeding on to the description of and justification for the mapping of this research, we reiterate that this autobiography should thus be understood on the basis along the four directions proposed by Clandinin and Connelly and the two characteristics delineated by Gergen and Gergen. It is still, to use the thinking of Goodson\(^\text{123}\), not actually a proper “life story”, but certainly a “life history” since, instead of the subject assuming a passive position with regards to the narrated facts as is characteristic of “life stories”, the subject has, despite initiating the unfolding of his historical identity with a story, tried to go further, constructing and deconstructing issues, confessing his ideological perspective, and compelling the reader to react or to take a stance (even if he fails to achieve this), especially since he has before him, not an actual combination of events but a vast horizon of symbols that demand from him the commitment to an intertextual and intercontextual analysis.

Before ending this section, it will be interesting to consider Foucault’s analysis of fearless speech. Anchoring his analysis in the etymology of the word \textit{parrhesia}, Foucault argues, “the one who uses \textit{parrhesia}, the \textit{parrhesiastes}, is someone who says everything he has in mind [and] he does not hide anything, but opens his heart and mind completely to other people through his discourse; [that is to say] the word \textit{parrhesia} refers to a type of relationship between the speaker and what he says [for] in \textit{parrhesia} the speaker makes it manifestly clear and obvious that what he says is his own opinion”\(^\text{124}\). So according to Foucault’s understanding, “in \textit{parrhesia} the speaker emphasizes the fact that he is both the subject of the enunciation and the subject of the enunciandum—that he himself is the subject of the opinion to which he refers”\(^\text{125}\). Moreover, the \textit{parrhesiastes} “says what is true because he \textit{knows} that it is true [and] he knows that it is true because it is really true [hence] the \textit{parrhesiastes} is not only
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sincere and says what is his opinion, but his opinion is also true because it is really true”\(^{126}\).

In some ways, this autobiography is a counter narrative, for it challenges some of the quite (ab)normal silences, and also some of the dominant views in colonial countries of the process of decolonization (or, to be honest, neocolonization). Thus, and along with Said we should highlight that narratives can serve for both the dominant and subordinate groups\(^{127}\). By acting as a counter narrative, autobiography, to use Rosaldo’s\(^ {128}\) term, becomes a question of human agency.

This flashback, through autobiographical narrative, much more than allowing for solid bases for a relational analysis, crucial in the field of education, in general and in that of the curriculum, in particular, permits the reawakening of a vast spectrum of solid intellectual tools, which can “show the fly the way out of the fly-bottle”\(^ {129}\), as was emphasized by Wittgenstein. Faced by a reality that is always contradictory, we are envisaging an arduous political task; however, this is what social transformation entails. The autobiography must then be perceived as one of the tools through which we define the topography of the ‘Self’ and attempt to find the most secure means of touching the real that we determine and which determines us on a daily basis. It also underlies our political decisions in undertaking a work of this nature.

Having laid out the power of the personal and its implications in studying Michael Apple’s intellectual journey, it will be wise now to unveil the ‘cartography’ of our research.

1.2 Mapping the Research

Saramago’s phrase, when he was awarded the Nobel Literature Prize in 1998, was to become famous: “The wisest man I met could not read or write”. This saying, besides reawakening the conflict between knowledge vs. wisdom, forces us to reflect

\(^{129}\) Wittgenstein, L. (1958) *Philosophical Investigation*. New York: Macmillan, p. 103. We find ourselves indebted to Michael Apple and Dwayne Huebner for bringing this work to our attention for a better understanding of educational issues, in general, and of curricular issues, in particular.
upon the nature of the sources of knowledge. In fact, it was this phrase, and of course the authority in a name like Saramago’s, that came to mind while we read *Critical Ethnography in Educational Research* by Carspecken. Carspecken begins his noteworthy work with a type of confession that, in some ways, translates what other researchers feel when they propose to undertake a certain type of research. As he notes,

> These days, trying to learn about social research is rather like walking into a room of noisy people. The room is full of cliques, each displaying a distinctive jargon and cultural style. There is, of course, a large group talking quantitative research much as it has been talked for decades. But there are new, flashy groups heatedly discussing ‘constructivist’, ‘postmodern’, ‘post-positivist’, and ‘critical’ research. Most of these people are talking about qualitative social research, but they disagree with each other on such basic issues as the nature of reality, the nature of knowledge, and the concept of truth. You cannot get more basic than that!130

But what is the real connection between Saramago’s and Carspecken’s thought and myself and this research? Before proceeding with this question, let us state our research question, for therein lies the motivation for choosing specific kinds of scientific research tools.

The problematic of this particular research is structured in a critical qualitative methodology of narrative kind. The problem is centered on the following question: How Michael Apple’s thought and work could be situated both social and professionally within a particular critical progressive curriculum sphere and its connections with the general tensions of the curriculum field in general. In order to address such a question, the aim of this research is to interpret and examine the contribution of the work and thought of Michael Apple to education, and more precisely, to the curriculum field. Thus and to accomplish such a task, it becomes crucial (1) to analyze, both his time and position not only in the field in general, but, and this is quite important, within a specific intellectual and political vein that, from the end of the nineteenth century has assumed a critical stance and argues for a more

just society, and (2) to understand the general influences on Michael Apple at the national and international levels, and, above all, the crucial influence of a specific number of intellectuals within the curriculum field.

On the basis of the many Ph.D. dissertations that one consulted at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Library, it is not fitting here to undertake an analysis of different approaches and methodological perspectives since the objective of this work is not to debate the methodological conflicts that currently occupy the field of education, in general and that of the curriculum, in particular. Even less, do we propose to undertake an investigation of the methodology. However, before going on to describe the mapping of this research, it is our intention to explain very briefly the “posture”\(^{131}\) that we have assumed in this work, to use an expression by Wolcott, taking into account as much of the complexity as the specificity of the object under analysis demands.

Whoever proposes to undertake an investigation which is anchored in a complex research question of the type presented above and begins to discuss the way it has been thought out and how it should be done with his peers, to use the terminology of Carspecken, will feel as though s/he is “walking into a room of noisy people [a space] full of cliques, each displaying a distinctive jargon and cultural style”\(^{132}\). To use an analysis by Hamilton\(^ {133}\), it is as if we were tossed around in a cyclone. In fact, there is no ideal methodology. Nevertheless, thanks to this rumble of ideas and different points of view surrounding basic notions like “the nature of reality, the nature of knowledge, and the concept of truth”\(^ {134}\), it is possible to open a door or a narrow opening in a small window, so that we may apply to the same problematics different intellectual tools, which when subject to triangulation will create conditions for attaining the investigation objective that we proposed to undertake. The choice of these tools is made, not only by delving into the debates which have taken center stage (and those which have not) in the field of social sciences, but also, curiously, through a prudent and serene distancing from the ‘rumble’, which allows for a
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complex abstraction with regards to what was (and continues to be) written and from what was (and continues to be) read. While Carspecken warns that “the value orientation of the researcher does not ‘construct’ the object of study”\textsuperscript{135}, but this object is also achieved as we operate as social and political agents who engage in a keen reading of reality. Although, as Hillway emphasizes, “we look at research as the principal agency by which we extend our knowledge of the universe”\textsuperscript{136}, the fact is that we must not forget that experience has dominion in the investigation. The way we position ourselves in the research is also closely related to the experience that we have come to acquire and which we cannot ignore.

With regards to this issue, Bullough and Gitlin, based on the thinking of Griffiths and Tann and that of Cole, focus on the intersection between that which they consider public theory [and] private theory. That is to say, “by public theory [they] mean expert talk—the substance of academic discourse, including concepts, generalizations, models and ways of making meaning”\textsuperscript{137}; in contrast, “private theory is grounded experientially, and is represented by personal, idiosyncratic, biographically embedded, and often implicit concepts and understandings by which individuals make life meaningful”\textsuperscript{138}.

Both of these two sources allow us, using the terminology of Livingston, our true ‘conditions for thinking’\textsuperscript{139}, and transform us into researchers, members of an epistemological community that is metaphorically represented by Thayer-Bacon as a “quilting bee”\textsuperscript{140}. This issue was also felt, for example, by Tyler, for whom “inquiry never starts afresh, but operates with assumptions while it focuses upon genuine issues in doubt, defining a problem”\textsuperscript{141}.

\textsuperscript{138} Op. Cit., p. 3.
\textsuperscript{139} We are in deep debt to our colleague Grace Livingston for the discussion and clarification of this argument. You can deal with this perspective in a more detailed analysis in Livingston, G. \textit{Chronic Silencing and Struggling without Witness: Race, Education and the Production of Political Knowledge}. Madison: University of Wisconsin-Madison. (Ph.D. Dissertation, photocopy).
It is in this sense that resorting to the analysis by Leslie Roman and Michael Apple\(^{142}\), who assume an almost autocritical stance with regards to the critical qualitative approach, proposing the necessity to opt for a materialist qualitative construction that is sensitive to the limits of the subjective and of the objective, and by Thayer-Bacon, who appeals to the need for reawakening an approach that is sensitive to a relational epistemological dimension, “one that considers questions of social being and the consequences of acting on those questions as directly connected to knowing”\(^ {143}\), and taking into consideration the referred distancing of *strategical abstraction* that we opted to use, our methodological perspective nevertheless should not be interpreted as hybrid.

In fact, and as we will have the opportunity to explain in a more detailed way later, we are using critical qualitative analyses of multiple kinds. As we mentioned before, because of the nature of the research, one must understand the person Michael Apple and his history, and we must understand the professional and social context in which this particular person and his history arose, and one must understand the most significant texts that he produced. Given the nature of this research, the following methodological forms have been used: textual analyses; long term and continuous informal interviews, over a three-year period, with Michael Apple - 70 tapes - and his major professor, Huebner – 15 Tapes; and historical work on the history of the curriculum. The social context in which all of this occurs, along with informal notes that we took in Michael Apple’s doctoral courses were also considered. In other words, it is not a hybrid methodology in the usual sense. It is, in fact, a critical qualitative methodology that is triangulated in order to understand this particular problem: Michael Apple and his work in context. We would call it a critical approach with complementary qualitative methods - or a socio critical approach to use Arnal e Rincon’ lenses\(^ {144}\) - and these methods are deeply connected to each other, given the very complex nature of the research. We must flag here that since the interviews were informal one did not build any guide.


In other words, what we have done is draw on two concepts. One is triangulation in which multiple sources of data that are related to each other, and mutually correct and complement each other – textual analyses, informal interviews, and informal notes - and the other is what Thayer-Bacon calls “relational epistemology”\(^{145}\), a conceptual and theoretical framework that, curiously, emerges in the field towards the end of the 1970s by the hands, among others, of Huebner and Michael Apple.

This is the model of research design that we put forward to analyze the contribution of the work and thought of Michael Apple to the educational path, more precisely in the curriculum field. It is a model that, according to Hitchcock and Hughes, will “act as plans and blueprints for [me] to follow, [a model that will supply] sets of concepts and ideas, and preferred tools and techniques for the conduct of research”.\(^{146}\) In fact, we fully agree with Lather for whom the method is “not a matter of looking harder or more closely, but seeing what frames our seeing spaces of constructed visibility and incitements to see which constitute power/knowledge”\(^{147}\).

If on the one hand, as is defended by Lincoln and Guba\(^{148}\), Borg\(^{149}\), Bogdan and Biklen\(^{150}\), the method of qualitative research should be understood as a term which allows a wide range of investigation strategies, on the other hand, and as defended by Gibson “it is vital to grasp [...] that there is no such thing as unified critical theory [rather] there are critical theories [since] critical theory is a label which conceals a host of disagreements among different writers”\(^{151}\). Thus, we are faced by two perspectives that are a constant challenge and, consequently, thrilling for any researcher. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify some common characteristics in the qualitative approach and which also cross this research, namely that the “researchers collect data within the natural setting of information [...]”; the key data collection instruments are the researchers themselves [...]”; the methods for data collection include interviewing, scanning records and files [...]”; the researcher does not act in isolation [...]and] the researchers are concerned with the process of an activity rather

than only the outcomes from that activity”\textsuperscript{152}. Moreover, as Soltis adds, the qualitative approach, is better able to “capture the human dimension in education”\textsuperscript{153}, a crucial dimension in this type of research.

Although “there is no single way to answer the question of where theory comes from”\textsuperscript{154}, we cannot ignore that critical theory has a basis in the thinking and work of some of the theoreticians of the Frankfurt School - it is, though, prudent to emphasize that, as is demonstrated in the correspondence exchanged between them, such intellectuals “did not speak of ‘Critical Theory’ at that time, and the thought of a ‘school’ was certainly far from them”. Nevertheless, their work, their explicit (and implicit) manner, their defense of the concept, and their critical position was central to their analysis.

This is in fact what explicitly transpired in one of the works by Horkheimer. For Horkheimer, “the identification […] of men of critical mind with their society is marked by tension, and the tension characterizes all the concepts of the critical way of thinking”\textsuperscript{155}. This becomes more complex given the fact that “reason cannot become transparent to itself as long as men act as members of an organism which lacks reason”\textsuperscript{156}. However, and as Horkheimer put it, “critical thinking is motivated today by the effort really to transcend the tension and to abolish the opposition between the individual’s purposefulness, spontaneity, and rationality, and those work-process relationships on which society is built”\textsuperscript{157}. That is why, as Gibson highlights, “critical theory argues that in human affairs all ‘facts’ are socially constructed, humanly determined and interpreted, and hence subject to change through human means”\textsuperscript{158}.

By assuming this, we are assuming Marcuse’s position about any critical theory of society. That is to say that “any critical theory of society is […] confronted with the

\textsuperscript{156} Op. Cit., p., 208.
problem of historical objectivity, a problem which arises at the two points where the analysis implies value judgments”\(^{159}\). As Marcuse argues:

the judgment that human life is worth living, or rather can be and ought to be worth living [and] this judgment underlies all intellectual effort, the judgment that, in a given society, specific possibilities exist for the amelioration of human life and specific ways and means to realize these possibilities\(^{160}\).

This Marcusian perspective is very close to the Gramscian approach and, curiously, is well imprinted in the works of Michael Apple, as we shall have the opportunity to discuss later on. In fact, critical analysis, Marcuse argues, “has to demonstrate the objective validity of these judgments”\(^{161}\), a quite complex task given the fact that “the very mechanism which ties the individual to his society has changed, and social control is anchored in the new needs which it has produced”\(^{162}\).

Thus, the critical task should not be perceived as something that occurs within a social vacuum, as something that is static within a monolithic entity. As is defended by Horkheimer, (and as is also clarified by Thayer-Bacon\(^ {163}\), “critical thinking is the function neither of the isolated individual nor of a sum-total of individuals. Its subject is rather a definite individual in his real relation to other individuals and groups, in his conflict with a particular class, and finally, in the resultant web of relationships with social totality and with nature”\(^ {164}\).

In fact, this methodology does not lose its critical spine because it does not minimally peck at one of the basic pillars of the critical position—“the ability to disrupt and challenge the status quo”\(^ {165}\), but because, by being sensitive to the


\(^{160}\) Op. Cit., pp., x- xi


necessity of complexifying the critical qualitative approach, it maintains and reinforces certain nuclear assumptions that participate in the construction and deconstruction of the actual identity of a critical researcher, namely that

(1) all thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations which are socially and historically constituted; (2) that facts can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from some form of ideological inscription; (3) that the relationship between concept and object and signifier and signified is never stable or fixed and is often mediated by the social relations of capitalist production and consumption; (4) that the language is central to the formation of subjectivity; (5) that certain groups in any society are privileged over others and, although the reasons for this prevailing may vary widely, the oppression which characterizes contemporary societies is most forcefully reproduced when subordinates accept their social status as natural, necessary or inevitable; (5) that oppression has many faces and that focusing on only one at the expense of others (e.g. class oppression versus racism) often elides the interconnections among them; (6) that the mainstream research practices are generally, although most often unwillingly, implicated in the reproduction of systems of class, race and gender oppression.166

In essence, and as was previously stated, we opted for a critical approach with complementary qualitative methods which in relation to the objective of the research, attempts not only to break free of a certain impasse that is verifiable with regards to the critical approach, but which simultaneously reacts to this impasse, admitting the necessity for other methodological tools. Thus, it becomes stronger, without ever losing its critical focus, and without diminishing the genealogy of the critical researcher’s subjectivity; more than interpreting reality it is crucial to provide the theoretical and practical impetus that will transform it. In a Carspeckenian way, this is the methodological approach that embeds a cultural style and crosses this research.

Having provided a brief analysis of our research question and the model which we propose to use for our work, and considering the dilemmas and the ethical issues, generated by a research project of this nature, it is now important to describe the tools and the stages that make up this investigation. Before explaining the structure of the

dissertation by chapters, we will describe the various kinds of data that we gathered how we obtained them and why we need them.

In order to accomplish our research we had to gather five kinds of data. The first kind of data is what one might call - based on Estrela’s\textsuperscript{167} approach - archival data. We spent three years at the University of Wisconsin-Madison Libraries, namely the Memorial Library (probably one of the best libraries in the world), the School of Education Instructional Materials Center, the College Library and the ‘Universidade da Coruña’ Library. This type of data was important because this research is not just about Michael Apple. In order to explain the impact of both his thought and work within the curriculum field, it was also necessary to situate him and his work in its larger historical context within the curriculum field. Given the fact that this is one of the tasks of our research, we had to engage in archival work. Therefore, in the three years we spent in the archives of the said Libraries, we read the works of all the major figures in the field, from 1870 until now, including some works that have largely not be spoken of but which we consider to be part of a specific progressive curricular tradition.

This type of data was fundamental to aid in the analysis and comprehension of the positioning of the thinking and work of Michael Apple in the field of the curriculum and constitutes the basis of the third and fourth chapters of this research, serving furthermore as the basis for a significant part of the second chapter. After being gathered, this data was submitted to what in scientific terms is commonly referred to as literature review. As Bieger and Gerlach highlight, “the literature review [a comprehensive and exhaustive process] serves to place the current study in a chronological as well as a theoretical context [and the researcher] should find a connection between the theories on which the study is based, and a connection between prior related research and current study”\textsuperscript{168}.

The second source of data is also textual and encompasses an extremely vast collection of texts and documents, published and unpublished, by Michael Apple and by scholars that throughout more than three decades have labored with him. This


material was obtained through the University of Wisconsin-Madison Libraries, namely the Memorial Library, the School of Education Instructional Materials Center, and the College Library, and from the personal archives of Huebner and Michael Apple. Both gave unlimited access to their personal archives, where we had the opportunity to gather an extremely vast collection of personal material, in some cases intimate, unpublished or little circulated within academic circles. This type of material was important to enable us to understand the influences that Michael Apple received not only on an international and national level, but also in various other arenas, in the curriculum field. In order to obtain this information, it was necessary to investigate a combination of material from scholars situated in the curriculum field who revealed themselves to be major influences in the thinking and work of Michael Apple, as for example, his professors and some of his peers. This combination of data would prove fundamental, not only for a better understanding of the context of the thinking and work of Michael Apple, but it would also serve as the basis for the second chapter of this research project.

Nevertheless, although it proved crucial for to have the unlimited access that both Huebner and Michael Apple were to allow us into their personal archives, the fact is, the material that we managed to gather from the University of Wisconsin - Madison Libraries, continued to be of central importance. The library, to use Manheim’s words, functioned as an efficient “research tool”\textsuperscript{169}.

In both cases, the textual data was submitted to a careful interpretation of the available material. The text(s) was (were) submitted to an interpretative analysis on the basis of both the thinking and the work of historical figures in the field, such as Krug, Cremin, Spring and above all Kliebard, with the purpose of understanding the relations that were established between certain themes and the thinking and work of Michael Apple. Nonetheless, it was actually an analysis driven by the testimony of these intellectuals since, the objective was (and we consider that it was achieved) to delve deeper and to complexify his analyses. Thus, the analysis of this kind of textual data was based on the long-standing tradition within historical scholarship. However, our task was to complexify those positions and to try to establish the connections within the work and thought of Michael Apple and his position within the field.

The third source of data is also textual, even if more restricted, and is the basis for the fifth and last chapter of this research. During a period of four years, we read, interpreted and analyzed an enormous quantity of work by Michael Apple, from books, to articles, to critical reviews. It was a hard and painstaking process that forced us to consider both the published and unpublished work. Faced by this vast amount of information, we concluded that it was mandatory to make selections from this work. This complex process began with discussions with Beane with regards to the analysis of the work of Michael Apple. Probably, next to Dewey, Michael Apple is the most productive author in the field of education in the United States of America. This made it necessary for us to make disciplined selections from his work in order to focus our research. We decided then to limit our analysis to a significant sample from among his most significant works, namely Ideology and Curriculum\textsuperscript{170}, Education and Power\textsuperscript{171}, Teachers and Texts\textsuperscript{172}, Official Knowledge\textsuperscript{173}, Cultural Politics and Education\textsuperscript{174}, Educating the ‘Right’ Way\textsuperscript{175}, and Democratic Schools\textsuperscript{176} (co-authored with James Beane). Since, in essence, this vast range includes three major evolutionary stages in the thinking of Michael Apple, we deemed choosing Ideology and Curriculum (2\textsuperscript{nd} Edition)\textsuperscript{177}, Official Knowledge (2\textsuperscript{nd} Edition)\textsuperscript{178}, and Democratic Schools\textsuperscript{179} to be an excellent strategy. Nonetheless, attention, though brief, will be paid to other works of his, including one that is part of his first phase: Education and Power; and the remainder are part of his second phase: Teachers and Texts, Cultural Politics and Education and Educating the ‘Right’ Way, as well as his masterpiece, the one we consider the mother of all his work, his doctoral dissertation, Relevance and Curriculum: A Study in Phenomenological Sociology of Knowledge, which he unfortunately decided not to publish.

\textsuperscript{176} Apple, Michael and Beane, James (1995) Democratic Schools. Alexandria: ASCD
\textsuperscript{179} Apple, Michael and Beane, James (1995) Democratic Schools. Alexandria: ASCD.
Given the first step of selecting texts on which to focus, it was important to understand the next step of how to work through these books. Again, after innumerable discussions with Beane, we decided to approach the work of Michael Apple in accordance with three themes and not through an individualized analysis of each volume. Having identified the themes, we would conduct an analysis of the works with respect to those three themes. The themes were decided on the basis of the grounded theory approach following a close reading of the works in question. That is to say, as a reader, we delved into the textual material, and as we went on reading certain thematic categories naturally emerged and overlapped with others. It was not an isolated process, but rather a relational one since it forced us not just to read the work, but also to constantly compare works and clarify them without losing sight of the major objective that gave direction to this research. Fundamentally, this process consisted of trying to generate a combination of theories on the basis of the data that was available. As was emphasized by Glaser and Strauss, “generating theory from data means that most hypotheses and concepts not only come from data, but are systematically worked out in relation to the data during the course of the research, generating a theory involves a process of research”\(^\text{180}\).

This implies a careful process of reading in which, as is defended by Armstrong, Patberg and Dewiz, “the reader examines the words to determine what is being said—literal level—looks for relationships among statements—interpretative level—and takes the product of the literal and interpretative levels and applies it to earlier knowledge thereby deepening the understanding—applied level”\(^\text{181}\). In other words, reading can be defined “as a thinking process which includes decoding of symbols, interpreting the meanings of symbols and applying the ideas deriving from symbols”\(^\text{182}\). Thus, and as Irwin highlights, “when we are reading, we often engage in many types of higher-level thinking processes, [that is to say] transferring information to apply in new situations, analyzing the reasoning used by the author, integrating


ideas into a creative idea or product, and making judgments about what is being read are all higher-level thinking responses that can be part of the reading act\textsuperscript{183}.

As we shall have the opportunity to see further on, the scope of this investigation does not rest on the analysis and stance that others have assumed of the work and thinking of Michael Apple, but rather on our reading of his work and interpretation of his thinking and context in the field of education, in general, and in the field of the curriculum, in particular. That explains the basis of the grounded theory, in which “the theory that emerges from the researcher’s collection and analysis of qualitative data is in one sense equivalent to what he knows systematically about his own data”\textsuperscript{184}. Fundamentally the act of reading and interpretation is related to, and to use the terminology of Merleau-Ponty, the primacy of perception. Contrary to the classical analysis of perception, that which “reduces all our experience to a single level of what, for good reasons, is judged to be true”\textsuperscript{185}, Merleau-Ponty “consider[s] the whole setting [l’entourage] of [one’s] perception [and in so doing] it reveals another modality which is neither the ideal and necessary being of geometry, nor the simple sensory event”\textsuperscript{186}. This position strongly reinforces something, which we have previously analyzed and justified. In other words, Merleau-Ponty’s primacy of perception reinforces not only the concept of literature as a code as proposed by Barthes, but it also reinforces, to use the terminology of Jameson, the power of its eloquent silences.

It is worth stressing that this analysis of the work of Michael Apple is supported by the theory of cultural production proposed by Johnson and put into practice by many scholars, including Michael Apple. As Johnson\textsuperscript{187} highlights, if we pay close attention, the cultural products or cultural commodities reveal a marked circuit of quality. As products or commodities, they are also the result of acts of significance. In other words, the products or cultural commodities, by stemming from acts of significance, may also be read and assimilated in distinct forms, allowing for still

other readings and effects. For Johnson, all human products are cultural since they deliver a multiplicity of meanings, allowing for a multiplicity of readings. According to Johnson\textsuperscript{188}, the circuit of cultural production embraces four stages: the production conditions or production, the circulation of the ‘product’, the autonomous meanings that are permitted and the interpretations conferred to those products by various social groups, and the effect and impact of that same product in the social tissue as in the participation in the construction and deconstruction of the identities of each one.

It is, in fact, this analysis, which is to be found in one of the works by Michael Apple. However, this research will be centered only at the level of the first stage of the cultural production circuit suggested by Johnson; in other words, the research will be centered at the level of the conditions of production in the thinking and works of Michael Apple.

The fourth source of data entails the informal but quite extensive and careful notetaking that we conducted in all the doctoral courses given by Michael Apple in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison that we had the chance to attend, \textit{(Elementary Curriculum Design, Theory and Design of the Curriculum, and Ideology and Curriculum)}, as well as the notes gathered at the \textit{Friday Seminar}. The legitimacy and credibility of this type and data were never a source of questioning for us since we have always been clear in our mind about the way the thinking of Saussure, for example, was diffused. Attending the doctoral courses given by Michael Apple not only permitted us to see up to what point his theoretical and practical coherence remained steadfast, but it also enabled us to triangulate some of the data that was obtained and interpreted.

The fifth source of data is related to the informal, but rather extensive and detailed interviews, over a period of three years, that we conducted weekly or biweekly, with Michael Apple, and informal interviews with Huebner. At an initial contact with Michael Apple, we approached him with regards to the necessity of maintaining informal interviews that had, as a starting point, very broad issues, namely, the influences on him, his background, his position in terms of the field, his impulse in

\textsuperscript{188} Op. Cit.
terms of the critical educational theory, in short, a combination of very general and broad themes that were to serve as catalyzing points for the development of informal interviews which we, held in his office. The same strategy was used with Huebner. In a first approach, and after a detailed explanation of the project, we proposed to him that we discuss a set of very broad issues, namely, that he had had Michael Apple as his student and as his research assistant, his past and current position in the field, and his turning point or natural evolution towards religious education, issues that served as the basis for the informal interviews that we kept up with Huebner at his house. The informal interviews with Huebner allowed us to validate the content of the information that we had obtained from the informal interviews we had had with Michael Apple. These initial issues, although broad, served, to use the terminology of Fontana and Frey, for “breaking the ice” between us. These interviews were the source for a brief biographical excerpt on Michael Apple that structures part of the second chapter and which proved to be crucial both for the comprehension of the person and of his most significant influences, as well as providing tools around the polemical notion of reconceptualization.

Just as our biography proves to be crucial for the comprehension of the motives that are at the basis of this work, the brief biographical excerpt on Michael Apple that is part of the next chapter proves to be fundamental for the comprehension of the stances that were maintained throughout more than a decade in the field.

In fact as the investigation focused on both the educational and curricular thinking of an author, the methodological issues, especially those related to its validity, are colored by a singular specificity. Firstly, and according to Erickson 190, the methodological prerequisites of an interpretative investigation lead to finding the more significant aspects of the concepts of one of the more prominent authors of the educational and curriculum field. According to this perspective, we conduct informal interviews with the purpose of sifting through the superficial conscience of the subject in search of a number of affirmations, opinions and attitudes 191, as is stressed by

Walker. As pointed out by Becker, we “as scientists always, implicitly or explicitly, attribute a point of view, a perspective, and motives to the people whose actions we analyze”\(^{192}\). As he highlights,

We always, for instance, describe the meanings the people we have studied give to the events they participate in, so the only question is not whether we should do that, but how accurately we do it. We can, and many social scientists do, gather data about the meanings people give to things. We find out—not with perfect accuracy, but better than zero—what people think they are doing, how they interpret the objects and events and people in their lives experience. We can do that by talking to them, in formal or informal interviews\(^{193}\).

Secondly, the project proceeds on the basis of a narrative theory, in accordance with the fundamental aspects of any biographical composition. To ponder over a life's (hi)story is, according to Bourdieu\(^{194}\), to presuppose that life is a (hi)story and that one cannot separate the occurrences that comprise an individual’s existence conceived as a (hi)story and the narrative of that (hi)story. It is, in essence, to describe life as a path, a precourse, a guided itinerary in which its beginning, its intermediate stages and its outcomes are perceivable. That’s why according to Bourdieu, talking about ‘life histories’ is to be aware of the intricate notion of “trajectory”\(^{195}\), in which one could identify different ‘subject’ positions. By unfolding those subject positions one can become an “ideologue of his/her own life”\(^{196}\). In so doing one is quite able to identify critically what Bourdieu calls the “social surface [of] a biological individual”\(^{197}\), one that describe the subject positions that a particular individual occupies in a particular time.

The theory of narrative, as Bourdieu highlights\(^{198}\), perceives life as a coherent and guided whole which can and must be apprehended as having a unitary meaning entailing subjective and objective intentions, and attempts to comprehend the various constituent phases of a particular individual’s trajectory.


\(^{198}\) Op. Cit.
An investigation conducted by means of narrative is deeply implicated with the educational theory, methodology and politics. As noted by Casey, it is not actually a new paradigm. On the contrary, it makes use of a combination of new configurations and maintains old ones. Although a narrative investigation includes various perspectives—biographical, autobiographical and ethnographical—the fact is that the narrative has always described the personal, a particular historical synchrony, which is ultimately related to the diachronic perspective.

Going beyond the distinction between narrative and history, as argued by Connely and Clandinin, and inasmuch as it concerns education, teachers, students and researchers are simultaneously (hi)story tellers and characters or, in many cases, the protagonists in their own (hi)story and in the (hi)stories of others. Consequently, Carter mentions that individuals carry forth their own (hi)stories, narrating them, while researchers who utilize the narrative method, describe these same (hi)stories, composing them and recomposing them in their social and personal dimensions, since to understand the "thinking process, it is necessary to find the (hi)story which structures the individual mode or theory of occurrences."

Although there is a lack of consensus as to a definition of narrative, some, like Labov, favor specific, past and common occurrences. Others, like Riessman, alert us to the necessity of distinguishing between narratives with protagonists, events, and setting, and the modes of representation chosen by the narrators, often in accordance with what is thought to be the listener's expectations. And furthermore, as Thompson stresses, oral (hi)stories provide people with a historic past through their own discourse and, in endowing them with a past, permit them the construction of a future.


As Elbaz\textsuperscript{205} put it, as the life of educational agents—teachers, students and parents—translates itself into non-linear, holistic knowledge immersed in personal and tacit meaning. The narrative method, according to Cortazi\textsuperscript{206}, is an ideal used to analyze (hi)stories and to understand culture. Likewise, as Withrell and Noddings comment, (hi)stories "remind us that we find ourselves at the core of the process of teaching, learning and investigation with the intent to improve the human condition"\textsuperscript{207}.

Given the complexity and specificity of the objective of this research, we did not use non-directive interviews, which are described by Moser and Kalton as when “the informant is encouraged to talk about the subject under investigation (usually himself) and the course of the interview is mainly guided by him”. Although in this type of interview there are no set questions, and usually no predetermined framework for recorded answers\textsuperscript{208}, the fact is that the space for action by the interviewer and researcher is manipulated and limited. Thus, informal interviewing, in which questions emerge from the immediate context and are asked in the natural course of the interview\textsuperscript{209}, create an open space for a dialectical position between both the interviewer and the interviewed.

In these informal interviews, a non-directive position was not assumed. Quite the opposite, and to use Kvale’s metaphors, as the interviewer, we acted both as a miner and a traveler. As a miner, because we dug “nuggets of data or meanings out of a subject’s pure experiences, unpolluted by any leading questions”\textsuperscript{210}. Moreover, like Kvale highlights, “the precious facts and meanings are purified by transcribing them from the oral to the written mode”\textsuperscript{211}. On the other hand, we also acted as a traveler given the fact that in a very deep sense, it was a “journey [where I] explored many domains [of] the unknown territory of the [subjected]”\textsuperscript{212}. A journey “not only leads
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\textsuperscript{212} Op. Cit., p. 4
to new knowledge, [but also] changes [it] in a process of [constant] reflection”\(^{213}\). However, both the miner and the traveler approaches would come to reveal themselves as a dialectical process that is much more complex than the one described by Kvale.

In fact, both the miner and the traveler identities, in the informal interview, are not approaches that function merely in a unidirectional dimension. On the contrary, and this was extremely positive, it was a bidirectional process in which both Michael Apple and us were caught up in a dialectical activity that was decisive in the construction and deconstruction of our identities. As proposed by Gee, “socially situated identities are mutually co-constructed (co-built) in interviews”\(^{214}\). In this way, more than reinforcing Kvale’s metaphor, in the informal interview, the interviewer and the interviewee occupied subject positions metaphorically described as miners and travelers, which enriched this methodological tool. In fact, the results of informal interviews cannot be discussed nor analyzed in the first person singular.

This dual relation is also highlighted by Seidman\(^{215}\), who, resorting to the relation “I-thou” of Schutz, stresses that in an interview (and we can add, above all, in the informal one) the two subjects participate in the (des)(re)construction of a common engine of meanings and by both being thou oriented, create a we relationship.

Having described, explained and justified the methodological tools that are at the basis and which structure this investigation and before considering some of the dilemmas and the conflicts inherent to an investigation with these characteristics, it is important now to describe the structure of the investigation. In addition to this first chapter, which is reserved for discussing the methodology, is made up of five more chapters.

The second chapter entitled \textit{Here I stand} has proved crucial for the comprehension not only of the influences of Michael Apple and the way these intervened decisively throughout the evolution of his thinking and work, but also to problematize the fragile argument surrounding the concept of curricular reconceptualization. Throughout this

chapter, and since this dissertation has its basis in the curriculum field, more emphasis has been given to the influences that Michael Apple came to receive from scholars who were already established in the field. It is a chapter that contextualizes Michael Apple in the curriculum field, positioning him in a specific progressive intellectual river that since the end of the nineteenth-century has come to directly oppose a more technological curricular conception. This chapter furthermore discusses the four most significant spheres of influence on the thinking and work of Michael Apple, with special attention given to that which is related to the curricular field.

The chapter ends by leading on to the third and fourth chapters, with the purpose of understanding the contextualization of the thinking and work of Michael Apple in the general tensions of the field.

In the third and fourth chapters, entitled *General Tensions in the Curriculum Field I & II*, respectively, an exhaustive analysis of the conflicts that dominated the field since the end of the nineteenth-century was conducted. This strategy was largely influenced by the noteworthy thinking of Kliebard but goes beyond his vision and analysis, since it incorporates a minute analysis of the romantic critics, of the Civil Rights movement and of the singular political project that was the *Highlander Folk School*, and the role of Horton, which, in our understanding, cannot not be erased from the curricular debate. Both chapters must be perceived as wholes and this historical critical analysis is fundamental for the comprehension of the position assumed by Michael Apple—and of the specific progressive river in which he is to be found—in the great conflicts that have come to dynamize the field for more than a century.

The fifth chapter, entitled *The Long Revolution*, analyzes a sample of some of the most significant works that make up the rich intellectual storehouse of Michael Apple’s work, namely, *Ideology and Curriculum, Official Knowledge, and Democratic Schools*. As previously mentioned, this analysis has as its basis three themes, and will be supported through our reading and interpretation of the work.

In the sixth and last chapter destined for the final considerations, and although throughout the analysis in the fifth chapter we will not hold back from interacting
dialectically with the thinking of Michael Apple, we will lay out in a more systematic manner our critical positioning in terms of the thinking and work of Michael Apple.

This positioning takes a dialogical perspective with the secular tensions and conflicts that have contributed to the complex, though interesting, identity of the curricular field. Before ending this section we should highlight here, that Democratic Schools becomes central in our conceptual lenses for analyzing Michael Apple’s intellectual voyage. In fact, since Michael Apple’s goals are similar to Dewey’s work, both at the level of theory and practice—and clear evidence was provided in one his graduate courses that we attended (Elementary Curriculum Design)—we will try to demonstrate that Democratic Schools, in many ways equivalent to Dewey’s Schools for To-Morrow, is Michael Apple’s concrete attempt to have people describing curriculum practices that he believes in.

1.3 Some of the Dilemmas and Conflicts

Before one concludes this methodological section, and as was previously mentioned, it is important that we spend a significant amount of time discussing some of the dilemmas and conflicts that we (and sometimes Michael Apple) faced in the course of this research. Some probably might claim that this section is misplaced and that we should flagged our dilemmas and conflicts right before we unfolded the map of our research. Without any intention of minimizing such claim, we are confident that addressing our conflicts and dilemmas at this particular point would not damage the structure of this particular research.

If there is an investigation that highlights ethical and political questions, without a doubt, this is one of those. As Soltis noted, “ethics is ubiquitous [because] it permeates all aspects of our lives”\(^\text{216}\). Concepts such as fairness, honesty, justice, respect for persons and confidentiality - to use Soltis’s tools - although linked to human interaction, also play a key role in educational research, given the fact that education should be understood as a moral enterprise, or as Soltis puts it, “education

---

is ultimately about the formation of persons. Thus, and like Diener and Grandall note, ethical guides are not simply prohibitions, they also support our positive responsibilities.

Ethics, according to Smith, “has to do with how one treats those individuals with whom one interacts and is involved with and how the relationships formed may depart from some conception of an ideal”. Like Soltis, Smith refers to “caring, fairness, openness, and truth [as] the important values undergirding the relationships and the activity of inquiring”. In other words, “at a more technical level, inquiry is supposed to increase knowledge—in this instance about teaching, learning, and schooling [however, and] also at a technical level, inquiry should not harm the subjects of that inquiry”.

A more complex and interesting position about this problematic is raised by Leslie Roman and Michael Apple. According to them, one cannot split the ethical from the political with regards to educational research. In fact, for them “educational research [should be seen both as] an ethical, and a political act”. This type of approach is in fact, quite Aristotellean, given the fact, that for Aristotle, as McCarthy highlights, “politics was continuous with ethics, the doctrine of the good and just life”. Both defend “educational inquiry as an ethical and political act that is strongly connected to conflicts over knowledge, resources, and power outside as well inside of education, even when its practitioners think otherwise”. Their position becomes even more explicit, when they defend both the crucial need for a relational analysis of the educational process, and denounce the assumed neutrality of the curriculum:

Because forms of oppression by gender, class, race, sexual orientation, and age are structured into the very warp and woof of our society, to study schooling is not simply to inquire into an assemblage of neutral institutions whose role is to pass on ‘the common culture’ (…) while the relationship between, say, school achievement, attitudes, and the relations of class, race, gender, sexual orientation, and age in the society as a whole is complicated, one would have to be nearly blind to miss the importance of these interrelationships in structuring the lives, hopes, and futures of students inside and outside the school. It is unwise to think of the curriculum itself as neutral.  

Given this, educational research, in general, and curricular research, in particular, by assuming themselves as ethical and political acts, become complex undertakings, though necessary. It is furthermore, along this train of thought that Kaplan proposes the complex concept of “autonomy of inquiry.” Such a concept becomes even more complex if we take into consideration the debate that surrounds the dynamics of subjectivity and objectivity previously dealt with. It becomes useful to return to the thinking of Leslie Roman and Michael Apple and align it with Bourdieu’s analysis. For Leslie Roman and Michael Apple, more important than trying to justify the duality between subjectivity-objectivity [especially since “when we act in the world, we act simultaneously with and against our contradictory interests by gender, class, race, age, and sexual orientation (and) these power relations set perceptible and imperceptible limits upon the range of choices and actions in which we may engage to further one or more of our interests and, in turn, variously affect our subjectivities”], it is important to assume an alternative position that leads to the confrontation of certain issues, among them, “what ethical principles and epistemological traditions can be evoked to guide [researchers] facing the contradictions invariably entailed in the often.” Thus, and contrary to the analysis by Guba (according to which, for Leslie Roman and Michael Apple, “the concept of

objectivity is neither relevant nor useful”\textsuperscript{229}), the researcher and the research determine and are determined by a dialectical perspective, especially since, as is emphasized by them, “in the construction of our arguments, we (...) acknowledge the reciprocal determinacy that ‘subjectivity’ and ‘objectivity’—the conflicting sets of historically specific power relations and material interests—have upon one another”\textsuperscript{230}. In short, and as is proposed by Soltis\textsuperscript{231}, given the political nature of the educational act, in general and of the curricular act, in particular, the importance of the human dimension in this act is unquestionable, and such a dimension does not even minimally diminish the dynamics of objectivity in the process of investigation.

An identical position is adopted by Bourdieu, for whom “objective analysis of practical apprehension of the familiar world in not a new form of sacrificial offering to the mysteries of subjectivity but a means of exploring the limits of all objective exploration”\textsuperscript{232}. That is to say, “it teaches us that we shall escape from the ritual either/or choice between objectivism and subjectivism in which the social sciences have so far allowed themselves to be trapped”\textsuperscript{233}.

The need for a dialectical ethical position between the fields of subjectivity and objectivity lead us to some of the dilemmas and the conflicts generated by the process of investigation. The risks of our research clearly emerged from the objective that directed our research. Such an objective set off serious and constant ethical preoccupations on our part, especially involving three aspects, and these forced us to justify them.

The first major issue, which, in fact, opens the door to the other issues, was already discussed and justified at the beginning of this chapter, with the inclusion of the autobiographical narrative. It was, above all, the experience and privilege of growing up in a Marxist-Leninist country that compelled us to consider particular


social and political issues and which impelled us towards the field of education and also towards the thinking and work of Michael Apple and to the necessity of delving more deeply into it, and thereby noting his impact on the field of the curriculum. In fact, and as is stressed by Fiske, “narrative is a basic way of making sense of our experience of the real”234; that is to say, in a narrative “every detail makes sense, it contributes to the final overall understanding granted to the reader”235. Furthermore, the autobiographical narrative used as the basis for the study, the thinking and the work of Michael Apple, and an analysis of the impact of that same thinking on the curricular field. The narrative furthermore created the space for a profound intertextual analysis since “any text is necessarily read in relationship with others, and a range of knowledge is brought to bear upon it”236. In other words, “intertextuality exists (…) in the space between texts”237.

Another issue must be clarified here. The subject of this autobiographical narrative was a character participating in the revolutionary process of decolonization in Mozambique and in the reformative anti-racial process in South Africa. This subject was not merely a spectator in the balcony of the theatre of the revolution, to use an expression by Bakhtin238. His having lived in loco and having been a character in certain historical processes confers a measure of authenticity to the autobiographical narrative. This history is narrated not by an exterior hand, unfamiliar with the process, but rather by one who actually participated in and endured the good and the bad moments of complex processes that were experienced (and are still being experienced) in Mozambique and South Africa.

To utilize the thinking of Wolcott, “to conduct an inquiry of any sort, somebody must have an idea [that obviously] reflects human judgment”239. Thus, the autobiography that opens up this methodology chapter, besides having to be interpreted and perceived as an act of resistance that expresses a “refusal to accept the social identity proposed by the dominant ideology and the social control that goes

with it”\textsuperscript{240}, explains and justifies the social, political and ideological basis of our research question. In fact, it was an entire past that determined, to use Woolcott’s terminology\textsuperscript{241}, our whole position in this investigation. It is the very root of our research question. It is in essence one of the contours of our own identity in the sense proposed by Gee\textsuperscript{242}.

This issue, nonetheless, was to create the space for others, such as the way that the investigation should be conducted. It was this issue that opened the doors to the need for listening to credible intellectuals, not only in the field of the curriculum, but also those that would know in depth and in detail the thinking and work of Michael Apple. It is in this context that, after consulting and following the advice of various people, we decided, without any objection from Michael Apple, to begin to work closely with James Beane. Given the true nature and specificity of this work, Beane was the advisor of this investigation and we intend now to dedicate a small space to explain the reasons that motivated this choice.

As one mentioned before, part of our task in this research was to find the impact of Michael Apple’s work on the broader field that is not only critical curriculum theory, but more broadly the history of progressive curriculum theory and curriculum theory in general. Given this, it would not have been ethical or politically correct to be co-guided by someone (in this case Michael Apple) who was himself the object of investigation. Naturally, and given the specificity of the research and since we were in Madison for a period of three years, the choice of Beane was made for certain crucial reasons. In the first place, Beane is one of the people who knows best the thinking and the work of Michael Apple, as well as its implications for the day-to-day life of the classroom. Despite being frequently referred to in the acknowledgements of Michael Apple’s books, he is one of the greatest critics of Michael Apple. The fact that he worked on a daily basis in the schools with teachers, with students and other educational workers, lends him not only with a more practical understanding of curricular dynamics, but also lends him an independent, critical and credible voice on

certain theoretical perspectives. In second place, he is a world leader of programmatic curriculum theory, which is the translation of theory into actual curriculum plans. In third place, he has a world reputation in middle-level curriculum theory and is connected to progressive curriculum theory and to progressive curriculum practice, but is also a historian of progressive curriculum. In sum, Beane is a very well-known figure in curriculum theory as one can see when taking into account his rich body of work.

In fact, he is known as the person who best understands the history of progressive curriculum theory, and in many ways he is one of the guardians of the river, a metaphor that runs through the whole of this investigation.

Finally, the geographical and economic issue cannot be silenced here. Because he lived in Madison, Beane allowed us constant interaction. He created the conditions for constant critical feedback in our encounters. With Beane, and thanks to his knowledge of the finest of details, not only of the field, but also of their impact on the thinking, the work and the position of Michael Apple in the field, the investigation was practically turned inside out. It was as if everything had to begin from the beginning which, in all fairness and truth, was an excellent learning process for me.

Initially, we thought it fitting to support our whole research on a purely textual analysis. However, as a result of our grueling and profound discussions with Beane, we began to change our strategy as the investigation advanced, writing us and forcing us to reconsider certain of our initial positions.

It was thanks to these discussions that we felt the need not only to conduct weekly or biweekly informal interviews with Michael Apple, but also to attend all the doctoral courses that he gives at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, as well as

attending the Friday Seminar, a space dedicated to all his doctoral students, and which frequently includes the participation of visiting professors. The idea was, by means of this strategy, to gather more information and understand in the minutest detail possible, certain aspects that were less explicit, or even silenced in his work. We did not limit ourselves only to attending the courses given by Michael Apple. In fact, Michael Apple gave us absolute freedom in order that we might speak to whomever and about whatever we wished, with regards to the investigation. We understood it to be prudent to attend other doctoral courses given by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies, and by the Department of Sociology. The idea was to learn, but above all to informally weigh and compare the way the doctoral courses were given and thus be able to better contextualize the role of Michael Apple.

It was on the basis of these informal interviews and, again, after intense discussions held with Beane, that it became clear we needed to interview Huebner informally. So we traveled to Washington to meet with him. Throughout the texts and the interviews, the powerful influence of Huebner on the thinking of Michael Apple was manifested. Nevertheless, this issue led to other more complicated ones. Why Huebner and not others? At the time, we debated with the idea of doing informal interviews with yet other intellectuals in the field of education and of the curriculum. This issue was taken up and debated with Beane; however, we rapidly abandoned this plan for some very crucial reasons. In fact, (1) the focus was the influences on the thinking and work of Michael Apple in the field of education, in general, and in the field of the curriculum, in particular. It was not an analysis of what others thought about his thinking and about his work. The structural issue of the investigation was our reading of the impact of the thinking and work of Michael Apple on the curriculum field. (2) The almost mythical status of Huebner in the field, the fact that this investigation was positioned in the field of the curriculum, and furthermore the unquestionably powerful influence of Huebner on the thinking of Michael Apple, would come to decisively determine our decision to interview Huebner. With him, we managed to obtain not only important information relative to the period in which Michael Apple worked closely with him, but we also confirmed the methodology to be followed in the investigation.
Moreover, and as was previously stated, this investigation should be interpreted according to the theory of cultural production defended by Johnson\textsuperscript{244}, whereby our concern was to analyze one of the spaces in that theory, more precisely that of the production of the thinking and work of Michael Apple.

The reputation of Kliebard as the best historian of curriculum on a worldwide basis, was a crucial input for the analysis not only of the third chapter of the research, but also for contextualizing the thinking and the work of Michael Apple in the field of education and the curriculum. After a finely detailed explanation of the investigation, the third and fourth chapters were debated with Kliebard. Moreover, the simple fact that Kliebard knew Michael Apple during his time as a graduate student at the Teachers College when he was research assistant to Huebner and because he was directly responsible for Michael Apple’s being hired by the University of Wisconsin-Madison, allowed us to triangulate much of the information gathered in the informal interviews, with Michael Apple as well as with Huebner, with regards to the biographical element that structures the second chapter.

It was also after serious conversations with Beane, that, given the nature of the project and the way it began to develop, that the pressing need to listen to the opinion of someone who was outside United States academia became apparent. Among the many names thought of, naturally, the figure of Torres Santomé was the one who best met this need. Although we had already held many conversations with him throughout the years, we traveled to Coruña to attend the doctoral course that he gave at the Department of Pedagogy and Didactics of Experimental Sciences at the ‘Universidade da Coruña’. To use an expression by Beane, it was very important to obtain the critical input of someone in the European Union who had in-depth knowledge not only of the work of Michael Apple, but above all of someone who had followed that work throughout the years. It is furthermore important to stress that all the chapters of this dissertation were initially presented and discussed at the Friday Seminar, which allowed for and led to many reformulations.

In short, Torres Santomé, Huebner, Kliebard, and especially Beane functioned as both validity and reliability checks for this investigation, a methodology, in fact quite

\textsuperscript{244} Johnson, R. (1983) \textit{What is Cultural Studies Anyway?} Centre for contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, Nº 74 (Mimeographed),
typical in academia in the United States of America, England, Australia and New Zealand. However, it would be amiss not to emphasize that Torres Santomé, Huebner and Kliebard functioned as critical readers of the material, while Beane served as the true advisor of this investigation, a methodology that was, in fact, designed without the least objection or interference from Michael Apple.

Also, one might argue over the ‘absence’ of Portuguese and Portuguese speaking scholars in this particular research. Without any meaning whatsoever to marginalize such state, let us briefly unfold our arguments. Since this research is about Michael Apple’s work and thought and its impact within the educational and curriculum field, we choose to rely our path of analyses on some Portuguese and Portuguese speaking scholars, in a very brief way, only with regards their insight towards neo-liberal impulses in Portugal, despite the fact, that very punctually, we did invited for our general discussion Portuguese and Portuguese speaking scholars.

The proof that there actually was such a clear recognition of the possible ethical issues that surrounded this type of investigation, was not only demonstrated by the analysis surrounding the dilemmas and the conflicts that an investigation of this nature raises, but also by the large difference between the initial doctoral project presented to the Scientific Council of the Institute of Education and Psychology at the ‘Universidade do Minho’ and the manner in which the investigation ended up being conducted. This indicates one of the most significant risks, which an investigation of this type poses for a researcher. As Bieger and Gerlach stress, “all risks should, of course, be minimized, but sometimes they cannot”245. However, not only awareness of the risks that color an investigation of these characteristics, but also the methodological resources utilized so that such risks were lessened or even annulled have been manifestly demonstrated here. In fact, before a research of this particular kind, in essence, what Butt and Raymond246 and Pinar and his colleagues247 calls “collaborative autobiography”, one more than stumble in particular and delicate ethical issues, has to be deeply aware of the need to openly flag them.

Although, at times, we have tried to make obvious throughout this chapter the reasons for undertaking an investigation of this nature, and before ending this chapter, one must reiterate again that the decision that we took in engaging myself in this type of research embodies particular commitments. In order to do serious research in the curriculum field and within critical educational studies, we needed to engage in close readings of the texts, we needed to attain a broad and deep analysis of the author’s meanings, identity and history, and we had to engage in long-term conversations and discussions with the author. However, in order to do this, and just as Shutz and other scholars claim, it is not just that we are not studying a rock, but we are not a rock either, and since we are the one who is holding these conversations with Michael Apple, it is methodologically important for people to understand that our biography also plays an important role in our analysis. So, as a ‘validity check’ we are including some of our own biography, so that the reader is able, in a quite rational way, to understand the decision rules that we am using and what political, ideological, cultural, ethical, and educational elements form our analysis. In other words, people should understand that our reading of Michael Apple is filtered through our own biography, and, as we mentioned earlier, it is absolutely essential to anyone who is engaged in this kind of biographical textual analysis, as a methodological principal, to give to the reader his or her background so that readers can understand what lens they have been asked to look through.

Since this dissertation is in curriculum we are using autobiographical and literary forms, which have a long tradition within the field. Thus, it is a kind of research that is legitimized within the educational and the curriculum field. Both textual analysis and biography should be seen as part of a very complex process and as holding a well-established reputation within the curriculum studies, within educational critical scholarship, and within qualitative scholarship, as was demonstrated with the works of Dewey, Greene, Huebner, Macdonald, Eisner, and Pinar, among others.

Given the fact that this is an investigation that is positioned in the field of production of the thinking and the work of Michael Apple, as was previously stated, it quite naturally leads us back to an open investigation. In other words, it could well be an open door to future works on the dominion of thinking and work in critical theorization, especially since, as Foucault notes, “I wouldn’t want what I may have
said or written to be seen as laying any claims of totality. I don’t try to universalize what I say. Our work takes place between unfinished abutments and anticipatory strings of dots. I like to open out a space of research, try it out, then if it doesn’t work, try again somewhere else. It is hoped that, for the reader, this chapter served to map out and scientifically justify the way we intend to analyze the objective that directs this investigation, as well as to clarify why we want to know the things we are about to analyze.
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