

LEGITIMATING LIVED CURRICULUM: TOWARDS A CURRICULAR LANDSCAPE OF MULTIPLICITY

TED T. AOKI, *University of Alberta*

"The lived curriculum" . . . "the other curriculum" . . . These words inscribed in the title of this article speak to the way I have already been claimed by curricular landscapes of practicing teachers and their students. So claimed, I ask that I be allowed to dwell near, if not in the midst of, these landscapes, so that I may, by listening more thoughtfully to sayings of teachers and students, become more alert to the archi-texture of curricular landscapes within which activities like curriculum supervision, curriculum development, curriculum implementation, and curriculum evaluation are said to take place.

"SCIENCE MUST BE TAUGHT AS A HUMANITY": A CURRICULUM ANECDOTE

A short anecdote from my journal speaks to a curricular landscape at the university level, though in its import, it speaks as well to the curriculum at the school level. Highlighting a saying in the anecdote, I title it, "Science must be taught as a humanity":

During a late breakfast early last year, I was tuned to radio news coverage on the CBC (the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation). My ears twitched a bit as I listened, more carefully than I am wont to do for radio news, to a report of a Canadawide curriculum study.

We were told that the study was a response to a finding that of the high school graduates entering the Faculty of Science undergraduate programs across Canada, by the end of the third year, nearly one-third of the students were dropping out. Such a happening triggered a questioning of why students successful in high school science were dropping out of university science programs. A national study was launched to seek out why. We were told that the researchers sought out drop-outs to listen to their stories of their experiences.

They heard, among others comments, the following:

- "We found science a touch boring; we just did assigned experiment after assigned experiment. We felt science has to be more than that."
- "We felt in the name of science we were overemphasizing skills and techniques."

- “We felt science experiences were a bit irrelevant to what we see as human crises in these times.”

In other words, the researchers found that according to these ex-students, what they experienced as university science was a bit out of touch with their own lives. Reflecting upon the report, Dr. Stuart Smith, a scientist himself and chair of the sponsoring Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, said: “Science must be taught as a humanity.”

Of course, many of us would be interested in the full report. But for me, a sometime curriculum person, the anecdote evokes reflection. Two thoughts come forth, each in its own way disturbing somewhat our curriculum landscape.

DISTURBING THE CATEGORIES THAT POPULATE THE C & I LANDSCAPE

The first line of thought turns on Dr. Smith’s remark, “Science must be taught as a humanity.” These words claim me, cause me to pause and to question the way we have traditionally textured the curriculum landscape into epistemic categories, writ large, often labeled Faculties—the Faculty of Science, the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, the Faculty of Engineering, the Faculty of Education, and so on. We are familiar with this curriculum topography. And although the reference here is to the university setting, we can sense that what is at stake is fundamentally the lure of Western epistemology, our beliefs about knowing and knowledge, which has given our universities and schools a striated curricular landscape. Particularly at the secondary school level, we are familiar with the privileged curriculum categories that mirror the landscape of the university: courses or subjects we call science, mathematics, history, geography, literature, and so on.

Dr. Smith’s remark, “Science must be taught as a humanity,” disturbs the traditional landscape that separates science and the humanities into distinct categories. Even in our own minds, many of us feel we can readily spot science students or humanities students on campus by the way they comport themselves! We have deeply set images reflecting the way this curricular landscape is inscribed in us.

For me, Dr. Smith’s call to teach science as a humanity is more a question than it is a statement. It calls into question the underlying condition that allows science and the humanities to exist in separate domains. For curriculum people like us, Dr. Smith’s call is indeed a challenge. Should we “integrate” the two discipline fields? Should we search for a different condition that will allow science and the humanities to come together as one? Should we search for a different space that allows science and the humanities to be separate, yet together? I am hard pressed to ask good questions.

Even before the questioning is settled I have a tongue-in-cheek response. How would it be if we brought together a scientist, a novelist, and a bottle of scotch at a café on Bourbon Street? Wouldn’t it be fun to listen to what

they might talk about? Hopefully, after a round or two (or three), they get around to talking about "science must be taught as a humanity." And if this should come to pass, I would love to hear how they sing or dance the "belonging togetherness" of science and humanities.

Less playfully, what Dr. Smith's remark evokes in me is what some call a crisis of modernity in the Western world, a questioning of the way of life we have constituted as modernism. Today, we have curriculum scholars who seem attuned to the same soundwave as Dr. Smith. Some of them are engaged in the modernist/postmodernist debates. How they interpret Dr. Smith's remark, "Science must be taught as a humanity," may well influence how we might reunderstand our curricular landscape. We, as curricular people, would be wise to be attentive to these debates.

DISTURBING THE LANDSCAPE THAT PRIVILEGES THE CURRICULUM-AS-PLAN

Another line of thought that flows from the anecdote concerns the architectonics of the curriculum landscape. In the anecdote we heard that the researchers approached students to listen to their stories of their lived experiences as science students. In other words, the researchers sought out what may be called the lived curriculum of the students. This lived curriculum, of course, is not the curriculum as laid out in a plan, but a plan more or less lived out. It deserves the label "curriculum" as much as the plan deserves the label "curriculum-as-plan." But what I have said, I am afraid, is too glib.

For a more intimate understanding of the curriculum landscape, let us visit Miss O, who, as a grade 5 teacher, lives amidst a landscape that knows both the curriculum-as-plan and the curriculum-as-lived. Let me quote a few paragraphs from an earlier effort of mine to portray Miss O's curricular landscape in an article I titled "Teaching as In-dwelling Between Two Curriculum Worlds":

Even before Day 1 of the term, our teacher, Miss O, walks into her assigned Grade 5 classroom. Because Miss O is already a teacher, her presence in the classroom initiates a transformation of a sociocultural and physical environment into something different. Even before a pupil walks in, she silently asks: "Can I establish myself here as a teacher?" and the classroom's desks, walls, chalkboards, floor, books and resources jointly reply, albeit wordlessly, by what they are. They respond to Miss O's intention and presence. And when the pupils arrive, things and pupils arrange themselves, as it were, around Miss O's intention. They become "teachable," "promising," "difficult," "hopeful," "challenging." The environment ceases to be environment, and in its place comes into being a pedagogic situation, a lived site pregnantly alive. Within this site, Miss O soon finds that her pedagogic situation is a living in tensionality—a tensionality that emerges, in part, from in-dwelling in the difference between two curricula: the curriculum-as-plan and the lived curriculum.

Curriculum-as-plan

The first of these, the curriculum-as-plan, usually has its origin outside the classroom, such as the State Department of Education or the school district office. But

whatever the source, it is penetratingly and insistently present in Miss O's classroom. This curriculum-as-plan is the curriculum which Miss O is asked to teach the Grade 5 pupils who are entrusted to her care.

The curriculum-as-plan is the work of curriculum planners, often selected teachers from the field, under the direction of some official often designated as the curriculum director or curriculum supervisor. As a work of people, inevitably, it is imbued with the planners' orientations to the world, which inevitably include their own interests and assumptions about ways of knowing and about how teachers and students are to be understood. These interests, assumptions, and approaches, usually implicit in the text of the curriculum-as-plan, frame a set of curriculum statements: statements of *intent and interest* (given in the language of "goals," "aims," and "objectives"), statements of what teachers and students should do (usually given in the language of *activities*), statements of official and recommended *resources* for teachers and students, and usually implicitly, statements of *evaluation* (given, if at all, in the language of ends and means).

The Lived Curriculum

The other curriculum is really a multiplicity of lived curricula that Miss O and her pupils experience. For Miss O it is a world of face-to-face living with Andrew, with his mop of red hair, who struggles hard to learn to read; with Sara, whom Miss O can count on to tackle her language assignment with aplomb; with popular Margaret, who bubbles and who is quick to offer help to others and to welcome others' help; with Tom, a frequent daydreamer, who loves to allow his thoughts to roam beyond the windows of the classroom; and some 20 others in class, each living out a story of what it is to live school life as Grade 5's. Miss O's pedagogic situation is a site inhabited by students with proper names—like Andrew, Sara, Margaret and Tom—who are, for Miss O, very human, unique beings. Miss O knows their uniqueness from having lived daily with them. And she knows that their uniqueness disappears into the shadow when they are spoken of in the prosaically abstract language of the external curriculum planners who are, in a sense, condemned to plan for faceless people, students shorn of their uniqueness or for all teachers, who become generalized entities often defined in terms of generalized performance roles.¹

In this portrayal of her curriculum situation, we can see how in her class, Miss O as a practicing teacher is alert to the lived curriculum, the other curriculum that she in her practical wisdom knows. And so knowing, she knows that there are many lived curricula, as many as there are self and students, and possibly more.

Acknowledging the lived curricula as Miss O has done offers us a retextured landscape, populated by a multiplicity of curricula, disturbing the traditional landscape, with its single privileged curriculum-as-plan awaiting imple-

¹Ted T. Aoki, "Teaching as In-dwelling Between Two Curriculum Worlds," *The B.C. Teacher* (Vancouver: The British Columbia Teachers' Association, April/May 1986); republished in Ted T. Aoki, *Inspiriting Curriculum and Pedagogy: Talks to Teachers* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1991), p. 7. Miss O, the practicing teacher referred to in this excerpt, was a grade 5 teacher at Westwind School and later vice-principal at Lord Byng Elementary School in Richmond, B.C. Miss O, now Mrs. S. Chamberlain, is principal of Maple Lane Elementary School, Richmond, B.C. I consulted her throughout the preparation of this report.

mentation. It is to this promising disturbance of the curricular landscape I now turn.

FROM THE C & I LANDSCAPE TO A CURRICULAR LANDSCAPE OF MULTIPLICITY (C & C LANDSCAPE)

A critical feature of Miss O's curricular landscape, which is already populated by a multiplicity of curricula, is the very word *multiplicity* itself. How shall we understand this cumbersome sounding word, *multiplicity*?

The C & I Landscape

Before we explore the word *multiplicity*, let us remember where we now are. For many of us, *curriculum*, in spite of its inherent indefiniteness, has become definitive, so much so that we speak with ease of *the* curriculum, *the* curriculum-as-plan. And when we so speak, we seem to be heedless of the way we have been drawn into a curricular landscape where in privileged aplomb stands, as a tree does, a single curriculum. In this arboreal landscape, curriculum-related activities such as "instruction," "teaching," "pedagogy," and "implementation" become derivatives in the shadow of the curriculum-as-plan.

Consider these familiar curricular phrases: "teaching the curriculum," "implementing the curriculum," "assessing in terms of fidelity to the curriculum." Do we not hear the chiseled motif of the striated linear instrumentalism deeply inscribed into our landscape?

Over the years, this instrumental landscape has become the working framework in many quarters. So prominent is instrumentalism woven into the fabric of curriculum work that we will not be remiss to call this landscape the *C & I landscape*. The C & I landscape frames many curriculum and instruction courses in teacher education. The same C & I landscape has become the curriculum developers' framework, framing curriculum development and implementation. The same C & I framework has become the curriculum supervisors' framework, framing supervision, the overseeing of activities related to curriculum and instruction, curriculum and implementation.

A Curricular Landscape of Multiplicity (Which Grows in the Middle)

How can we displace the C & I landscape's primacy? We might begin by heeding the words "multiplicity is not a noun," a claim by Gilles Deleuze, for whom, like Heraclitus, life is constantly in flux.² With such a saying in mind, let us open ourselves to understandings of "multiplicity." To be noun-oriented, thing-oriented, or positivistically oriented is to be culturally condi-

²Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987), p. vii.

tioned to see multiplicity as multiple identities. So conditioned, in Miss O's landscape, we may be first attracted to the identities of the curriculum-as-plan and the lived curricula, much as we are drawn to ethnic identities when we speak of multiculturalism. Such a way of positing identities in the landscape is, we are told, a habit of modernism grounded in the metaphysics of presence. That is, we are drawn into a view that any identity is a preexistent presence—a presence we can re-present by careful scrutiny and copy.

Increasingly, we are called upon to reconsider the privileging of "identity as presence" and to displace it with the notion of "identity as effect." What is being said here? We are being asked to consider identity not so much as *something* already present, but rather as production, in the throes of being constituted as we live in places of difference. For example, according to this understanding, our identities as teachers or curriculum supervisors are not so much in our presences; rather, our identities, who we are as teachers and as curriculum supervisors, are ongoing effects of our becoming in difference.

But where in multiplicity is such a place? In *Dialogues*, Deleuze states:

In a multiplicity what counts are not . . . the elements, but what there is between, the between, a site of relations which are not separable from each other. Every multiplicity grows in the middle.³

This saying reminds us of Miss O, our grade 5 teacher, who found her place in the middle—in the midst of a multiplicity of curricula, between and among curriculum-as-plan and the lived curricula. Miss O's indwelling as teacher is indeed a living in difference, in the midst of curricula where, according to Deleuze, multiplicity grows as lines of movement.

LINE OF MOVEMENT #1: IN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DISCOURSES

In noting the between as a place of difference, we might listen more fully to what Deleuze has to say elsewhere:

- We tend to think in terms of more or less, that is, to see difference in degree where there are differences in kind.⁴

- . . . each time that we think in terms of more or less, we have already disregarded differences in kind between the two orders, or between beings, between existents . . .⁵

- . . . conceiving everything in terms of more or less, seeing nothing but differences in degree . . . where, more profoundly, there are differences in kind is perhaps the most general error of thought, the error common to science and metaphysics.⁶

Deleuze's remarks alert us to how differently "difference" might be understood, and further, how, if one understands difference only as difference in degree, one may become indifferent to difference in kind.

³Ibid., p. viii.

⁴Gilles Deleuze, *Bergsonism* (New York: Zone Books, 1988), p. 21.

⁵Ibid., p. 20.

⁶Ibid.

With this understanding of difference, let us return to Miss O's curricular landscape to listen to her language carefully. For Miss O, her in-dwelling in difference is *not* a monochromed difference in degree. Let us recall that Miss O knows . . . "the uniqueness of her pedagogical situation from having lived daily with Andrew, Sara, Margaret and Tom and others," and so living "she knows that their uniqueness disappears into the shadow when they are spoken of in the prosaic abstract language of the external curriculum planners who are in a sense, condemned to plan for faceless people, students shorn of their uniqueness or teachers who become generalized entities often defined in terms of performance roles."⁷

For Miss O, to live in the middle between the language of the curriculum-as-plan and the language of lived curricula is to live amidst discourses that are different in kind. On one hand is the prosaic discourse of the external curriculum planners, whose techni-scientific language of planning is the striated language of ends-means. Further, this prosaic language is abstract, written for faceless people in a homogeneous realm.

On the other hand is the language of the lived curriculum, the more poetic, phenomenological and hermeneutic discourse in which life is embodied in the very stories and languages people speak and live. These two discourses are different in kind; they resist integration.

At this point we might remember our friends, the scientist and the humanist, whom we left in conversation at a table on Bourbon Street. We wonder if they have moved to discuss how two discourses, the discourse on science and the discourse on humanity, may "belong together," if indeed they belong together at all. But let us return to Miss O.

Surely, Miss O's open curriculum landscape is different in kind from the traditional C & I landscape that enframes many curricular activities. Rather, Miss O's curricular landscape is a multiplicity of betweens. This landscape, so different from the striated C & I landscape, is textured by a multiplicity of lines moving from between to between, is ever open, knowing no beginning and no end, resisting enframing. In contrast to the C & I landscape, I might call this the C & C landscape, a landscape embodying the curriculum-as-plan and curricula-as-lived, indeed, an open landscape of multiplicity.

Within such a retextured curricular landscape, how should a curriculum developer re-attune as a curriculum developer? How should a curriculum supervisor re-attune as a curriculum supervisor? How should a teacher re-attune as a teacher?

⁷Ted T. Aoki, "Teaching as In-dwelling Between Two Curriculum Worlds," in *The B.C. Teacher* (Vancouver: The British Columbia Teachers' Association, April/May 1986); republished in Ted T. Aoki, *Inspiring Curriculum and Pedagogy: Talks to Teachers* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1991), p. 7.

LINE OF MOVEMENT #2: IN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN METANARRATIVES AND NARRATIVES

I return to Deleuze to remind myself that "multiplicity grows from the middle." So reminded I ask you to join another moving line in the midst of the discourse of curriculum-as-plan and the discourse of the lived curriculum. In this line of movement, I lean on Jean François Lyotard, who chooses as his focus not the "will to power" that Nietzsche espoused, nor the "instrumental reason" that Habermas and the neo-Marxists favored, but rather the principle of legitimacy of narratives, a principle which, in my language, boils down to "who says what stories count and don't count."

In his book *The Postmodern Condition*, Lyotard speaks to the way of life we in the West have historically characterized as modernism, with its 2,500 years of tradition from the time of Socrates and Plato, accelerated in more recent times by the Age of Enlightenment and the Age of Reason.⁸

According to Lyotard, modernity is marked by the advance of a techno-scientific mind-set, which in the past has relied on metanarratives to legitimate itself. By the techno-scientific mind-set, he is referring to the way we tend to constitute our world in terms of Cartesian subject-object dualism, the way we constitute realms of objective meanings or of subjective meanings. Our C & I landscape reflects this modernism. By metanarratives he means the grand stories through which we have come to accept certain notions about "truth," "progress," "goals," "rationality," "unity and totality," "subjectivity," "objectivity," "ends-means," and so on—master narratives that cradle modernism.

Lyotard boldly states:

Simplifying to the extreme, I define postmodernism as incredulity toward metanarratives. This incredulity is undoubtedly a product of progress in the sciences. . . . To the obsolescence of the metanarrative apparatus of legitimation corresponds most notably the crisis of metaphysical philosophy and of the university institution that in the past relied on it.⁹

By "the obsolescence of the metanarrative apparatus of legitimation," he means the diminishing legitimacy of the master stories about "progress" (progress is always good for us); about "goals" (we as humans are driven by goals); about "rationality" (by sound reasoning we can arrive at all truths); about "truth" (somewhere there is a thing called "the truth," which, by our striving, we can discover); about "unity" (unity is not only possible but desirable; hence we should strive to connect things and people into a totality); about "ends-means" (our world is striated technically; everything boils down to ends-means.) These are examples of grand narratives whose privileged primacy Lyotard questions. Legitimation by these and other metanarratives,

⁸Jean François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 74.

says Lyotard, has led to delegitimation of understandings we come to through narratives and stories we daily tell and hear.

For us, the modernist/postmodernist dialogue allows deeper awareness of how the modernist vision of the world has dominated our curriculum landscape shaped in the manner of the curriculum-as-plan and instructional strategies—a landscape legitimated by metanarratives. If Lyotard makes sense, as he does to me, it is time not to reject but to decenter the modernist-laden curricular landscape and to replace it with the C & C landscape that accommodates lived meanings, thereby legitimating thoughtful everyday narratives.

In this context, we might reinterpret Dr. Smith's statement, "Science must be taught as a humanity." I now hear Dr. Smith (1) recognizing the unwarranted privileging of the techno-scientific curriculum mind-set understood almost totally in terms of objective meanings, and (2) calling for a de-privileging such that a clearing can be opened up to allow humanly embodied narratives to dwell contrapuntally with metanarratives. For the university founded within a metaphysical philosophical framework that is fragmented into categories called faculties, like the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Smith's call that "science must be taught as a humanity" seems to beckon questioning from the ground up. Such a questioning, it seems to me, puts not only the structure of the university but also the structure of curriculum at all levels into turbulence, opening possibilities of a fresh line of movement for curriculum.

In this context, we again recall Miss O, who sees herself in "face-to-face living with Andrew, . . . with Sara, . . . with Margaret, . . . with Tom, . . . and with some 20 others in class, each living out a story of what it is to live school life as Grade 5's." I do not know whether Miss O has read anything of Jean François Lyotard; but somehow in her wisdom she knows the significance for herself as a teacher of allowing space for stories, anecdotes, and narratives that embody the lived dimension of curriculum life. As far as she is concerned, these narratively structured lived curricula have legitimacy in her class, even though the curriculum-as-plan is silent about lived curricula. Miss O flourishes in vibrant lines of movement in the midst of her C & C landscape of multiplicity, and she offers us practical wisdom.

Three years after my earlier portrayal, Miss O, by this time a vice-principal, leads Laura, a beginning teacher, into that place of difference between meta-narratives and narratives, beckoning her to struggle and flourish on her own in a line of movement that has its own zigzags. Listen to Laura, who, by the way, holds a science degree and is now a third-year teacher in an elementary school, speak of her own experiences as a beginning teacher of social studies:

Polyphonic Lines of Movement: A Practicing Teacher Grows in Wisdom

The June before I began my first year of teaching, I was introduced to the narrative as a way of moving into that space between curriculum-as-plan and the lived curriculum

of a child. I had finished my teacher education program in April, and in June I was substituting in the school where I would be teaching in September.

The teachers there reached out to me. They shared with me their way of transforming curriculum into the form of a master story. During three weeks, I was immersed in stories; stories surrounded me, stories that hopefully reach into the world of the child.

In the last days of school, Vice-Principal Miss O sat with me and helped me create a plan for the year to come. The plan was a long story that would take ten months to tell. I remember my amazement and delight as I saw those areas of study listed in the curriculum guides woven into a master story on a large sheet before us. . . . I held this plan in anticipation of the year to come.

Thus I began my first year of teaching with a master story that was my curriculum-as-planned and daily stories to create by myself and students as we went along. Creating these stories was for me difficult. Each story attempted to reach into the worlds of a roomful of children, each child different from any other. I struggled with the role of the storyteller; it did not come easily for me. But I remember at least a couple of times when my struggling as storyteller was rewarded with the coming into being of a kind of tension I had never experienced before.

I think back to one of these times. There were 28 of us in the room and together we were involved in a story about the early voyageurs in Canada and the extreme conditions they lived within. We were questioning what life might have been like for the voyageurs. Every child was tense, leaning forward, silent, looking right at me, the storyteller. Something had clicked and there we all were gathered together by a tension holding us in a way that we did not want to let go. I felt I was reaching them.

The story was more than 30 minutes long and the children's thoughts and questions that followed led me to believe they had considered deeply the question we were exploring. I was delighted.¹⁰

Miss O gently led Laura to that tensioned place in the curricular landscape between the curriculum guide and the lived curricula. And in that between grew this story, which is for Laura already a line of movement we might call a thesis-in-the-making. Laura as a graduate student in curriculum studies has placed herself in the openings the story offers. And at this moment, her interest is in understanding the lived meaning of the click she heard in the tension as she and her children indwelt between the curriculum-as-plan and the lived curriculum. And in that space in the middle of her curricular landscape, she is now beginning to hear more deeply echoes of the sound of the click as it opens up into a polyphony of lines of movements, lines such as:

- Experiencing differences in kind in the tension between the master story and the daily stories
- Experiencing pedagogic reaching as a mode of becoming
- Pedagogic reaching as a letting go and a letting be
- Pedagogic listening as a responding to others
- Harkening to the call of the calling

¹⁰Laura Richter, "Pedagogical Reaching as a Mode of Being" (unpublished manuscript, University of Victoria, B.C., 1990). Laura Richter is a teacher at Lord Byng Elementary School in Richmond, B.C. She is a masters student in Curriculum Studies at the University of Victoria, B.C. The story presented here is originally from a paper done for a graduate course.

At this moment, Laura is drawn into what seems to be an architectonics of lines of movement that we feel sure Deleuze also would hear rather than see as a multiplicity growing in the middle.

LINE OF MOVEMENT #3: IN THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FACELESS OTHERS AND FACES OF OTHERS

For another line of movement in our C & C landscape, let us move into the difference between what I call "the faceless others" and "faces of others." We return to Miss O in her curricular landscape and recall these words about faces of others:

... external curriculum planners are condemned to plan for faceless people, students shorn of their uniqueness, ... teachers who become generalized entities. ... The other curriculum is ... the lived curriculum, a world of face-to-face living with Andrew, ... with Sara, ... with popular Margaret, ... with Tom ... and some 20 others. ...¹¹

What is this saying? In the C & I landscape, students become faceless others; in the lived curricula, teachers and students are face to face.

We can see that for a teacher like Miss O, the face of the other is already inscribed in the "other" of "the other curriculum," the lived curriculum. Implicit in such an understanding of face is the question of our understanding of "self/other," the question of how we should understand the pedagogical relationship of the teaching self and the other, the student. Such a question places Miss O in a curricular site of multiple meanings of "self/other."

In our everyday understanding of "self/other," the self is often understood as an individualized being bestowed with the self's rights and freedoms. But Miss O wonders whether or not, in such an understanding, the self may already be reduced, pared down to an identifiable ego who, in the very act of becoming an ego, distances others into faceless, objectified others. In this everyday understanding of self/other, there seems to be a subject/object dualism that is inscribed in the familiar positivistic Cartesian saying: "I think; therefore, I am."

Miss O also knows another everyday understanding of "self/other," one that intertwines the self as subject and the other as subject—an intersubjectivity, which, in the hermeneutic language of Hans Georg Gadamer understands it as a fusion of horizons, an intersubjectivity fused into a "we."¹² And although such a romanticized understanding may be tantalizingly holistic, Miss O worries that there might be something remiss in the synthesized totality.

For Miss O, both of these understandings of "self/other"—the "self/other" in distanced solitude and the "self/other" in integrated wholeness—

¹¹Ted T. Aoki, "Teaching as In-dwelling Between Two Curriculum Worlds," *The B.C. Teacher* (Vancouver: The British Columbia Teachers' Association, April/May 1986); republished in Ted T. Aoki, *Inspiriting Curriculum and Pedagogy: Talks to Teachers* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1991), p. 7.

¹²Hans Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1975).

express differences between self and other in terms of more or less, in terms of degree, neglectful possibly of the irreducible surplus in the difference. Hence, Miss O seeks to displace and replace these understandings of "self/other" with one that considers difference in kind as a possibility.

In this, Miss O recalls the challenging remarks of Heidegger, whose works have long haunted her. She recalls him saying of teaching, teacher, and taught:

Teaching is even more difficult than learning. . . . Teaching is more difficult than learning because what teaching calls for is this: to let learn. . . . If the relation between the teacher and the learners is genuine . . . there is never a place in it for the authority of the know-it-all or the authoritative sway of the official. . . . It . . . is an exalted matter . . . to become a teacher . . . which is something else entirely than becoming a famous professor. . . . We must keep our eyes fixed firmly on the true relation between teacher and taught.¹³

Heeding Heidegger's call "to keep our eyes fixed firmly on the true relationship between teacher and taught," the between in "self/other," Miss O sets aside the language of rights, that is, the language of the privileged ego, and beckons a language of pedagogy that might help her re-understand "self/other" and embrace the otherness of others. Feeling a bond of ethicality in her own relationship with her students, she wonders if it is not in responding to others responsibly that a teacher finds promise in ethical pedagogy. Is this what Heidegger was pointing to when he said, "We must keep our eyes fixed firmly on the true relationship between teacher and taught"? Remembering that etymologically, *pedagogy* comes from the Greek words *agogue*, to lead, and *pedae*, children, she wonders about the ethical moment in the difference between teacher and taught, between self and other. She remembers Emmanuel Levinas, whose ethicality in "self/other" hinges on the self's responsibility to the otherness of others.¹⁴

In Levinas, Miss O sees a decentering of the self's ego, allowing the acknowledgment of the teacher's responsibility to others, the students. Hence, she sees pedagogic leading not so much as asking the followers to follow because the leader always knows the way. Rather, she sees it as a responsible responding to students. Such a leading entails at times a letting go that allows a letting be in students' own becoming. Miss O asks, "In such a leading, is not a teacher called upon as leader to hearken to the call of the calling that is teaching?" And in such leading, is there not entailed a humility of obeisance as a teacher responds to the call of the calling? Is this pedagogic leading a pedagogic wisdom that comes to thoughtful teachers who, in the midst of the practice of teaching, listen with care to the voice of the silent other? Is this what Heraclitus, the Greek philosopher of flux, meant when he told his

¹³Martin Heidegger, *What Is Called Thinking?* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968), pp. 15–16.

¹⁴Emmanuel Levinas, *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1981).

students in Athens, "Do not listen to me; listen to the logos"? It is indeed wisdom Miss O seeks.

The Chinese knew well what it is for humans to live in wisdom, for in their language, wisdom is inscribed in a family of words: *human*, *humility*, *bumus*, and *humor*, all etymologically related as they are, too, in our language. The Chinese characters of a wise leader read *sei-jin* (聖人)—a person who, indwelling with others (人), stands between heaven and earth (王), listening (耳) to the silence, and who, upon hearing the word, allows it to speak (口) to others so others may follow.

Miss O knows this is but one understanding of pedagogy, one understanding of "self/other" in a curricular landscape that allows multiplicity to grow in the middle.

A LINGERING NOTE

Claimed by a curricular landscape that includes the lived curricula of teachers and students, we dwelt awhile in the midst of a multiplicity of curricula, a landscape radically different in kind from the traditional, instrumental C & I landscape that has long contained us. We have listened to practicing educators who found themselves in sites of openness between and among the multitude of curricula that grace the landscape. And in those sites we saw insights and heard resonant sounds of "multiplicity growing from the middle."

It is urgent now that those curriculum developers and curriculum supervisors encompassed in the traditional C & I curriculum framework take heed, for in light of the growing skepticism regarding the privileging of modernism, the very curriculum landscape that sustained them may be slipping into obsolescence.

Curriculum developers and curriculum supervisors should heed thoughtful practicing teachers who already seem to know that the privileging of the traditional C & I landscape may no longer hold, but must give way to a more open landscape that offers possibilities by, in part, giving legitimacy to the wisdom held in lived stories of people who dwell within the landscape. But most importantly, curriculum developers and curriculum supervisors need to learn to listen to the wisdom of practicing educators, for we are already in the age where *episteme* will not be able to stand alone. It needs to stand together with *sophia*, for it seems that the name of the game is no longer knowledge alone but rather the belonging together of knowledge and wisdom.

If that be the case, we should go back to Bourbon Street, where our scientist, a person of knowledge, and our novelist, a person of wisdom, are supposed to be in conversation about "science must be taught as a humanity."

But, who knows, since it is in the French Quarter, our friends from France, Jean François Lyotard and Gilles Deleuze, may have already joined

our scientist and novelist in conversation. Possibly, we might be allowed to listen to their improvised lines of movement growing from the middle of their conversation. And possibly, just possibly, there might be a new language in the making—growing in the middle—a language with a grammar in which a noun is not always a noun, in which conjoining words like *between* and *and* are no mere joining words, a new language that might allow a transformative resonance of the words *paradigms*, *practices*, and *possibilities*. If that be so, we should all move to the French Quarter so that we can not only listen but also join them right in the middle of their conversation.¹⁵

TED T. AOKI is Professor Emeritus, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, 6976 Beechwood Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6P 5V3.

¹⁵This article is a distinguished lecture presented by invitation at the 1992 ASCD Annual Conference in New Orleans. The conference theme was "Transforming Learning: Paradigms, Practices, Possibilities."

Copyright of Journal of Curriculum & Supervision is the property of Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.