**Crazy cross-curricularity or intelligent interdisciplinarity?**

**Crazy cross-curricularity 1**

Common content – First World War, tigers, colour, the Antarctic – around which history, geography and RE (and sometimes English, art and music) must find some connection and develop their workschemes. This has its roots in the mistaken assumption that these subjects are chiefly substantive ‘content’ and (a) they don’t have distinctive, *disciplinary* progression journeys; (b) each chunk of content doesn’t depend on having learned *other* content (whether cumulatively or hierarchically). So it abandons any progression journey within the subject, whether substantive or disciplinary.

**Crazy cross-curricularity 2**

Trying to teach pupils the words ‘explain’, ‘describe’, ‘evaluate’ and ‘analyse’ as though they mean the same thing in each subject. A causal explanation of the Russian Revolution is nothing to do with an explanation of how photosynthesis works. One is causal explanation, the other is the other, totally different, meaning of explanation – i.e. explication. Moreover, causal explanation in history is ALWAYS analysis. They cannot be separated.

**Intelligent inter-disciplinarity 1**

**Intelligent inter-disciplinarity 2**