As soon as the editorial process is completed, each article is posted online. As articles are added, the reader is invited to revisit the statement. Also, even for those who have read some readers may wish to read the 2002 first statement are strikingly appropriate to the current socioeconomic and geopolitical scene in the United States. Ideas, charged words, and slogans may be invoked to justify inaction such as unemployment, outsourcing, dependency on foreign talent, dearth of citizens prepared for the scientific and technology professions, increasing productivity with minimum job creation, a presidential election campaign, national security needs, and the war on terrorism. Some or all could be used to rationalize the status quo for the technology curriculum.

Go! The position here is much to the contrary. The circumstances that those words and phrases suggest may indeed be the foundation and rationale for:

• a militant, self-confident, dynamic posture for the technology curriculum and those who deliver it;
• assuming leadership in research and curricular studies that deal with the issue of

An earlier statement on this topic (Streichler, 2002) took a provocative stance. It remains a matter of critical importance to all technology professionals (including engineers) and their organizations, all professionals in education, persons in business, industry, and government, and other concerned citizens. Since that first statement was published, ideas continued to be generated in support of the rationale and for implementation strategies. It was thought that these would be useful to respond to readers’ inquiries or challenges.

Surprisingly, another very meaningful use for these ideas surfaced in the form of an invitation to give the keynote address at the New York State Technology Education Association’s 41st Annual Conference this coming spring. The ideas being collected and the material in the first statement are strikingly appropriate to the conference theme: “Technology Education: A Core Subject.” Thus far it has been pleasing to consider that the stimulating, challenging, and motivating ideas will be included in a presentation that will attempt to include uplifting and positive notions about the listeners’ chosen profession and about themselves.

These ideas are offered as a sort of preview of a provocative and challenging issue. Obviously, they are not in the final presentation format and they provide more information than is likely to be in that presentation. The reader is invited to come along on this “trial run” for the keynote address. While this material can stand alone, some readers may wish to read the 2002 first statement. Also, even for those who have read it, revisiting Technically Speaking: Why All Americans Need to Know About Technology (Pearson & Young, 2002) will provide a meaningful context for what follows here.

The Importance of Technology Studies

This technology is an important school subject is partly confirmed by recent activities of engineering educators. Creighton (2002) described a number of “innovative” programs that engineering schools have gotten underway to get kids excited about engineering. This is only part of a much broader involvement in the lower schools by engineers.

The foregoing, an aspect of technology instruction and engineering’s interest, represents recognition of the need to include technology experiences in the curriculum. Other components of technology could have been used to make the preceding point, but engineering is intentionally used as a device to capture the readers’ attention and more will be said in this article about that technique.

Regardless of why the term has been used, it is emphasized that engineering is but one important component of the much broader kindergarten through college technology curriculum.

No Go? Technology educators may be tempted to bask in the glow of recent impressive accomplishments and accept small successes of programs in some school systems and states while being resigned to the field’s current status in many other states and school districts. Such an attitude may ensure that technology will never assume its rightful place in the majority of school offerings. In fact, that attitude may contribute to an unhealthy erosion of the progress the field has made.

In considering a militant and vigorous campaign to achieve the status that technology deserves, some may respond that this is not the time in the current socioeconomic and geopolitical scene for the technology curriculum and those who deliver it; revisiting Technically Speaking: Why All Americans Need to Know About Technology (Pearson & Young, 2002) will provide a meaningful context for what follows here.