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Editorial

We are happy to present here a special issue of Theory and Research in Social Education (TRSE) dedicated to the foundations of social studies. The issue was put together in collaboration with guest editor David Warren Saxe of The Pennsylvania State University.

Since TRSE's last special issue on foundations (Fall 1980), there have been a number of strong critiques on the very notion of historical treatments. The critiques range from questions regarding What has the past to do with the present? and Whose history should we study? to pronouncements that History must serve social ends and the ubiquitous History is dead! The reaction of teachers on history's place in schools has been varied. Some teachers have paid attention and responded, others have simply continued teaching without missing a step. Nonetheless, issues concerning what is relevant, whose history is presented, and what purpose history should serve are often determined in advance of instruction by such things as state curricular mandates, district and school objectives, and, of course, classroom textbooks. Perhaps a majority of social studies teachers look at the critiques and wonder, What's the fuss? There is, however, a strong vocal minority who are dead serious about the need for change in what might be called the multiculturalization of social studies. In opposition to the perceived disuniting of America, still others labor equally hard to present what may be a more balanced history of America and the world.

Regardless of where our readers stand on these issues, one goal in assembling this special issue was to further the case of disinterested scholarship. This term was in common use at one time, but now seems an archaic relic of our flawed educational past. I do not suggest that we resurrect disinterested scholarship because I don't believe it ever wholly disappeared; however, in response to some postmodern critiques, I do believe that for historical writing to continue to have value for schools, disinterested scholarship should become the preferred mindset. The notion requires the researcher to set aside personal views and interests in order to open history to critique. The success of the researcher as historian is the acquisition of scholarship. To study fully, to challenge or support warranted knowledge and standards, to examine leads, to report what is found, and to offer competent interpretation are requirements of scholarship. Moreover, disinterested scholars may work to persuade readers with warranted and grounded assertions, but they also write and teach with the understanding that their work is merely one possible interpretation of the past, that their conclusions remain subject to review and correction.
In a sense history is simply what happened in the past. But more than that it is what we choose to remember about the past. It is this act of choice, of selecting what to preserve and interpret that becomes problematic. Often the decisions and selections of the researcher say more about the historian than about the history itself. This is why disinterested scholarship is imperative for historical research. A researcher with an ax to grind, a cause to further, or paid assignment to fulfill is suspect. The notion of how history can be manufactured for particular ends is fraught with the potential for abuse.

While no history is completely without bias, without a perspective, to be of use in the liberal democratic classroom, teachers must work to be as objective as possible, to offer as much information as is available, and to provide as many perspectives as are apparent. One of John Dewey's intellectual predecessors, Charles Sanders Pierce, argued that if we had all the information available to us about a particular problem, all students would reach the same conclusion. While we might disagree with this outcome, the premise of providing information as well as the tools to acquire information should be an imperative for the social studies teacher. Once the information has been examined, students then can begin to assemble and defend their positions. Students need to act as members of a jury at trial to consider with a skeptic's eye as much relevant information and evidence as possible before rendering their judgments.

The attempt to avoid politicizing history can be an occupational hazard. One duty of editors, critics, scholars, and readers is to identify polemics, politics, flaws, errors, and overindulgence. These tasks are also a duty of social studies teachers who must model, instill, or lead students to understand and practice. The research found in this special issue works to further the notion of disinterested scholarship, to present glimpses of a social studies past that may help to fill in a few more gaps in our understanding of the field. Although this work is a small contribution to social studies foundations, it is an important step in the evolution of the field. As I urge our readers to critique this work, I hope that they will also wish to expand this research, to explore more of our past efforts, and to help contribute to our collective knowledge of the social studies.

Historical research is an important part of what makes social studies a field, a profession. The study of things past is also a critical part of the social studies teacher's daily work. As teachers we should remain cognizant of disinterested scholarship when we present accounts on Columbus, World War I, Little Big Horn, Charlemagne, or Timbuctu. As professionals, we should be interested also in how other social studies teachers in different times and places taught these topics. In looking at such things as how other teachers taught or how other curricular materials were prepared and packaged, we are adding something not
only to our professional lives but also to the enrichment and enjoyment of social studies for our students. We may not be better teachers for this effort, but we might become more professional in our view of teaching and learning.

David Warren Saxe, Guest Editor
November, 1994
LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dr. Jack Fraenkel
Burk Hall 238
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA 94132

Dear Dr. Fraenkel,

Please convey my congratulations to Lynn R. Nelson and Frederick D. Drake for their article “Secondary Teachers’ Reactions to the New Social Studies.” It appeared in the Winter 1994 issue of TRSE.

I fit into the profile of teachers they interviewed* and find their analysis accurate and perceptive. Studying the article was almost like reading my professional biography with one exception. The successful teachers interviewed seemed—by and large—to be ending their careers on a pessimistic note. Many do not even like to use the word “social studies.” One felt that the teachers “grabbed at every straw and bill of goods” and that all they tried to accomplish “went down the tubes” (p. 57). Nelson and Drake say that “By the 1970s, many of the interviewees began to develop a siege mentality” (p. 60).

These sorts of problems were a part of my career. To illustrate, in 1990 I tangled with local “reform” school board members to the point where I decided to take an unpaid leave of absence. Nonetheless, my down periods were temporary, and I ended my teaching career on a positive note. I continue to be excited and active in the profession.

From my perspective, Nelson and Drake pinpoint a major reason for a social studies teacher’s career satisfaction—an ability to “personalize curricular materials, to create instructional materials” (p. 46). Apparently Riverside-Brookfield High School is rather unique in this regard because teacher creativity in the social studies traditionally has been encouraged and supported. Classroom teachers have not been viewed as mindless clerks hired to blindly implement ideas from authorities on high and they have not been forced to do what others were doing. As a consequence, my association with colleagues and students was profoundly stimulating over a 30-year period. And, elements of the curriculum we developed did not “go down the tubes.”

Sincerely,

Brant Abrahamson

*I am a white male with a master’s degree in political science. Riverside-Brookside High School (where I taught from 1961 through 1993) is in the Chicago metropolitan area. In 1985, I was selected as an Illinois Master Teacher.
ALBERT BUSHNELL HART AND THE ORIGINS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Michael Whelan
SUNY—New Paltz

Abstract
Albert Bushnell Hart was a leading figure during a critical period in the development of history education in the United States. Throughout his career as a professor of history and government at Harvard University (1883-1926), he made many contributions, arguably more than anyone else of his generation, to history's emergence as a modern school subject and to its inclusion as a core component of the school curriculum. In doing so, he helped fashion the door through which social studies subsequently entered the schools. His career, therefore, offers an interesting and enlightening perspective on both the theoretical and institutional foundations of social studies education.

Social studies' emergence in schools is commonly traced to the 1916 report of the National Education Association's Committee on

1Despite the many contributions Hart made to the development of social studies education, his achievements in this regard have been the subject of very little scholarly research. Indeed, very little has been written about any aspect of Hart's professional life, but the reason for this is easily explained. Hart, often referred to by his contemporaries as the Grand Old Man of American history, suffered the historian's cruelest irony: His accomplishments were numerous and notable, but many of his papers were sold and scatter soon after his death in 1943. Thirty years later, however, a large collection of these papers were recovered and donated to the Harvard University Archive by Mrs. Robert T. Lenz, a niece of a former friend and professional associate of Hart's. This new wealth of source material, which includes personal and professional correspondences, student educational and political reform activities, personal files about historical and educational associations, and background material about Hart's work as an author and editor of historical and educational publications, has created a research opportunity that simply did not exist at an earlier date. Analyzed in conjunction with the corpus of Hart's published writings, these papers reveal much about his family background, his formal education, and his career as a scholar and educational activist.
Social Studies, but the subject's roots actually extend further back in time to two curricular reform initiatives that arose during the final decades of the nineteenth century. One was led by a group of reformers inspired by the social welfare movement of the early Progressive period. They believed that schools should be restructured as agencies of social betterment and that the school curriculum should therefore be organized, at least in part, around the interdisciplinary study of current social issues. In this way, they hoped to imbue students with the knowledge, the skills, and perhaps most important, the spirit of social activism (Saxe, 1991, 1992a, 1992b).

The other initiative was part of a broader reform movement in American education, one whose overall goal was to modernize the curricula of schools throughout the country (Sizer, 1964). With respect to the future of social studies, this meant reforming programs in history education that at the time rarely involved more than a single-semester survey of ancient Greece and Rome (Hertzberg, 1981, pp. 3-5; Johnson, 1915, pp. 13-135; National Education Association, 1893, pp. 171-174 and pp. 185-201; Whelan, 1991, p. 199). In place of such limited historical study, reformers sought to establish multi-year programs of history education in which students would investigate and analyze the development of Western civilization from classical times to the present.

The conception of social studies that eventually emerged as a school subject is largely derivative of these two reform initiatives (Whelan, 1991). Herein lies the significance of the 1916 report: the sequence of courses the Social Studies Committee defined and recommended for adoption was essentially an effort to balance and to a certain extent integrate the curricular models and educational objectives of both the current-issues and the history-centered initiatives. To the degree that this reconciliation was realized, credit belongs most to moderate reformers whose vision of social studies tended to embrace key aspects of both curricular initiatives.

Albert Bushnell Hart is an excellent example of such a reformer. As a professor of history and government at Harvard University between 1883 and 1926, he contributed in many ways to the theoretical conceptualization of history as a modern school subject and to its inclusion as a core component of the school curriculum. In doing so, he was a forerunner for the subsequent development of social studies education. Throughout his career, he remained a strong proponent of a history-centered curriculum; indeed, all of his work as an educational

---

2At the time, the study of history in schools was intended to conform to college admissions requirements that dated from colonial times and emphasized knowledge of classical languages and culture. Within this framework, history was considered widely as an adjunct to the study of Latin and Greek.
activist arose from his underlying understanding of the nature and purposes of history and history education. These ideas were not rigid or unchanging, however; rather, they evolved through the years and as they did, increasingly accommodated the educational philosophy of those calling for a curriculum based on the study of current social issues.

The Foundations of a Reformist Disposition

Like many of the Progressive period's most influential reformers, Hart grew up and went to school during the Civil War and Reconstruction (Crunden, 1984). He was six years old when the first shots were fired at Fort Sumter and a freshman at Harvard College when the last Union troops were withdrawn from the South (Hart, 1937; Morison, 1966, pp. 28-52; Morison, 1973, pp. 335-338). As a child, he viewed the war and the events that led to its outbreak through the eyes of his parents, especially his father, Dr. Albert Gaillard Hart, who served as a stationmaster on the underground railroad during the antebellum era and as a volunteer surgeon in an Ohio infantry regiment during the war (Hart, 1898a, pp. vii-xiii; Hart, 1899, p. v; Hart, 1901, pp. 273-276; Hart, 1937).

Both of Hart's parents were staunch Congregationalists whose deeply felt religious conviction inspired a melioristic conception of civic morality. They believed that the spirit of Christianity and the political ideals inherent in the concept of inalienable human rights were essentially in accord with the ethical obligations they entailed. Thus, they further believed that their spiritual salvation obliged them to foster humanitarian virtues consistent with the political values upon which the country had been founded. Social reform, in other words, was part of their religious creed; they felt compelled by the dictates of a higher law to work toward a society characterized by a fundamental respect for human dignity and an ideological commitment to the principles of individual liberty and equal opportunity.

Hart reflected his parent's precepts—and a certain amount of youthful bluster—when on a high school assignment he declared that "John Brown [had been] a better patriot than Stephen A. Douglas" (Hart, 1870a). In another assignment, an essay entitled "American Progress" (1870b), Hart indicated in greater detail how much like his parents he had come to think. The United States, he wrote, "is preeminently a nation of progress [which] has accomplished in one century what took older countries five or six." Nevertheless, he believed that reforms were still needed to "purify...[the nation's] public offices" and to counter the "evils that threatened [it]...at every step." He therefore exhorted "the American people...to press on...toward the truth [and] toward the right" and thereby fulfill "the
object[s] of liberty [and] freedom...for which [the nation's founders had] started out." To underscore how important he considered this effort, Hart emphasized in concluding the essay that an analysis of “successful national reforms [always finds] them operating through and toward moral improvement.”

Thus, like his parents, Hart believed that the truest measure of progress in the United States was moral, not material. The determining factor was the degree to which the nation's ideals were reflected in its political and social institutions. Moreover, as he argued in yet another high school essay (1870c), Hart thought public education was the surest means of promoting the sort of civic morality upon which democracy depended. He therefore declared it imperative that “knowledge...[be] disseminated...among the masses” through the nation's public schools. Indeed, he believed that “the public schools [were] so intimately...connected with [the maintenance of] free institutions that with their destruction...free government [would also be] destroyed.” This, he explained—again in the brashness of youth—was why he was so “solicitous about [the school's] welfare” and why he was willing to “die in their defense.”

Firmly fixed at a young age, these fundamental ideas about the relationship between civic virtue, education, and democratic institutions were reinforced by the two people Hart turned to for mentorship while an undergraduate at Harvard College (1876-1880) and a doctoral student at the University of Freiburg in Germany (1881-1883). At Harvard, Hart said (1898b) the professor to whom he felt most grateful for having “strengthened...his principles” was Charles Eliot Norton, a popular professor of fine arts and a cousin of Harvard’s influential president, Charles W. Eliot. Norton was also a prominent member of the mugwump wing of the Republican Party who remained throughout his adult life an unfailing supporter of liberal political reforms and programs of civic betterment. He freely expressed his political opinions when teaching, and steadfastly held to the belief that a university professor should inculcate among students a profound concern for matters of public policy (Villard, 1939, p. 82).

It was Norton who first advised Hart to consider history as an area of academic concentration while a student, and as a possible profession thereafter. Some years later, Hart said (1896, 1898b) he would always be indebted to Norton for this advice, adding that he also felt indebted for the example of pedagogical excellence Norton set. From Norton, Hart said he learned that a teacher’s ultimate responsibility is to encourage students “to see things as they are with a view to making them better” (1896).

Hermann von Holst, to whom Hart turned as a dissertation advisor at the University of Freiburg, also combined the duties of a professor with a penchant for political activism. As a young man, von
Holst had been forced to flee his native Russia after writing a pamphlet attacking the country's czarist form of government. Thereafter, he traveled and studied in the United States for a time before returning to Europe in 1872, and two years later secured a position as a professor at Freiburg. He soon earned a reputation as a leading scholar of United States history and also became active in local German politics. His particular area of intellectual interest and expertise was the institution of slavery which he tended to analyze primarily in moral terms (Goldman, 1973, pp. 511-532). The central theme of analysis, Hart wrote in 1890 in a review of von Holst's multi-volume Constitutional and Political History of the United States, is "the essential contradiction of free institutions and slavery about which the author's strongly felt opinions are unambiguously clear: von Holst "thinks slavery wrong" and "exults not only in the triumphs of the champions of freedom, but also over the mistakes and errors of the friends of slavery" (Hart, 1890, pp. 677-687).

In June, 1883, after two years in Germany, Hart submitted the final draft of his dissertation, "The Coercive Powers of the Government of the United States." At the end of July, he passed his final written and oral examinations, and one week later on August 4th, was notified officially that he had completed all of the requirements for a doctoral degree (Hart, 1883a, 1883b). Shortly thereafter, Hart left Freiburg for London where he boarded a ship for his return voyage to the United States (Hart, 1883b).

History as Fact Infused by Imagination

Hart arrived in New York on the last day of August, 1883. From there he hurried back to Boston by train and soon began teaching a course at Harvard entitled "The Constitutional and Political History of the United States to the year 1850" (Hart, 1886a).

President Eliot had appointed Hart to Harvard's faculty largely because of the prestige Eliot attached to his German degree (Baird, 1965, p. 132). It is ironic, therefore, that Hart rarely organized his courses as seminars, the method of instruction most often associated with the German school of historiography. Instead, he set out early in his career to develop a style of teaching that he thought was more consistent with his conception of history as an intellectual discipline and with his understanding of the reasons history should be studied and taught.

Like most of the professional historians of his day, Hart considered himself a "scientific" historian and as such was

---

3Hart later published his dissertation in greatly expanded form under the title Introduction to the Study of Federal Government.
representative of a general turn in American culture away from romanticism and toward realism. This sweeping cultural shift was evident in many areas of artistic and scholarly endeavor during the final decades of the nineteenth century, including the novels of William Dean Howells and Stephen Crane, the paintings of Winslow Homer and Thomas Eakins, and the pragmatic and instrumental philosophies of William James and John Dewey (Commager, 1950, pp. 41-54; Parrington, 1930, pp. xiii-xix; White, 1947, pp. 3-31). Many factors contributed to this broad cultural trend, but in the field of history, none was more influential than Darwin's theory of evolution (Grob & Billias, 1987, pp. 6-8; Handlin, 1979, pp. 60-63; Higham, 1983, pp. 94-100; Hofstadter, 1970, pp. 30-43).

For Hart, Darwin's explanation of change and continuity in the natural universe seemed to offer a fruitful framework for studying similar phenomena in the social universe. In fact, Hart once referred to Darwin as "the greatest historical master of [the] age," the person who "taught [historians] how...human institutions also follow the law of natural selection by the survival of those which are best adapted to their surroundings" (Hart, 1907a, p. xiv).

The Darwinian conception of evolution as an ongoing process of development operating through a discernible chain of causes and effects was the essence of historical wisdom for Hart (Hart, 1907a, p. xiv). Moreover, he believed that Darwin's research had set a standard for all other areas of scientific investigation, and he urged his fellow historians to adopt Darwin's inductive and comparative methods of inquiry as the principal means of collecting and evaluating historical evidence. This, in fact, was a central theme of Hart's presidential address to the American Historical Association (AHA) in 1909."What we need," he advised the gathered historians, "is a genuinely scientific school of history, which shall remorselessly examine the sources,...critically balance evidence,...[and] dispassionately and moderately set forth results. For such a process," Hart continued, there is "the fortunate analogy of the physical sciences: [D]id not Darwin," he asked rhetorically, "spend twenty years in accumulating data...before he so much as ventured a generalization." Is that not "the way historians must work" also, he asked in similar fashion, if they are to produce results of corresponding insight and value (pp. 232-233).

Hart thought that historians might one day develop a doctrine or philosophy of human history as comprehensive as Darwin's principle of natural selection, but he thought it more promising at least in the short run to concentrate on the more modest goal of identifying those aspects of historical development that distinguished one society or culture from another. Thus, in 1885, during his second year as a member of the Harvard faculty, Hart suggested a short list of
"fundamental principles of American History" (Hart, 1885, pp. 2-3).4 This list included the following propositions: competition for political authority is inevitably in a federal form of government; political parties in the United States appeal to national principles when in power and to local principles when out of power; most institutions in the United States are Teutonic in origin; most have become increasingly centralized through the years; and the principle of union has developed slowly in the United States.

Hart did not conceive these principles as historical laws comparable in any equivalent sense to the laws of physics; rather they were more descriptive than predictive, and were presented as tentative suggestions. In fact, he intended them to serve as hypotheses for history teachers to use with their students in initiating a systematic study of the nation's development (Hart, 1885, pp. 2-3; 1886b, pp. 7-8). Nevertheless, after 1887 Hart never again proposed such a list, but he did continue his efforts to discover the distinguishing characteristics of the United States as a nation. This effort culminated 20 years later in the publication of the final volume of the landmark American Nation series.5 In this ambitious monograph entitled National Ideals Historically Traced (1907a) Hart sought to measure the American nation "by its own progress as recorded in history [and thereby] show not alone what exists but what it has sprung out of [and] how it has been conditioned by the national experience" (p. xv).

Thus, for Hart the model to follow in historical research was that of the natural sciences, but as he made equally clear in his presidential address to the AHA, he did not believe that historical facts, even if established with the utmost scientific rigor, had the power "to speak for themselves" (Hart, 1909, 234-241). This is key in understanding Hart's conception of history as a science. He believed that a scientific approach to historical investigation was necessary, but that historical generalization required more than a mere accumulation of factual evidence.

He therefore cautioned his colleagues that "the analogy of the natural sciences may be pushed too far" (Hart, 1909, p. 234). It is misleading, he warned, to use terms like research and investigation as though history could be prepared in a laboratory with all the accidental causes shut away because, he explained, there is "much in

4Hart also included this list of general principles in the syllabus he published in 1886 for his course about "The Constitutional and Political History of the United States to the Year 1850" (Hart, 1886b, pp. 7-8).

5The first American Nation series was a 26-volume history of the United States, written between 1904 and 1907 by 24 different authors. Hart served as the series editor and also wrote two of the volumes. Praise for the series was nearly unanimous at the time, and, more recently, has been described by John Higham (1983) as "the first great professional synthesis of American history" (p. 20).
history that cannot be measured like atomic weights or averaged like insurance losses" (p. 240). Moreover, he believed that the pivotal factor in all historical inquiry is human personality and that historians, as a result, had to deal continually "with the manifold manifestations of human nature" (p. 234). Accordingly, Hart considered history a "philosophical subject," a point he emphasized rather graphically when he declared that "facts as facts, however carefully selected, [and] scientific treatment in itself, however necessary for the ascertainment of truth, are no more history than recruits arrayed in battalions are an army" (pp. 237-238).

Continuing this line of argument, Hart directly challenged the scientific ideal of the famous German historian, Leopold von Ranke who, when teaching, reputedly began each class with the apothegm, "I will simply tell you how it was." In response to this grand assertion, Hart pointedly asked if the students "did not really get how it was as seen through the mind of von Ranke" (Hart, 1909, p. 245). By so asking, Hart said he did not mean to question "the dictum that history must be objective" or the dictate that "every assertion must rest upon a source," but intended instead to affirm his conviction that real, vital history consists of something more than "simply a condensation of facts" (pp. 245-246). Rather, he said it involves nothing less than a "transmutation of the lifeless lead of the annals into the shining gold of historical understanding" (p. 246). The source of this intellectual alchemy, he continued, is human imagination, which enables historians to bring the past to life and thereby render historical study more applicable to instructional purposes (pp. 246-251).

Hart's conception of scientific history as "fact infused by imagination" (Hart, 1909, p. 240) transcended the view of those who held that history's ultimate objective was simply to reconstruct the past by putting together bits of information the way one would put together the pieces of a puzzle. For Hart, history was more interpretive than replicative and more creative than simple re-construction. The metaphor he used to describe the historian's greatest challenge—that of transforming lead into gold—was intended to call attention to the essential role of judgment, insight, empathy, and analysis in the work of historical investigation and generalization. Not coincidentally, these are the habits of mind that Hart thought citizens needed to participate fully and intelligently in a democratic society.

**History Education for Public Participation**

Throughout his career, Hart's fundamental objective as an educational reformer was to equip students with the intellectual abilities to think and act for themselves. He believed that the maintenance of democratic institutions presumes an educated citizenry
whose members are capable of making sound, independent judgments and of discerning and criticizing the arguments underlying the judgments of others. Consequently, he further believed that all teachers in a democracy shared a common responsibility to foster the goal of intellectual independence among students and to devise instructional practices effective in advancing this common goal. He thought history teachers, however, in light of their subject matter, had a special obligation and a special opportunity in both of these interrelated curricular areas.

Early in his career, Hart spoke of the relationship between historical study and citizenship education in vague, somewhat inferential terms. In his first article about history education in schools (1885), for example, he advised history teachers “to select a point of view which will oblige...students to think [for themselves]...to extract from [factual evidence] an independent judgment...and to see the relation of...the past with the present” (pp. 4-5). If each topic were analyzed in this way, he thought that students would be more likely to benefit from history’s instructive or practical values (pp. 2-4) and not become lost in the less valuable task of memorizing a mass of factual information (pp. 21-30).

He discussed these ideas in greater and more explicit detail as chief author6 of the subcommittee report on “History, Civil Government, and Political Economy” of the National Education Association’s (NEA) Committee of Ten (NEA, 1893).7 His ultimate recommendation—that every school adopt a multi-year program of history education—was based upon his conviction that the intellectual skills and attitudes engendered by the study of history were essentially the same as those needed by citizens to participate in the decision-making processes of a democratic state (Hart, 1893a, pp. 8-11; NEA, pp. 162-163, pp. 171-172).

6Hart, who served as subcommittee secretary, and Charles Kendall Adams, who served as chair, were chosen by their colleagues to co-author the final report. It was Hart alone, however, who wrote the preliminary draft of the report and then submitted it to the members of the subcommittee for their suggestions and revisions. He then prepared the final report that was submitted to the Committee of Ten (Adams, 1893; Bourne, 1893; Brown, 1893; Hart, 1893, p. 16). Even if Hart’s authorship is contested, however, he and his colleagues unanimously agreed on each of the report’s 35 resolutions (NEA, 1893, p. 166). Thus, it may be inferred that the report accurately reflects Hart’s ideas at the time about the nature and purposes of history education in schools.

7In other writings during the 1890s, Hart expressed ideas about history education very similar to those of the subcommittee report. See, for example, Revised Suggestions on the Study of United States History and Government (1895a), Studies in American Education (1895b), and the Guide to the Study of American History (1896), which he co-authored with Edward Channing. Hart also served on the AHA’s Committee of Seven, whose final report, The Study of History in Schools (1899), is for the most part a more detailed exposition of the subcommittee’s arguments and recommendations.
Specifically, Hart said history "train[s]...the judgment in selecting the grounds of an opinion, in accumulating materials for an opinion, in putting things together, in generalizing upon facts, in estimating character, in applying the lessons of history to current events, and in accustoming [students] to state their conclusions in their own words" (NEA, 1893, p. 170). Such results were realized rarely, Hart explained, not because history was in any way deficient, but because most teachers aimed to reach the subject's least important outcome, that of "acquir[ing] a body of...detached historical facts" (p. 168). If students were put regularly into the position of exercising their powers of critical judgment, however, history's unique educational values would have widespread effect (pp. 169-170).

Hart's explanation of the shortcomings of history education suggested a clear course of action to improve the situation. Two reforms were especially critical: teachers needed better training in both subject matter and methods of instruction, and instructional materials better adapted to history's citizenship goals needed to be developed and made more available. Moreover, as he stated in the Committee of Ten report and in an article published six months earlier, he thought that universities had a duty to address the issue of teacher training (Hart, 1893b; NEA, pp. 187), and, as he noted on several other occasions (Hart, 1898c; Hart, 1913; NEA, p. 189), that professional historians had a similar responsibility with regard to the development of instructional materials. Hart understood, in other words, that the process of improving history education in schools would require more than merely making recommendations; it would require a sustained effort on the part of college- and university-based professors to implement a program of practical reforms. During the years following the publication of the Committee of Ten report he therefore redoubled his efforts to establish teacher training programs in history education and to prepare textbooks and other instructional materials for history teachers and their students.

In the 1880s, Hart conducted several workshop series for history teachers in schools throughout the Boston area (Grummere, 1893, 1894; Goodrich, 1887; Hill, 1887; Parmenter, 1887; Thompson, 1891). During the following decade when Harvard established a graduate school of education (Holmes, 1930), Hart regularly taught a course for teachers in which he integrated historical content with suggestions about "methods and appliances" for classroom use (Hart, 1907b; Hart, undated; Secretary's Report, 1895, pp. 39-41; Harvard College Catalogues, 1892-1907). During the same period, he also wrote several textbooks and edited several collections of primary sources for school-
The textbooks were intended to hold students "to a definite line of work" and to help them establish history's requisite "basis of fact." The source readers, like the practice of using several textbooks, which he regularly advised history teachers to do, were intended to help students develop the "habit of comparison" and "the no less important habit of doubting," both of which he thought essential to the proper study of history and to the proper exercise of one's citizenship responsibilities (Hart, 1887, pp. 1-21; NEA, pp. 188-189).

Hart's leadership in the drive to improve history education waned somewhat during the first decade of the twentieth century. While he continued to author and edit textbooks and other instructional materials, and also continued to offer a regularly scheduled course for history teachers at Harvard's Graduate School of Education, he never returned to the question of history's basic rationale as a school subject. During these years, which roughly coincide with the political ascendancy of his close friend and Harvard classmate, Theodore Roosevelt, Hart involved himself more deeply with political issues, both national and international, than with issues directly affecting schools.

After serving as a Roosevelt delegate to the Republican and Bull Moose Party Conventions in 1912, Hart's interest in educational matters was rekindled when he agreed in 1913 to serve as an advisor to a school in Illinois for orphaned children (Secretary's Report, 1920, p. 95; Fiftieth Anniversary, 1930, pp. 39-40). By then, however, advocates of various current-issues initiatives had become much more influential than before the report of the Committee of Ten (Saxe, 1991, pp. 109-143). Although Hart rejected out of hand any curricular proposal that would have eliminated the study of history as a separate subject, his ideas about history education and about schooling in general were nevertheless affected by the basic assumptions underlying the current-issues position.

Perhaps the three most important sets of instructional materials Hart prepared during these years were the American History Leaflets (1895-1907, New York: American Book Company) which he edited and for which he wrote a volume entitled Essentials of American History, and the multi-volume collection of primary sources entitled American History Told by Contemporaries which he edited (1897-1929, New York: Macmillan).

Hart was also distracted during this period by a number of changes in his personal and professional life. With regard to the former, two developments are particularly noteworthy: First, he and his wife adopted two children, Albert Bushnell, Jr. and Adrian Putnam Hart; and second, his 86-year-old father, who was still practicing medicine at the time, died in a trolley-car accident. Professionally, Hart took two extended sabbaticals during these years, one to travel through the states of the Confederacy and another to travel around the world with his wife and children. In the interim, he was chosen to be the first chair of Harvard's newly established Department of Government (Secretary's Report, 1900, pp. 40-42; Secretary's Report, 1912, pp. 22-23).
Hart came to share the broad, comprehensive view of citizenship education that most current-issues advocates identified as the central function of schooling in the United States. While he had previously thought of citizenship education primarily in terms of preparing students for political participation, he eventually came to see, as he said in a speech before the Pennsylvania State Educators' Conference in 1919, that the necessity of teaching citizenship involves a much wider range of educational responsibilities. Indeed, he said, it involves nothing less than "the making of men and women out of boys and girls" (The Harrisburg Patriot, 1919, p. 1). He still believed that much could be done toward this end by teaching history, but only if the subject's curricular organization were adjusted substantially.

Hart addressed this issue at length in a series of reports he prepared during the 1920s (Hart & Spencer, 1920; Hart, 1923). Modern education, he wrote, commenting on the need for school reform in general, requires more than "the old three R schools [ever] dreamed of" (Hart, 1923, p. 5). In addition to regular academic matters, it requires vocational training for every student; attention to students' health and proper nourishment; and most important a clear understanding that the ultimate aim of good schooling is personal character and not mere bookish pedantry (pp. 5-7).

Hart understood that the changes he recommended in the mission of schools would entail significant reforms in the way every subject was taught. Instruction in general, he advised, must "be broader and deeper, more intensive and more thorough" than it had been in the past (Hart, 1923, p. 2). With regard to history, he called upon teachers to reorganize their courses on the basis of two fundamental principles: to connect every topic studied with the reality of students' lives (Hart, 1923, p. 3); and to connect the study of history with topics studied in other school subjects (Hart & Spencer, 1920, p. 64).

Elaborating on the need to implement the first principle, Hart argued that students would better understand the social and economic problems the nation and its citizens faced if historical study arose from their real-life experiences. He therefore advised history teachers to pay special attention to conditions students and their families faced "in their homes, their workshops, their mines, their stores, their means of transit, their banks, their co-operative societies, [and] their schools and universities" (Hart & Spencer, 1920, p. 133; Hart, 1923, p. 3).

Hart thought history's educational potential would be further enhanced if it were studied in conjunction with other school subjects. He therefore recommended that history instruction be tied closely to geography, civics, literature, mathematics, and even physical training. In this way, he thought students would better understand the need to act together in pursuing their "common interests in life." Such understanding, he added, should be the "essential" theme of all
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historical study in schools (Spencer & Hart, 1920, pp. 64-65; Hart, 1923, pp. 2-4).

Explicating the general rationale underlying his specific recommendations, Hart said citizens in a society as complex as the United States needed to perform many services that were unnecessary during simpler times (Hart, 1923, p. 2). He therefore felt schools needed to provide every student with an education that "expands his [sic] consciousness of human relations and arouses and enlarges his sense of being part of the people—a participant in [all aspects of] public life" (Hart & Spencer, 1920, p. 62).

From a historical perspective, what is most striking about Hart's recommendations is the extent to which they are in accord with the basic approach to education advanced by the Social Studies Committee in 1916. He did not conceive of social studies as a radically new course of study, but as a series of moderate yet significant reforms in the kind of history education he had proposed in the Committee of Ten report a generation earlier. In his judgment—and apparently many social studies advocates agreed—the social studies movement was not an effort to replace history education, but rather an effort to expand the focus of historical study and thereby make it more instructive.

Conclusion

Hart's place in the history of social studies education is that of a precursor or catalyst. The conception of history education he defined and helped implement during the final decades of the nineteenth century became the door, both in an intellectual and an institutional sense, through which social studies entered the schools during the early decades of the twentieth century. Some contemporary social studies advocates proposed a more radical vision of social studies education, one that would have involved a total break with the sort of history education Hart recommended. But such a vision was not endorsed by the report of the Committee on Social Studies in 1916 nor widely adopted by schools throughout the country. Rather, the fundamental curricular tenets that Hart and his colleagues on the Committee of Ten proposed for history education in 1893—that the subject hold a central place in the school curriculum, that it focus on modern historical themes and issues, and that it be taught in a way that cultivates the intellectual abilities and attitudes of enlightened citizenship—were essentially the same as those proposed by the Social Studies Committee 25 years later. Perhaps more importantly, these tenets have also characterized social studies practice throughout most of the twentieth century.
Hart remained a strong proponent of history education until the end of his career; in fact, he rarely ever used the term social studies.\textsuperscript{10} He was not an ideologue mired in a rigid educational orthodoxy, however. On the contrary, as a student of history he understood the inevitability of change, and as a reformer he understood that there is no virtue in an idea simply because it is old (Hart, 1923, p. 4). In sum, Hart was a progressive activist who challenged educational conventions early in his career, and embraced subsequent challenges from other progressives later in his professional life. By the 1920s, his vision of history education was clearly in harmony with that of the mainstream social studies movement, and he supported the movement's encompassing conception of citizenship education, calling upon schools to address a range of issues much broader than those directly related to political participation. He understood the consequent need to implement a synthesizing conception of history education, one that would speak directly to issues of present student and social concern.

"The big thing," Hart wrote when he was in his 70s and looking back on the course of his life, "is to know the world, [to] live in the world, and [to] leave the world a little farther along than if we had never been" (Fiftieth Anniversary, 1930, p. 38). This, perhaps better than anything else he ever said, sums up the goals Hart believed history education should inculcate among students.
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Abstract
During World War II, the nature of elementary social studies changed significantly. Prompted by popular interest in the events of the war and government initiated victory and defense savings programs, elementary educators reshaped both the content and structure of their classrooms to foster patriotism, community service, interest in geography and history, and good citizenship traits. Students participated in war savings stamp and bond sales, scrap collection drives, and production of war-related plays; they studied rationing economics and conservation of resources; they expanded their understanding of geography and world events; and they learned how to be responsible citizens working toward the common goal of victory in the war. As a result of enhanced and broadened activity during the war years, elementary social studies emerged as a curricular field of prominence.

Introduction

As the United States entered World War II on December 8, 1941, schools continued to educate young Americans reliably, comfortably, and safely. War was not a new topic to teachers or to students. Everyone had been following current events in Europe and in the South Pacific for some time. Still, the impending role that elementary schools should assume during World War II became a topic of widespread discussion. While most educators may well have agreed that schools would be active participants throughout this war as they had been in World War I, the level and intensity of such activities were being contested. Some teachers supported almost total immersion in wartime activities, claiming that the role of the schools was "to help win the war"
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(Stoddard, 1942, p. 53) and that schools must be "utilized to full capacity" (Redefer, 1942, p. 300). Others recommended that schools conduct business as usual. Educators sent and received mixed messages. While most agreed with the necessity of revised roles, goals, aims, duties, and curricula for wartime elementary and high schools, a minority advised extreme caution in promoting wartime activities.

Role of the Schools

Alexander J. Stoddard, the superintendent of schools in Philadelphia, recounted active participation by many schools during World War I through the national defense training program, and he delineated several responsibilities for wartime schools. He called for clarification of the issues and aims of war and endorsed the encouragement of patience and calm among schoolchildren. Cleveland's superintendent Charles H. Lake (1942) recommended that a balance in education be maintained, that real needs be anticipated, and that teaching procedures be adjusted to meet changing needs under pressure. He recognized, too, the vital role of teacher leadership in implementing wartime educational policies.

Like many of his colleagues, Frederick L. Redefer, the executive director of the Progressive Education Association, called for a challenging "curricular reorganization" that would "take precedence over time-worn routines" (1942, p. 300). In his view, wartime should not frustrate the major educational reforms that had begun during the previous decade. Maud Frothingham Roby (1943), principal of Shepherd Elementary School in Washington, D.C., agreed that the school's role had to be defined clearly in two ways: guiding the maximum development of boys and girls to help win the war, and preparing young children for life after the war. Principal Harold Drummond (1943) from Skellytown, Texas, called for a changing, nonstatic curriculum and a faculty to provide for a rich development and awareness of community and international needs. These views likely were not held by educators alone, but were also deeply felt by the public (Davis, 1988-1989).

Individual action was important, but major organizational influences were also directed toward the new circumstances. Among the most important influences were the policy and action reports of the National Education Association and its major affiliates (1942), the John Dewey Society Sixth Yearbook (1942), the work of the American Association of School Administrators (1942), and three policy reports from the National Council for the Social Studies: The Social Studies Mobilize for Victory (1942), Wartime Social Studies in the Elementary School (Chase, 1943), and The Social Studies Look Beyond the War.
Elementary Social Studies during World War II

Elementary Social Studies In the Field of Battle: Applications in the Classroom

A rich legacy of efforts by schoolchildren during World War II has been recorded. Documents include instructional units, classroom enrichment activities, and school enterprises. These reports of classroom practice, heightened by the country’s involvement in a world war, are simple and direct, and they reveal an important dimension of the story about elementary social studies during this period.

Teachers of the social studies faced the extraordinary challenge of having to help maintain the existing political order and amplify the curriculum to meet wartime needs. War-related activities in the social studies were significant for several reasons. They differed from commonplace routines; they were flexible, not static; and they were relevant to the larger social context in which Americans found themselves at the time. While specific activities varied from school to school, several major theme areas can be identified: war savings stamp and bond sales; scrap and salvage drives; instruction about the economics and practicalities of rationing and conservation efforts; civic education and community service; victory gardens; health and nutrition; democratic, patriotic, and citizenship-related activities; modern era education and geography; and general plans for educational improvement.

Helping to Finance the War: War Savings Stamp and Bond Sales

After December 7, 1941, a shocked nation of citizens was called into service for its country to help win the war. The government immediately and, over the years, repeatedly appealed to citizens to assist in raising money to fund the war effort. As a result, teachers and schoolchildren were enlisted into war bond and war stamp sales campaigns with resounding success.

Several methods attracted student interest. Patriotic plays designed for performance at school assemblies were published directly after the start of the war and later during successive defense savings campaigns. One such play, Investing for Uncle Sam (Goebel, 1942), was intended unmistakably to teach children to save their pennies for war stamp purchases: As a group of children discuss their savings, they agree that pennies have little value except to buy chewing gum, until John pipes in, “Well, I’m not buying gum. Every time I get a penny I put it in my pig bank. When I get ten pennies, I buy a stamp” (p. 44). As the play continues, different types of savings plans, the amount of interest earned on savings, and government use of the contributions are discussed.

Another play, Helping Your Uncle Sam (Sister Josephine, 1942), was created to inform and motivate. The author commented, “Three of
my pupils, Clarice Marik, Ann Doris Sklar, and Helen Valigura originated this play and wrote most of it" (p. 32). In this play, as proof of lessons well learned one of the characters, Ernest, tells the postmaster, "You see, our mother gave each of us a nice new dime to spend just as we please. At first, we thought we would buy candy. Then, when we remembered about our father who has gone to help Uncle Sam, we decided we would buy some Defense Stamps" (p. 32). Another play, *Mother Goose Helps Defense* (Dalby, 1942) presented a novel approach to defense savings: Little Miss Muffet and Jack Be Nimble join other characters encouraging elementary students to buy defense stamps and bonds with verses such as "I am Little Miss Muffet. I used to sit all day on a tuffet and eat curds and whey. I'm not going to be so lazy anymore. I am going to earn money and buy Defense Stamps" (p. 26).

In other schools, war stamp and war bond sales projects were organized by classes. Mildred I. Heckman (1942), for example, reported the following Franklin School 7A class undertaking: Two class managers were elected, and the remaining 24 class members were divided into two sales groups that on alternate months served as salespeople to the remainder of Franklin School's 12 rooms. Sales day was Tuesday from 8:10am to 8:30am and 1:00pm to 1:15pm. Photographs accompanying Heckman's account depicted class members displaying the award flag designed by the class, applying symbols to homeroom doors, preparing forms for weekly graphs, posting results of weekly sales, taking money and stamp orders, totalling stamp orders, counting money, buying stamps at the post office, and delivering stamps the following morning. Ruth L. Hallenbeck's (1943) second-grade class decided to convert their schoolroom into a post office for war stamp sales. The children made advertisement posters and constructed a post office area from orange crates. They elected a postmaster and planned the sales routine. Because the school was located in a rural area, the project was viewed as a form of community service. Hallenbeck described the success of her class this way: "Not only the children themselves profited, but [so did] the parents and other people in the neighborhood who could thus buy their stamps at the schoolhouse" (p 29).

At Lulu J. Kisselbrack's (1944) school, five primary teachers volunteered to oversee the war stamp drive each for a month at a time. Students presented pep talks to other students, and constructed posters for display. One such poster read:

You must buy War Stamps
To help Uncle Sam;
We are buying War Stamps
As fast as we can (Kisselbrack, 1944, p. 28).
One large poster was placed prominently in the school hallway, with individual classroom sales represented by airplanes, reflecting the students' popular interest in aircraft. Each week, the teacher in charge completed and deposited sales orders in the school office. Later that day, stamps and bonds were delivered to her for distribution by her students. According to Kisselbrack, during the second year of the war, "our Primary Department overreached the goal which had been set. The five classrooms purchased Stamps and Bonds well over $1,000" (p. 60).

Defense and war savings efforts were an overwhelming success nationwide. Some of these programs were recounted by Judy Graves (1942), a staff member for the Treasury Department, who noted the vigorous participation of schoolchildren in "Stamp Days, Stamp Week, Defense Savings plays, Radio programs, assemblies, parades, rallies, and pageants" (p.18). Stamps and bonds were also given as scholarships, as memorials to schools, and as prizes in essay, poster, and speech contests. Sample slogans provided by children included "A dime a day to keep the Japs away"; "Stamp out the Axis"; and "Buy a stamp and lick the other side" (p. 18). Graves highlighted the stamp-selling campaign in one unidentified midwestern city by noting that once organized, "the city's seventy thousand schoolchildren were soon buying $6,000 worth of stamps a week" (p. 18). At the end of the 1941-42 school year, a total of $81,000,000 in war bonds and war stamps sales in schools was reported in a *Childhood Education* editorial. Nancy Larrick (1944), a Treasury Department staff member, reported that "by January 1943, at least 90 percent of the country's 200,000 schools" were selling stamps and bonds with a total amount "well over $300 million in War Savings" (pp. 41-42).

School administrators also encouraged war bond and stamp sales in their districts and in individual schools. Jesse O. Sanderson (1943), the superintendent of schools in Raleigh, North Carolina, revealed that "Hayes-Barton Elementary School, with an enrollment of 600 pupils, purchased 365 bonds, the largest number of any of the schools" (p. 23). In Cincinnati, Ohio, war stamp sales were held weekly, according to John F. Locke (1943), director of community relations. He reported over $200,000 worth of sales in the initial campaign from January 13, 1942, until the close of summer school. Louis Nusbaum (1943), associate superintendent of schools in Philadelphia, reported that "since the first of last year, a total of over $3,000,000 worth of bonds and stamps has been sold" (p. 23). Unmistakably, schoolchildren were persuasive salespeople. Perhaps the success of their community efforts and the achievement of quality citizenship traits were best synthesized by Treasury Department staffer Nancy Larrick: "In every instance, the schools came through. They helped their town make its
quota and learned the lessons of War Savings, civics, and cooperation in the process" (1942, p. 42).

Scrap/Salvage Collection Drives

Elementary schoolchildren also joined with older boys and girls in a display of their loyalty and exemplary citizenship by participating in school salvage programs. Pittsfield, Massachusetts, school superintendent Edward J. Russell (1942) described this project and the implementation role his schools played as one "to achieve unity in thought and action for the American people through the medium of their children" (p. 27). The Pittsfield schools undertook a salvage program for collection of paper, rubber, metals, and rags. "Schools were designated as salvage centers and the community was subjected, through the children, to a barrage of salvage propaganda" (p. 27). Within just two weeks of implementation, the project achieved widespread community support from the adult population. Russell attributed the success of the salvage campaign to Pittsfield's children. "It pays to wait until parents have been influenced—often literally dragged into an activity—by their children. Consequently, new salvage operations (such as fat conservation and tin-can processing) are not launched until the children thoroughly understand the project and are ready to interest their parents in it" (pp. 27, 38). The Pittsfield salvage program appears to have been successful, probably like countless others nationwide, because of the groundswell support of administrators, teachers, students, and community members. Through the practical application of cooperation, sharing, and willingness to work for a common cause, young Americans received first-hand experience in the workings of democracy by way of these school-sponsored, curricular activities.

Cooperation with the government's request for systematic collection of scrap came from schools of all sizes. One example merits special attention. As reported by Norman Frost (1942), professor of rural education at George Peabody College for Teachers, the efforts within a one-teacher school in Tennessee grew to include an entire community. Teacher and students first researched such questions as: Why is waste paper needed? and What will be done with the paper collected? Students surveyed and mapped their community, interviewed community leaders, planned and implemented bimonthly collections, secured scales, and wrote monthly reports for the community newspaper. The benefits resulting from these efforts, according to Frost, included increased understanding, thinking, feeling, and patriotism. The wartime collection of scrap became an integral element of the school's social studies education.
Early evidence of successful school salvage drives was published in the October 1942 issue of *The National Elementary Principal*. "The elementary schools of this nation have never failed to help in an emergency. When paper was needed, we did so well that the call came to 'Hold off!'" (p. 64). *Childhood Education* reported that same month that 162,000 tons of waste paper had been collected by schools during the 1941-1942 school year. Salvage drive results in just one school, Hampden School No. 55 in Baltimore, Maryland, were reported by principal Marie E. Wallace (1943) for the school year 1942-1943:

- more than $23,000 worth of stamps and bonds sold.
- six truck loads of scrap metal collected.
- more than 1,000 wire coat hangers collected and given to the Salvation Army.
- more than 2,000 old phonograph records collected. (p.33)

Wallace also noted the formation of seven school committees to oversee school war activities for the 1943-1944 school year. Salvage activities were relegated to the Clean-Up committee, which was also responsible for the appearance of the school building.

Other successful scrap drive projects were reported by W.W. D. Sones (1942), professor of education at the University of Pittsburgh, and Margaret Noel (1944), fifth-grade teacher at the training school of State Teachers College, Fredonia, New York. According to Sones, in Illinois Winnetka schools gathered enough scrap metal for two medium tanks; schoolchildren in Chicago collected over 100,000 tons of wastepaper in just five weeks; and youngsters in Bloomington collected enough automobile license plates (2,427 sets) to provide material for a small tank. Noel (1944) reported the success of scrap metal, paper, rubber, rags, cordage, light bulb, and tin can collections at her school. According to Noel, these collection drives were successful not because of the amounts salvaged, but because every child had the opportunity to participate and feel useful.

Social studies teachers promoted, organized, and administered countless salvage and scrap drives throughout World War II, and they did so for many reasons. First, the government made frequent requests for teachers to participate in organized scrap collection campaigns. Second, social studies teachers desired to take advantage of a unique call to action, one that extended beyond the classroom and into the community. They seized the opportunity to motivate their youngsters and to extend citizenship education into a practical dimension. Social studies instruction was advanced far beyond classroom walls during the war because it was based upon a fresh reality for a new generation of Americans—young citizens felt a keen sense of responsibility to their
nation. Salvage drives and similar promotions were successful because they could and did engage every student to do his or her patriotic duty.

**Economics, Rationing, Conservation:**

*Wartime Civilian Life and the Schools*

As the hardships of wartime civilian living increased, social studies teachers were encouraged to include economics and conservation in their curriculum. When rationing became commonplace, it was also added to the social studies curriculum. During the summer of 1942, the Office of Price Administration held week-long teacher training workshops across the nation (Davis, 1981). One- to five-day workshops were held in 177 other locations. Reports published in the July 1943 issue of *The Teachers College Journal* revealed that "social studies teachers in many cities are having pupils study inflationary dangers, price control, and rationing through the use of current newspapers and magazines" (p. 131). Price control and rationing were urged as topics of study for every grade level.

In 1943 at summer workshops held at the University of California at Los Angeles, teachers, supervisors, and administrators studied elementary school efforts to help battle inflation and establish economic literacy (Isle, 1943). Wartime economic purposes for elementary schools included:

- developing an understanding of why scarce goods are rationed
- helping students use available goods and services efficiently
- helping students buy wisely
- helping students participate in maintaining price rationing and regulations (p. 29).

Specific social studies teaching activities were advocated, including teaching about: sources of supplies, conversion of industries to wartime needs, and uses of salvaged materials; materials critical to the war effort; health studies; and recreational activities not requiring the use of automobiles (and gasoline consumption). Evidence from several local schools reveals the use of some if not all of these instructional ideas.

In Garden City, New York, the first-grade students of Julia O’Brien (1943) learned about scarcity in their lives through daily discussion time. O’Brien’s students came to understand “how to get enough food and supplies for our armies here and overseas, how to get enough food for our allies, and how to get enough food for our own people” (p. 31). Topics of discussion included food conservation; the effects of rationing milk, butter and meat; and speculation about possible shoe rationing.
One large poster was placed prominently in the school hallway, with individual classroom sales represented by airplanes, reflecting the students’ popular interest in aircraft. Each week, the teacher in charge completed and deposited sales orders in the school office. Later that day, stamps and bonds were delivered to her for distribution by her students. According to Kisselbrack, during the second year of the war, “our Primary Department overreached the goal which had been set. The five classrooms purchased Stamps and Bonds well over $1,000” (p. 60).

Defense and war savings efforts were an overwhelming success nationwide. Some of these programs were recounted by Judy Graves (1942), a staff member for the Treasury Department, who noted the vigorous participation of schoolchildren in “Stamp Days, Stamp Week, Defense Savings plays, Radio programs, assemblies, parades, rallies, and pageants” (p.18). Stamps and bonds were also given as scholarships, as memorials to schools, and as prizes in essay, poster, and speech contests. Sample slogans provided by children included “A dime a day to keep the Japs away”; “Stamp out the Axis”; and “Buy a stamp and lick the other side” (p. 18). Graves highlighted the stamp-selling campaign in one unidentified midwestern city by noting that once organized, “the city’s seventy thousand schoolchildren were soon buying $6,000 worth of stamps a week” (p. 18). At the end of the 1941-42 school year, a total of $81,000,000 in war bonds and war stamps sales in schools was reported in a Childhood Education editorial. Nancy Larrick (1944), a Treasury Department staff member, reported that “by January 1943, at least 90 percent of the country’s 200,000 schools” were selling stamps and bonds with a total amount “well over $300 million in War Savings” (pp. 41-42).

School administrators also encouraged war bond and stamp sales in their districts and in individual schools. Jesse O. Sanderson (1943), the superintendent of schools in Raleigh, North Carolina, revealed that “Hayes-Barton Elementary School, with an enrollment of 600 pupils, purchased 365 bonds, the largest number of any of the schools” (p. 23). In Cincinnati, Ohio, war stamp sales were held weekly, according to John F. Locke (1943), director of community relations. He reported over $200,000 worth of sales in the initial campaign from January 13, 1942, until the close of summer school. Louis Nusbaum (1943), associate superintendent of schools in Philadelphia, reported that “since the first of last year, a total of over $3,000,000 worth of bonds and stamps has been sold” (p. 23). Unmistakably, schoolchildren were persuasive salespeople. Perhaps the success of their community efforts and the achievement of quality citizenship traits were best synthesized by Treasury Department staffer Nancy Larrick: “In every instance, the schools came through. They helped their town make its
quotient and learned the lessons of War Savings, civics, and cooperation in the process” (1942, p. 42).

Scrap/Salvage Collection Drives

Elementary school children also joined with older boys and girls in a display of their loyalty and exemplary citizenship by participating in school salvage programs. Pittsfield, Massachusetts, school superintendent Edward J. Russell (1942) described this project and the implementation role his schools played as one “to achieve unity in thought and action for the American people through the medium of their children” (p. 27). The Pittsfield schools undertook a salvage program for collection of paper, rubber, metals, and rags. “Schools were designated as salvage centers and the community was subjected, through the children, to a barrage of salvage propaganda” (p. 27). Within just two weeks of implementation, the project achieved widespread community support from the adult population. Russell attributed the success of the salvage campaign to Pittsfield’s children. “It pays to wait until parents have been influenced—often literally dragged into an activity—by their children. Consequently, new salvage operations (such as fat conservation and tin-can processing) are not launched until the children thoroughly understand the project and are ready to interest their parents in it” (pp. 27, 38). The Pittsfield salvage program appears to have been successful, probably like countless others nationwide, because of the groundswell support of administrators, teachers, students, and community members. Through the practical application of cooperation, sharing, and willingness to work for a common cause, young Americans received first-hand experience in the workings of democracy by way of these school-sponsored, curricular activities.

Cooperation with the government’s request for systematic collection of scrap came from schools of all sizes. One example merits special attention. As reported by Norman Frost (1942), professor of rural education at George Peabody College for Teachers, the efforts within a one-teacher school in Tennessee grew to include an entire community. Teacher and students first researched such questions as: Why is waste paper needed? and What will be done with the paper collected? Students surveyed and mapped their community, interviewed community leaders, planned and implemented bimonthly collections, secured scales, and wrote monthly reports for the community newspaper. The benefits resulting from these efforts, according to Frost, included increased understanding, thinking, feeling, and patriotism. The wartime collection of scrap became an integral element of the school’s social studies education.
Early evidence of successful school salvage drives was published in the October 1942 issue of *The National Elementary Principal*. "The elementary schools of this nation have never failed to help in an emergency. When paper was needed, we did so well that the call came to 'Hold off!'" (p. 64). *Childhood Education* reported that same month that 162,000 tons of waste paper had been collected by schools during the 1941-1942 school year. Salvage drive results in just one school, Hampden School No. 55 in Baltimore, Maryland, were reported by principal Marie E. Wallace (1943) for the school year 1942-1943:

- more than $23,000 worth of stamps and bonds sold.
- six truck loads of scrap metal collected.
- more than 1,000 wire coat hangers collected and given to the Salvation Army.
- more than 2,000 old phonograph records collected. (p.33)

Wallace also noted the formation of seven school committees to oversee school war activities for the 1943-1944 school year. Salvage activities were relegated to the Clean-Up committee, which was also responsible for the appearance of the school building.

Other successful scrap drive projects were reported by W.W. D. Sones (1942), professor of education at the University of Pittsburgh, and Margaret Noel (1944), fifth-grade teacher at the training school of State Teachers College, Fredonia, New York. According to Sones, in Illinois Winnetka schools gathered enough scrap metal for two medium tanks; school children in Chicago collected over 100,000 tons of wastepaper in just five weeks; and youngsters in Bloomington collected enough automobile license plates (2,427 sets) to provide material for a small tank. Noel (1944) reported the success of scrap metal, paper, rubber, rags, cordage, light bulb, and tin can collections at her school. According to Noel, these collection drives were successful not because of the amounts salvaged, but because every child had the opportunity to participate and feel useful.

Social studies teachers promoted, organized, and administered countless salvage and scrap drives throughout World War II, and they did so for many reasons. First, the government made frequent requests for teachers to participate in organized scrap collection campaigns. Second, social studies teachers desired to take advantage of a unique call to action, one that extended beyond the classroom and into the community. They seized the opportunity to motivate their youngsters and to extend citizenship education into a practical dimension. Social studies instruction was advanced far beyond classroom walls during the war because it was based upon a fresh reality for a new generation of Americans—young citizens felt a keen sense of responsibility to their
nation. Salvage drives and similar promotions were successful because they could and did engage every student to do his or her patriotic duty.

Economics, Rationing, Conservation:
Wartime Civilian Life and the Schools

As the hardships of wartime civilian living increased, social studies teachers were encouraged to include economics and conservation in their curriculum. When rationing became commonplace, it was also added to the social studies curriculum. During the summer of 1942, the Office of Price Administration held week-long teacher training workshops across the nation (Davis, 1981). One- to five-day workshops were held in 177 other locations. Reports published in the July 1943 issue of The Teachers College Journal revealed that “social studies teachers in many cities are having pupils study inflationary dangers, price control, and rationing through the use of current newspapers and magazines” (p. 131). Price control and rationing were urged as topics of study for every grade level.

In 1943 at summer workshops held at the University of California at Los Angeles, teachers, supervisors, and administrators studied elementary school efforts to help battle inflation and establish economic literacy (Isle, 1943). Wartime economic purposes for elementary schools included:

- developing an understanding of why scarce goods are rationed
- helping students use available goods and services efficiently
- helping students buy wisely
- helping students participate in maintaining price rationing and regulations (p. 29).

Specific social studies teaching activities were advocated, including teaching about: sources of supplies, conversion of industries to wartime needs, and uses of salvaged materials; materials critical to the war effort; health studies; and recreational activities not requiring the use of automobiles (and gasoline consumption). Evidence from several local schools reveals the use of some if not all of these instructional ideas.

In Garden City, New York, the first-grade students of Julia O'Brien (1943) learned about scarcity in their lives through daily discussion time. O'Brien's students came to understand “how to get enough food and supplies for our armies here and overseas, how to get enough food for our allies, and how to get enough food for our own people” (p. 31). Topics of discussion included food conservation; the effects of rationing milk, butter and meat; and speculation about possible shoe rationing.
Elementary social studies teachers also taught about rubber shortages and means for addressing the issue to benefit the community; for example, Alvin C. Eurich (1942), director of the consumer division of the Office of Price Administration, notes that one California school operated a clothing exchange where children could exchange outgrown rubbers, boots, shoes, and clothing for those of another size. The Radnor Township schools in Wayne, Pennsylvania, also initiated a rubber garment exchange (Sones, 1942): a clearinghouse for outgrown galoshes, rubbers, and raincoats for redistribution to smaller children. In Bentley, Pennsylvania, former second-grade teacher Ellen H. Kitler (1942) provided a detailed outline to help teachers initiate similar rubber exchanges, and she included a sample letter to parents explaining the purpose of the exchange and suggesting ways to care for rubber clothing and galoshes.

In many of the nation's schools, educators approached instruction about the economics of rationing through extremely practical, yet varied methods. Principal Ella S. Beall (1943) of Baltimore's Betsy Ross School No. 68 reported, "Several classes were very much interested in the rationing program of the country....They set up stores in their classrooms, made play ration books, and practiced making purchases using both money and the correct stamps and point values. The care of shoes and clothing was stressed" (p. 24). School No. 122 in New York City was featured in the article "Studying Food Rationing" in the June 1943 issue of Grade Teacher. Four photographs depicted students in their school store explaining the point system, removing coupons from ration books, and selecting foodstuffs.

The second-grade class of Glenn Morris (1943) determined to help the war effort in another manner. A photograph of parachutes and a class discussion about the number of women's stockings needed to make one parachute prompted a decision to study nylon and silk. The children agreed to save enough stockings to make a parachute and to learn more about paratroopers and conservation. Although the results of the class project were not reported, the stated objectives of the unit likely promoted sensible patriotism, enriched character training, and helped students develop teamwork skills. Luella Herbst, a second-grade teacher at the Irving School, Bozeman, Montana, organized a grocery store in her classroom. Ration points were displayed clearly for all foods, and students used facsimiles of ration books to buy and sell grocery items. The aim of the project, to realize patience and cooperation, was apparent in the two accompanying photographs (Pletsch, 1944).

An article entitled "Milkweed in the War," appearing in the September 1944 issue of Grade Teacher, described an unusual collection drive stemming from the government's request that children assist in gathering milkweed fiber, to be used as a substitute for kapok in life
jackets and aviator's suits. Supply lines for kapok importation from Java had been blocked by Japanese forces, and milkweed was found to be a suitable replacement. The article provided useful information about how to find, recognize, collect, dry, and store milkweed pods, and contained several photographs, including one of students from a school in Belmont County, Ohio, displaying their collection. Collection stories from three schools in Utah and Michigan were also presented. At an Indian training school in northwest Utah, students collected enough milkweed to make 50 life jackets, and at a school in Michigan, students achieved their goal of collecting enough floss to supply a life jacket for every member of the armed forces from their community. Another Michigan school held a milkweed picnic, and harvested enough pods to buy school supplies, war bonds, and gifts for the Red Cross.

Collection drives went hand in hand with conservation studies. Lillian O. Bahr (1943), sixth-grade teacher at State Teachers College in Eau Claire, Wisconsin, described one curricular unit on the effect of the war on farming, industry, and home life. Class members studied the history of farming, factors that affect farming, and ways that the war had changed farming. Study of one local industry, an egg powder plant, added to the educational inquiry into commerce and new technology. A segment on home life followed. Typical activities included reading books and reporting on farm duties, discussing scarcity of labor and raised prices, studying two nearby plants converted for defense work, and visiting a farm. Bahr claimed that these activities effectively helped children adjust their daily living to the requirements of war.

Another conservation unit prepared by Paul Hensarling, principal of Franklin Elementary School in Port Arthur, Texas, suggested topics for discussion and research, practice, and creative activities. All 1,500 children in his school participated in discussion groups, which included topics such as: care of personal belongings; thrift measures to be taken at home and at school; and ways to save school supplies, money, and scrap for the war effort. Students also practiced thrift by conserving paper, keeping a scrap box, using old newspapers, and harvesting a victory garden. Creative activities included writing plays and poems, making scrapbooks of newspaper clippings, and making conservation posters.

As supplies became scarce, enlivened attention was drawn to the nation's natural resources. When oil, gas, rubber, coal, and agricultural products were rationed, some teachers planned units of study to highlight shortages and the necessity of civilian rationing. Curricular guides such as "The Study of Coal" (Watrous, 1945), for example, provided teachers with useful information about the properties of coal, coal mining, and uses for coal. Two pages of photographs accompanying the informational narrative depicted the safety features of a Pennsylvania coal miner's uniform, anthracite miners, and the
transportation of coal by rail. Teacher Esther Z. Schwartz (1943, 1945) wrote two articles promoting the conservation of rubber. She described several practical applications initiated by her students' study of rubber production and synthetic rubber. These included mending torn items and repairing bicycle tires—certainly matters within the children's experiences. Several topics generated for discussion included the cost of producing rubber, the prospects for post-war production, and the growing use of plastics as a substitute.

In the midst of the war, teachers were asked to enforce strict school rules concerning care of school equipment and supplies. Since "much of school play apparatus and equipment is made from priority materials" (Peavy, 1943, p. 58), teachers were advised to teach regular lessons about the proper care of play equipment and supplies, as well as concern for the care of articles of personal clothing made from priority materials.

Schoolchildren embraced difficult economic hardships with vigor, and their teachers encouraged them to understand the basic reasons necessitating rationing. Indeed, some planned elaborate projects to teach their students about the larger national economy. Wartime inflation was surely on teachers' minds, but little evidence indicates that elementary schoolchildren studied this phenomenon. In fact, only one article advocated teaching children more about inflation than the basic principles and practices of food, gas, and clothing rationing. James E. Mendenhall (1945), chief of educational services for the Office of Price Administration, compared inflation during World War I with that of World War II (97 percent during World War I as compared to 29 percent—held in check by government price controls—during World War II), and encouraged teachers to continue lessons and projects related to rationing and price controls.

Civics Education and Community Service

At the start of the war, the elementary school social studies curriculum featured a formal program of study about family, school, and community. Reflecting Hanna's (1987) "expanding environments" schema, this curricular organization introduced children to topics believed meaningful to them in their early years. World War II precipitated a small change in emphasis by creating a desire for children to go beyond simply learning about their surroundings and instead offer service to their families and communities as part of their civic duty.

Elementary educators conceived of civic duty in various ways; for example, principal Maud Frothingham Roby (1943) wrote, "Our responsibility lies largely in strengthening the home front" (p. 267). Roby believed that teachers should encourage students to assume "their
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share of the responsibility in the home for the care of younger children, for household duties, and the running of errands” (p. 268). M. Flavia Taylor (1943), a social studies teacher at Hamilton Junior High School in McKees Rocks, Pennsylvania, interpreted home responsibility in this way: Primary schoolchildren should help with work at home to free their parents for wartime duties, and should be obedient so that their parents and other adults could conduct their responsibilities efficiently. In Baltimore, Maryland, teachers were advised by assistant superintendent Mary A. Adams (1942) to emphasize that “the people of Baltimore must adjust effectively to the changes resulting from the tremendous impact of the war program of this city” (p. 14). For elementary students, this meant engaging in home and family duties: understanding the increased work responsibilities of their parents and helping at home with arrangements for blackouts and safety. Similarly, J. Edward Bond (1942) stressed home safety and preparedness as a part of civic responsibility.

New York University Center for Safety Education instructor H. Louise Cottrell (1942) also emphasized several civilian defense duties in a unit of study. She encouraged her elementary students to oversee the preparation of first aid kits for air raid shelters and to learn blackout procedures for their homes. Cottrell provided checklists for home safety inspections as well as lists of foods that could be gathered for use during an emergency. Daisy Parton, an education professor at the University of Alabama, also promoted the social nature of civic and community education. She proposed providing children with various work and group living experiences such as “raising and caring for animals, cultivating flowers and vegetables, arranging and caring for materials in the classroom, making and keeping the surroundings clean and attractive, collecting needed salvage, preparing and serving food, selling wanted articles, conserving materials and property, and caring for and helping younger children” (p. 162). She suggested that students be, not simply study, community helpers. Perhaps the frankest explanation for involving elementary children in home, school, and community activities was offered by supervising principal Harold A. Shaterian (1943): “War activities...provide an opportunity for developing good public relations....[E]lementary schools can be the link between the school and all the people, for it is the elementary school which reaches the greatest number of parents in the community” (p. 34).

A regular feature in American Childhood, “Lessons in Social Studies,” focused on personal responsibility (Hanthorn, 1942). One issue included the following lesson for children to read aloud:

Our country is at war.
That means there is danger.
We boys and girls are brave.
We can obey orders.
We can look after ourselves.
We know just what to do.
And we will do it.
Mother does not have to look after us.
We will help little children, too.
We can take responsibility (p. 5).

Teachers were also encouraged to lead discussions of suggested topics: 'I Play in Safe Places', 'How I Help Care for My Little Sister', and 'Soldiers Obey Orders'. According to Hanthorn, "When a child has honestly mastered some selfish impulse and replaced it with an act of obedience, much has been accomplished toward real citizenship" (p. 5).

Community service endeavors were a tangible means by which children could assist in their immediate surroundings. In doing so, boys and girls undoubtedly helped to keep morale at home high through their enthusiasm. Their community projects reminded the larger society to remain positive, enthusiastic, and active in conservation and defense savings efforts. Service to the community was understood clearly to promote good citizenship.

Loyal Americans: Citizenship Education

Much attention was accorded the symbolic aspects of patriotism in citizenship education during the war years. 'Our Flag', for example, a patriotic unit of study, was created by Sylvia Stark and Velma H. Omer (1943). Citing high interest created by the children's victory campaign work as an impetus, the social studies teachers planned and implemented the unit, which identified several objectives:

- To make better citizens of our youth and to instill the respect due our flag.
- To present the history of our flag, the origin of Flag Day, and the meaning of the flag's stars, stripes, and colors.
- To know correct form in using and displaying the flag.
- To learn more about how to respect our flag.
- To learn the "Pledge of Allegiance" and the "American's Creed."
- To learn national and patriotic songs and their meaning to our country (p. 36).

A wide assortment of activities helped achieve the unit objectives: a field trip to an army camp to witness a flag ceremony and to a state historical museum to view different flags; a display of library books about the flag; and a collection of flags brought from home by students. Additionally, children were encouraged to make posters showing the
proper display of the flag; to write original poems and stories; to listen
to stories about the flag; to learn various patriotic songs; and to make
scrapbooks displaying their work. Provided, too, were unit culminating
activities that included a patriotic pageant, a 25-item test, and two
bibliographies for both teachers and children.

Patriotic pageants and plays regularly appeared in journals for
elementary school teachers, and their number and sense of urgency
increased as the war progressed. Dramatic presentations took on a
variety of themes ranging from appreciation of the nation’s forebears to
support of the war effort through conservation and selling war stamps.
One play, *The Women of the Revolution* (Coffin, 1943), was
particularly unusual for its portrayal of women. In another case,
teacher Eleanor Fleming (1943) allowed her Miss America character to
convey changing attitudes in *We Who Serve*. Miss America opened the
play with conviction: “Only a few months ago, I was a symbol for peace
and harmony. Now I stand for strength and preparedness” (p. xx?).

Elementary social studies teachers found ways other than the
production of plays to help their students learn lessons of good
citizenship. Many asked children to copy wartime sentiments and
information during seatwork time. Some of these quiet lessons appeared
regularly in *The Instructor* and their themes often were related to the
war or to traits of exemplary citizens.

Patriotic activities that encouraged good citizenship and good
character development were considered extremely important to the
maintenance of high civilian morale during the war years. Social
studies teachers enjoyed an enthusiastic, supportive audience eager to
aid the nation’s fighting soldiers. Lesson planning most likely included
regular discussion of war themes in daily activities such as flag rituals
and patriotic songs and in large, ambitious projects such as salvage and
scrap campaigns, war bond and war stamp sales, victory gardens, and
pageants. Important lessons such as understanding democratic life and
the interdependence of citizens in a democracy were included in large
units of study. Just as important, however, were the seemingly minor
rituals of learning patriotic songs, doing patriotic seatwork, and
learning to work together on group projects.

*Geography: A Renewed Emphasis in the Social Studies*

"On December 7, 1941, America discovered geography," claimed
G. David Koch (1944), assistant professor of geography at Indiana
State Teachers College (p. xx?), reporting a renewed interest in
geography studies as the global war accelerated. William S. Miller
(1944) noted that just before and since Pearl Harbor, the demand for
world globes had “exceeded the ability of all globe factories to meet
requirements” (p. 25). Of course, experts realized that public interest in
geography resulted largely from personal interest in the course of the war and was related to concern about the welfare of loved ones and acquaintances. Yet even with increased interest among Americans in location or place geography, some critics believed that Americans faced a great challenge, even a crisis in preparing for postwar needs (Miller, 1944, p. 25). Koch (1944) stormed that “the people of the United States are geographically illiterate” (p. 32). He was joined in his battle cry by W. M. Gregory (1943) of the School of Education at Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, who said, “Our common knowledge of foreign affairs upon which to build any policy is close to nil” (p. 474).

Geography was touted widely as a basic necessity for impending peacetime needs. Monica H. Kusch (1942), a teacher in the Washington School of Chicago Heights, Illinois, stressed that to make a lasting peace and a fruitful present students “must know the conditions existing in all regions of the world. They must know the geography of the whole world” (p. 25). Many experts sought a metamorphosis of existing static geography courses to an active study concerning uses of the environment in addition to the generally understood matters of names, places, directions, regions, and climates. Koch (1944), assistant professor of geography at Indiana State Teachers College, asked that future geography instruction concern itself with “all these features, both cultural and physical, which affect man’s [sic] adjustments to his natural surroundings” (p. 32). To help achieve this metamorphosis, the use of essential geographic tools, including globes, geo-political maps, textbooks, motion pictures, posters, charts, and pictures was emphasized (e.g., Gregory, 1943). Thomas M. Gilland (1943), principal of Noss Laboratory School at State Teachers College in California, Pennsylvania, cautioned teachers to be thoughtful and discriminating in their use of newspapers, periodicals, books, and items from radio broadcasts and moving pictures because of potential inaccuracies that might exist in those materials.

During the prewar years, geography was taught chiefly in elementary schools and was characterized by attention to place names. Wartime changes to education apparently included recognition of deficiencies in the scope of place geography (many parts of the world had been studied too little and superficially—e.g., the Far East and Africa) and acknowledgment of the relegation of school geography to the elementary school level. Thus, the wartime argument for increased geography study called for (a) more substantial learning about place, environmental, and historical geography and (b) expansion of geography teaching to high school and college levels. The “journey geography” concept of introducing different countries into social studies education through stories about children living in various places continued somewhat during this period.
During World War II, the publication *Grade Teacher* featured geography instruction in more than 20 articles. Not surprisingly, only Allied nations were discussed. A new section, "Modern Objective Tests," was introduced that focused on a different country in each issue. *The Instructor* carried geography related articles in almost every issue from December 1941 through April 1945, and *Social Education* published several articles about Latin America. Even *The Harvard Educational Review* included six geography related articles from 1943 to 1945.

The Air Age was a recurrent theme in World War II era textbooks. Early in the war, *Human Geography for the Air Age* (Renner, 1942) emphasized the wholeness of geography as a result of air transportation, and cautioned against unsequenced instruction. By 1943, discussions of the war began surfacing in geography textbooks. *Exploring Our World* (Barnes & Beck, 1943), for example, included a short paragraph about the war in its chapter about Japan. Chapters eight and nine of *Toward New Frontiers of Our Global World* (Englehardt, 1943) also discussed the first "air war." In *Making the Goods We Need* (Hanna, Quillen, & Sears, 1943), one chapter was devoted to description of an airplane factory and the construction of aircraft. Written to foster self-direction, cooperation, creativeness, social sensitivity, and critical thinking, this chapter highlighted "the new quick air routes developed during wartime" (p. 265). A segment in *This Global World* (Hankins, 1944) examined the development of air travel as it related to the war, and by 1944, several texts were published with specific emphasis upon the war. *Nations Beyond the Seas* (Atwood & Thomas, 1944) provided a "war supplement" of 21 pages. *Our Air-Age World: A Textbook in Global Geography* (Packwood, Overton, & Wood, 1944) devoted the second of eight parts to "The United States in a Global War," and a very primary look at World War II and its causes was included in *Our Country's Story* (Cavanagh, 1945):

In some parts of the world, millions of men, women, and children were not free. During World War II, German and Japanese soldiers marched into one country after another. When a country was conquered, the people had to do whatever the soldiers told them. If they did not obey, they might be killed. "We shall conquer the earth," the leaders of the soldiers bragged. "Everyone else in the world will be our slaves." Then the Americans knew that they would have to fight again for freedom (pp. 68-69).

Fortunately, most textbooks did not share such a narrow view of the world crisis and the causes for World War II.
During World War II, social studies in elementary schools emerged as a prominent curricular field. Between 1941 and 1945, it enjoyed activity and utility previously unparalleled in importance. The war years heightened attention to geography, history, and citizenship education and expanded the range and scope of these subjects. Energized by national attention on the international events of the war, elementary students gained information previously unknown before the air age and benefited from enhanced geography and history study improved by the popular interest in war locations and causes. Victory and defense savings campaigns initiated by the United States government but often implemented by social studies teachers were overwhelmingly successful. Called into service to collect scrap, sell bonds and stamps, conserve resources, and maintain good citizenship traits and high morale, social studies students and their teachers joined the nation’s citizenry to work for victory.
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Abstract
The present article is an examination of recent social studies literature. The author describes the liberal-progressive roots of social studies education, and argues that the mainstream literature of the field has largely ignored such origins, reflecting instead the sociopolitical climate of the nation. In the 1950s and again in the 1980s, calls for school reform were based upon traditional conceptions of history and standards-based learning grounded in conservative thinking; these shifts toward conservative orientations, however widespread at the time, are viewed largely as interruptions in the general long term trend toward progressivism in the social studies.

In the quarter century since 1970, much of the mainstream literature in social studies education has illustrated a shifting emphasis from moderately progressive to significantly traditional orientations. These shifts are parallel to and somewhat behind a similar conservative shift in the sociopolitical climate of the nation. Although not precise terms, conservative and liberal can serve to identify diverse social views; progressive and traditional can separate educational views.

Social studies is grounded in liberal-progressive orientations, a view that one would expect to be reflected often and debated regularly in the literature of the field. Among other interests, a liberal-progressive orientation stimulates examination of highly divergent and radical social, political, economic, and educational views. Given the progressive roots of social studies, one would expect a diversity of views to be represented extensively in the literature. This article is a review of a selected segment of that literature in light of these expectations.

The essay form, as opposed to standard academic prose, allows increased opportunity for personal views, however arguable, without a
more formal presentation and extensive citations of other works. Although substantial scholarship exists to support most of the general views expressed here, citations of that work are few, while there are many citations of the reviewed literature. It should be noted also that ideas, themes, and issues do not sort themselves out neatly according to a simple chronology. This review addresses a small selection of publications that I consider important or illustrative of social studies literature from 1970 to the present, but it is cast within a larger context and longer time frame than those few decades.

A Context: Progressive Roots of Social Studies

The social and historical contexts of social studies education can be obscured in the specific debates over school curriculum and instruction that often occur in the literature; ideological context also can be ignored by focusing on specific examples. Despite these faults, there are areas of strong interest in linkages among social studies and larger ideas.

Meanwhile, scholars continue to dispute the exact roots of social studies. One widely reported contention is that the field arose out of a tradition of history teaching and out of the interests of progressive historians at the beginning of the twentieth century. More recent scholarship suggests that social studies developed out of social welfare literature in the nineteenth century and is linked to social issues rather than to a specific discipline. The orientation of the early authors in social studies literature, however, is not as disputed, drawn most often from the progressive side of history and social study. Lybarger (1991) noted, "It is difficult to detach the development of social studies from progressive education" (p. 12), and he presents an interesting historical analysis of early social studies that cites the link between the famous 1916 report on social studies and the earlier ideology of charity organizations and social settlements.

The 1902 bulletin of the Columbia University Settlement House, where Thomas Jesse Jones was acting headworker, was subtitled "Social Studies," a fact that suggests this term was used much earlier than in the work of the 1916 committee, and that it was related to social welfare progressive views far earlier than its more popularly known relationship to the traditional history establishment. Saxe (1992a, 1992b) argued that social studies has deeper roots in social welfare than is recognized in the standard literature.

The social welfare liberal root represents more progressive dimensions of the social studies. Examples of such ideas include open student inquiry into social and ethical issues, increased academic freedom for teachers and students, critical examination of values and value conflicts, and emphasis on participatory democratic discussion and action, whereas traditionalist ideas emphasize studying history
uncritically, learning particular information and skills as determined by traditional academic scholars or patriotic groups, instilling prescribed values and behaviors, decreasing concern with academic freedom for teachers and students, relying upon externally determined standards and testing, and imparting a recognition of and submission to traditional authority.

Concern for students, critical examination of human issues, and teacher freedom rather than concern for the accumulation of information and a passive acceptance of national values is the progressivism that would be expected in the literature of social studies over the past 25 years; however, that same progressive rooting makes social studies an obvious target for conservative school reformers in any period. In the late 1980s, social studies again came under severe attack by those who wanted a return to traditional historical study.

Conservative and liberal social orientations and related educational reforms are relatively cyclical. In this field, however, the long term general thrust is toward increasingly democratic ideas and liberalism and conservative setbacks are in the main periodic interruptions (see de Ruggiero, 1959; Nelson et al., 1972; Nelson et al., 1993). Changes in viewpoint are related to the political economy of the times, and the literature of each period contains undercurrents where the opposing camp seeks support. Much of each period’s literature represents the contemporary mainstream: some feature an attachment to golden eras, and some portend coming changes in the social or educational climate. The literature of social studies education also contains elements that foreshadow coming changes.

Major Social Studies Literature: The Issue of Diversity of Views

The literature of the social studies should be far ahead of practice, more searching in its breadth and depth than what exists in practice, and more intellectual in the best sense of examining diverse ideas. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) journal Social Education was founded in the 1920s with some assistance from the American Historical Association (AHA). Although the AHA had long before ceased co-sponsorship and involvement, the journal credited both associations on its cover until the 1970s. The majority of social studies teachers, other than those at the elementary school level, are history majors, and history remains the most taught subject within social studies. There is, then, a natural interest in history education in social studies, but that interest is not necessarily limited to traditional or nationalistic history. The progressive roots of the field would suggest broader and more diverse possibilities.

Nonetheless, Social Education contains little evidence of the exploration of widely diverse ideas beyond the moderate right to
moderate left spectrum related to either social or educational topics. This is surprising since social studies is the most logical location for a thoughtful and critical academic examination of the most diverse ideas, an examination intended not to indoctrinate students to radicalism, but to educate them more fully in an intellectual setting. The diversity most often found in the most popular social studies literature is restricted to commonly expressed, fairly moderate to conservative views (e.g., developing geographic skills, topics in history instruction, and standard economics education). More radical ideas are seldom found in the standard, professional social studies literature.

*Social Education* has no pattern of presenting highly divergent ideas from radical or critical literature in social studies, history, or the social sciences; for example, radical views of educational reconstructionists have direct and obvious implications for social studies education, and one would expect to find significant debates about reconstructionist ideas from the 1930s forward. Surprisingly, Stanley's (1981a, 1981b) careful examination of the impact of 1930 to 1950s reconstructionist educational thought on social studies literature (including an examination of 20 years of *Social Education*) revealed that mainstream social studies journals and texts essentially ignored the movement. Although social studies would appear to be the central school subject regarding reconstructionist education, that idea was not examined in the professional social studies literature of the time.

From 1970 to the present, radical critiques of society and education from within and outside the social studies field arose in much of the educational literature, and these ideas were also essentially ignored in *Social Education*. Provocative challenges provided by radical views had an important impact upon theoretical and scholarly publications in the field of education and in some social studies education publications as well, but appear to be a minor and unnoticed diversion in the literature most readily available to classroom teachers. More recent radical or divergent critical views that have special pertinence for social studies (e.g., Apple, 1979, 1982; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1985; Cherryholmes, 1988; Giroux, 1988; Pinar, 1988; Whitson, 1988; Stanley, 1992) also do not appear in *Social Education*, although they have appeared in *Theory and Research in Social Education* and often in a variety of other journals outside the social studies mainstream. This omission represents a serious intellectual limit on what social studies teachers are likely to read about their field.

**Examples of Relatively Progressive Social Studies: The 1970s**

Although *Social Education* has virtually no record regarding the publication of highly divergent or radical views of social studies, the journal did carry many articles during the 1970s that could be classified as relatively progressive.
as progressive. Shirley Engle, the progressive social educator who had argued persuasively that decision making and social criticism should form the cores of social studies, was president of NCSS in 1970. The January 1970 issue of Social Education featured a panel presentation (Mendlovitz et al., 1970), "Are National Self-Interest and World Peace Incompatible?" that included such progressive scholars as Saul Mendlovitz (Institute for World Order), Richard Barnet (Institute for Policy Studies), Harold Lasswell (professor of politics and law at Yale University), and Eugene Rabinowitch (editor of Bulletin of Atomic Scientists). The book review section of that same issue included an essay review by Fairfield (1970), a progressive activist historian, that examined books addressing the Vietnam era of student revolution and the response of the conservative establishment.

In the March 1970 issue of Social Education, Hertzberg (1970) argued for a progressive model of time and an approach to teacher education focused on continuing analysis of the student subculture. Carlson (1970), in a review of Postman and Weingartner’s Teaching as a Subversive Activity, noted that Hunt and Metcalf (1968) as well as Oliver and Shaver (1966) had earlier made the same progressive points, only better, in social studies literature. The April 1970 issue contained reports from that year’s NCSS annual meeting, where resolutions were passed: to establish a committee on racism and social justice, to endorse the 1940 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement on academic freedom and tenure, to encourage the U.S. government to withdraw troops from Vietnam, and to support voter rights for 18-year-olds. A revised academic freedom report also was published as NCSS policy. The May issue featured a highly unusual article by the radical scholar, Staughton Lynd (1970), in which he argued for the study of radical history.

Social Education commemorated the 50th anniversary of NCSS in its June 1970 issue with an article by Barth and Shermis entitled “Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions,” followed by a response by Barr (1970) that outlined the conservative form of citizenship transmission as a common tradition. In the same issue, Lewis Paul Todd, the editor of Social Education for its first two decades and coauthor with Merle Curti of a very popular U.S. History textbook, quoted Henry Adams and Alfred North Whitehead on the inertness of traditional education and the defects of specialization. Todd argued that social studies courses have “been among the most flagrant offenders in this regard” (1970, p. 773). In that same commemorative issue, Engle (1970) noted the conflict between traditionalist and progressive social studies arguing for NCSS to become more active in establishing social studies as a comprehensive subject well beyond the limits of single academic disciplines.
These illustrations suggest that much of the flavor of the social studies literature in the most popular journal at the beginning of the 1970s was on the progressive side, although not far removed from the mainstream. The same cannot be said for articles published in *The Social Studies*, another popular journal, at the same time. Ignoring the intense debates about the Vietnam War and massive social protests, *The Social Studies* maintained a traditionalist focus on the teaching of history and related subjects. Each issue in 1969 and nearly all the issues in 1970 and 1971 featured articles on the teaching of U. S. History. In 1971, there was a minor shift toward discussions of inquiry, international studies, and law-related education, but the emphasis remained fixed on the study of history, especially U.S. history.

For examples of more progressive social studies literature in the 1970s, the work of Lawrence Metcalf, published outside of mainstream journals, is instructive. The Progressive Education Association faded out during the 1950s and Metcalf was been the last editor of the association's journal. He also co-authored the most soundly argued and provocative college methods textbook in social studies teaching, and earned a reputation among the progressive leaders of the time, even in the McCarthy and post-Sputnik period when traditionalism was increasing (Hunt & Metcalf, 1955, 1968). Furthermore, Metcalf’s editorship of the 1971 NCSS yearbook on value analysis, despite its overly technical approach to the topic, suggested a return of social issues and values education to the center of social education.

The broad social studies interest in the examination of values was also evident in Douglas Superka’s doctoral dissertation, which he used as a source for the *Values Education Sourcebook* published by the Social Science Education Consortium (Superka, 1976). Superka’s philosophical analysis of the rationales and forms of values education proposed for social studies identified nine distinct types, and illustrated teaching materials developed for five of them, suggesting the widespread interest and diversity of efforts in the examination of these issues in the classroom. Values education became a significant part of the social studies discourse of the time (Ferguson & Friesen, 1974; Fraenkel, 1973; Galbraith & Jones, 1976; Kohlberg, 1968/1970; Purpel & Ryan, 1976; Raths, Harmin, & Simon, 1966; 1978; Simon, Howe & Kirschenbaum, 1972).

The variety of forms presented, the ideological differences explored, and the debates that occurred in the literature suggest a more progressive orientation to values study in social studies than that proposed during the traditionalist character education effort of the 1930s. But strong conservative reaction to values study in schools arose in the 1970s, and the result was a significantly diminished interest in values questions in the 1980s. The right-wing reacted against an openness in values education that permitted students to examine political, family,
and personal values fostered the uncritical character education, American or family values, or “Just Say No” and abstinence only values education programs currently advocated as part of the conservative agenda for schools. This agenda and the surge in efforts by fundamentalist religion groups to control education have not been addressed adequately in current social studies literature.

Shifting to the More Traditional: The 1980s

The articles that appeared in Social Education during 1980 suggest that interest in debates over knowledge, issues, and dynamic social studies education had diminished since 1970. In 1980, the interest in traditional subject teaching with some incursions into issues and some examination of the nature of the field was stronger; the January 1980 issue featured a simulation game on economics. In February, 1980, Fay Metcalf (unrelated to Lawrence Metcalf), who later became executive director of the very traditional National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, edited a special issue of Social Education on “The Textbook as a Teaching Tool” (Metcalf, 1980). The March issue was devoted to the People’s Republic of China and the then new college entrance examination on China. The April issue featured “Teaching About the Energy Crisis.” The May issue examined social studies through a report on the SPAN Project and a progressive article by Gross and Tynneson (1980) entitled “Regenerating Social Studies,” in which the authors argued for an integrated curriculum. In October the issue featured a focus on teaching American history, including an article stressing “The Importance of Teaching Facts” (McKenzie, 1980). The November/December issue contained a spirited discussion on the SPAN Report with rejoinders by several notable social educators. There was slight agreement among this group that the social studies curriculum was considered dull and boring by students, repeated history too often, and was poorly organized around separate subjects with few interconnections. With a few exceptions, a different and more traditionalist tone in the social studies literature prevailed in Social Education during the early 1980s.

Changes in editorship obviously influence the topics published in journals and emphasized in the literature; for example, Charles Rivera’s term as editor of Social Education was marked by his efforts to bring more challenging ideas and critical works into the discourse. During his editorship, the one issue that included articles by more radical scholars such as Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, Philip Wexler, Cleo Cherryholmes, and William Stanley appeared (Social Education, 1985). Similarly, a change in editorship for The Social Studies, after Byron Massialas and some colleagues took a more active role, shifted the editorial interests to more progressive issues concerning the field. By the
late 1980s, *The Social Studies* had become one of the journals in the field most noted for its attention to social issues. A similar shift toward consideration of more progressive social studies occurred in the *International Journal of Social Education* after it had emerged from its regional status as the journal of the Indiana Council for the Social Studies. The editorship of John Weakland and the work of James Barth in organizing articles and special issues of significant intellectual interest to the field helped to transform this journal into one that thoughtful social educators at any grade level should read. *Social Education*, however, remains the main journal of readership by social studies teachers.

**Literature for Practicing Social Studies Educators**

*Social Education* properly exhibits a strong concern for ideas of interest to practicing social studies teachers. What practitioners desire and need, however, is subject to interpretation. This does not imply that the interests of practicing social educators are atheoretical or nonintellectual; however, one can sense this belief in some mainstream journals, and it is a view commonly expressed in the field.

In a provocative article based on C. P. Snow’s conception of science and humanities, Leming (1989) argued that the social studies field consists of two cultures: practitioner teachers and theorist professors, who do not communicate with each other well because of ideological differences. Leming’s own ideological view was identified more clearly in a later work (1992a) in which he argued that liberalism, which he claimed to be the professoriate ideology, is responsible for many social and educational problems, and that social studies should return to conservatism for revitalization. Parker’s response (1992) and Leming’s rebuttal (1992b) show that divergent cultures and ideologies exist within the professor camp. Wade (1992) also noted defects in Leming’s argument: the narrow and stultifying purposes that Leming’s ideas hold for social education, and the limiting and ultimately self-defeating nature of conservatism in social studies. I agree with Wade and Parker; a field focused backward, on restating common and traditional practice is a moribund field that is short lived. Liberal views offer a dynamic field open to debate and change, presenting a full range of possibilities in the social studies literature whether practitioner or theoretician.

Obviously, the exchange of diverse ideas across a broad spectrum is not limited to professors only. Good practitioners at all levels appreciate diversity and intellectual challenge, and their published writings reflect this. Classroom teacher and supervisor William Wraga (1993) contributed a compelling and intellectually thorough examination of interdisciplinary social studies that followed a progressive-liberal concept of knowledge. William Fernekes, another teacher and
department head, has published several articles of theoretical and critical value to the field (e.g., Fernekes, 1987). Wraga and Fernekes are, by definition, practitioners.

I believe that there are more than two cultures in the field and that the split may not be so much in grade level as it is along a spectrum from right-wing traditionalist to left-wing progressive, with individual members of the teacher-practitioner and the professor-theoretician groups falling in various locations. My colleagues in colleges and in elementary and secondary schools differ not so much by where they teach, but by how they think and what they value—their ideologies. Good social studies teachers at every level need and desire intellectual stimulation and challenge; teachers must take their roles as transformative intellectuals more seriously (Giroux, 1985).

The essential point of this discussion of ideologies in the field is that social educators deserve legitimate and clear discussions of diverse ideas. As Palonsky (1986) discovered in his pioneering ethnographic study of life as a social studies teacher in a contemporary high school, little in the school setting enhances the intellectual interests of teachers, and much confounds or restricts it. Teachers must try to overcome these stifling conditions. Strong professional journals offering divergent ideas provide teachers with a rich opportunity to pursue intellectual and practitioner interests.

Establishment of CUFA and Additions to the Literature

Starting in 1965, despite a reluctance on the part of the executive officers of the NCSS, an affiliated organization later known as the College and Faculty Assembly (CUFA) was organized. Efforts to establish a separate publication for CUFA were frustrated for several years by promises that Social Education would be sufficient to meet the needs and interests of college-level faculty. Finally, in 1973, CUFA published the first issue of Theory and Research in Social Education (TRSE), under the editorship of Cleo Cherryholmes. TRSE was to become the primary publication for research studies, scholarly works, and more critical literature in social studies. The earliest volumes of the journal showed considerable diversity of topic, research method, ideology, and critique. In addition to publishing many traditional historical, philosophical and statistical studies, TRSE in its current form includes more diversity in terms of ideological and research viewpoints than do other social studies journals of this time.

In the first volume of TRSE, Naylor’s (1973) study regarding educator perceptions of nationalistic education showed that schools have narrow corridors of tolerance for diverse ideas. In the second volume, the editors commented that they wanted to serve multiple scholarly interests and to present works from different ideologies (Cherryholmes,
1974). This indicated an openness to variety and an ideological grounding for TRSE that was to be reflected in succeeding volumes under other editors. The third volume carried a provocative article by van Manen (1975) that challenged the limits of traditional research methodologies in social education and suggested drawing freely from the then newly emerging critical theory in research. In his response in the same issue, Larkins (1975) decried van Manen's use of emotive terms such as critical, oppressive, and emancipatory. In Volume V, Popkewitz (1977) used ideas from the new sociology of knowledge to critique the discipline-based social studies projects of the 1960s. Anyon's (1978) study of ideological orientations in elementary social studies texts illustrates other critical work published in TRSE.

A special issue of TRSE in 1982 featured work on critical theory. In this issue, Shaver (1982) offered a critique of research in social studies and of the positivist dominion of research. Giroux (1982) presented a clear explanation of Frankfort School thought and an argument for a critical theory of social education. Cherryholmes (1982) used the philosophic ideas of Habermas as a framework for criticizing the passivity that characterized social studies education, and argued the need for a new form of classroom discourse.

TRSE has continued to publish diverse works in the field and to encourage literate dispute over social studies ideas (e.g., Leming, 1992a; Parker, 1992; Wraga, 1993; Wade, 1993); however, the TRSE circulation is much smaller than that of Social Education, and its focus is on scholarly work rather than on classroom or school practice. For most social studies teachers, Social Education remains the primary publication in terms of circulation and the chief voice of NCSS. Its orientation is especially significant to the field. My concern is that Social Education should represent more clearly the progressive roots of the field and the diversity of views that good teachers deserve.

A Second Context: School Reform Cycles and the Current Literature

Evidence of a conservative movement in the last 25 years in the literature about society, schooling, and social studies is strong, but this is not the first such movement. The cyclical quality of efforts to reform schools follows changes in the broader society: Progressives challenge rigid and conformist traditional schooling, and increasingly, the public perceives the schools as locations of dreary drudgery where creativity and liberty are stifled (e.g., Dewey, 1916; Holt, 1964). Calls for more progressive reforms follow these public perceptions, and critics of progressive ideas arise and challenge the permissiveness and fluidity of progressive reforms. The public's perception then changes to the view that students are not learning traditional information and that academic,
moral, and behavioral standards are declining (e.g., Bestor, 1953; Rafferty, 1968). More traditional reforms then begin to re-emerge.

In recent times, this cycle of reform is well illustrated by post-World War II reactions to the progressive education movement of the 1930s. In the years between 1947 and 1957, there were many attacks on child centered, permissive, John Dewey-inspired progressive ideas. The media reported student test scores that purportedly demonstrated a decrease in student ability to recall specific historical and geographical information. Permissiveness in school was derided as contributing to crime, bad manners, and morals. Far more ominous, the McCarthy period included attacks on progressive teachers, who were identified as Communist tools posing a threat to American society, causing civil unrest, and undermining American values. The Soviet launching of Sputnik in 1957 increased the public focus on school problems, and critiques of progressivism led to traditionalist reforms.

Fundamental progressive reforms had not actually become standard practice in most public schools before World War II, but in the 1930s and early 40s educators and much of the public believed that progressive educational ideas were superior to traditional schooling. That belief changed as a result of the many attacks on progressive education that appeared following World War II. Consequently, there was a strong and sustained effort to reemphasize traditional discipline, defined by its advocates as formal bodies of knowledge and used as a term to describe the expected behavior for students. The substance of this traditionalist renaissance was reminiscent of the ethos of competitiveness and business efficiency that dominated school administrations in the early 1900s (Callahan, 1962). It ignored quality of school life to concentrate on quantity and on short-term measurable results. This foreshadowed the conservative school reforms of the 1950s and early 1960s and the conservative wave that emerged in the 1980s.

The 1950s and 1960s: A Midcentury Shift to the Right

The 1950s and early 1960s reflected a conservative view of basic education: teaching the disciplines, restricting teachers and students, and establishing behavior and test standards for students. Among the conservative reactions to perceived threats to American values during this period was the first excellence movement in education, which increased reliance on standardized testing and competition among students, expanded authoritarian control of curricula and teachers, and further mechanized schooling with a resultant decline in teacher ability.

In the social studies, advocates of this first excellence movement and its politically conservative agenda called for teaching of uncritical American history and forms of character and citizenship training to counter the perceived threat of Communism. Social studies with its links
to progressivism was accused of being socialistic and social slop. Efforts to abolish social studies in schools followed. Increased study of American history was prescribed as a major antidote, and discipline structures and specific modes of inquiry were reified as the proper models of knowledge (Bruner, 1960; Lowe, 1969). This school reform movement was based largely on the public’s perception that progressivism and permissiveness in schools were responsible for many social problems, a loss of American moral and political values, bad student behavior, the inability of students to recall information, and American weakness in international competition.

The main federally supported effort to control curriculum and teaching in the 1960s included projects that emphasized the use of experts in separate subject matter fields, and were intended to produce teacher-proof materials and increase student test scores. Funds were granted for the production of teaching materials preserving each of the traditional six social sciences as a separate field of study to keep school based social studies teachers from diluting them. Later research in curricular diffusion showed that those discipline based and teacher-proof projects had only a limited short-term classroom impact.

Consequences of Continuous Conservative Attack

The residue from conservative political pressures on schools in that period, however, produced continued erosion of progressive educational ideas. Since 1970, expanded forms of political restraint and externally imposed authority have resulted in further deprofessionalization of teachers. Curricular innovation has diminished, producing an overreliance on defective test scores and sterile textbooks and an increase in the number of deadly boring school climates for students and teachers.

During this period, the shift in the popular professional literature from progressive to traditional was pronounced, and it represents another cycle of conservative public reaction to perceived threats similar to those that occurred during the Red scare period of the 1920s and the McCarthyism and post-Sputnik period of the 1950s. In contrast to the more specific Communist threat upon which earlier twentieth century conservative reactions to progressive schooling were based, the 1970s and 1980s conservative spirit stemmed from the perceived threat of activists involved in antiwar, environmental, student rights, civil rights, feminist, and values education movements, and other challenges to the status quo. The rhetoric of attacks on schools and social studies in the 1980s was not as vituperative in the sense of labeling teachers as willing dupes of Communism, as it was in the 1950s. The 1980s produced concern with worldwide economic and educational competition.
Although the Communist threat had abated, international competition and domestic problems provided renewed grounds to attack schools, and the clamor for rigor and discipline-based schooling appeared. Stanley (1985) noted that the 1980s reform impulse appeared to "place undue emphasis on content mastery, testing, basic skills, and teacher accountability" (p. 1), and he further noted the increasing preoccupation of our society with narrow self-interest and less concern with collective social needs and issues. Like the antiprogressive education rhetoric about excellence that arose before (and found strength after) Sputnik in 1957, the 1980s reform strategy aroused public panic by calling attention to test scores, and reinstituting school and teacher bashing as focal points for a second so-called excellence movement.

The Traditionalist National Social Studies Commission: The 1980s

Despite the popular view that historical study is justified on the grounds that by studying the past we avoid making the same mistakes again, many of the misguided elements of conservative school and social studies reform that occurred in the period between 1950 and 1965 have repeated themselves in the 1980s. The current craze hit a peak in the middle 1980s, after the surprisingly uninformed but amazingly popular 1983 report *A Nation at Risk* appeared, which stated that American schools were in crisis and that those schools had become a serious threat to the United States. More recent and thoughtful reconsideration of the 1980s excellence reforms suggests that the profession and public learned little from our experience with the previous excellence movement.

Solid evidence that American schools were and are much better than the politicians, media, and conservative commentators had suggested is now beginning to surface, despite government and other efforts to suppress those data (see Bracey, 1992; Berliner, 1993; Tanner, 1993; Rothstein, 1993; Jensen, 1994). The fact that schools work better than the conservatives claim does not clearly demonstrate that progressive schooling has worked, since relatively few public schools are fully progressive. It does illustrate, however, the ideological and political manipulation of educational information in documents such as *A Nation at Risk*, and it should make social educators wary of reforms based on scare reports, limited information, and ideas coming from conservative-traditionalist camps.

Similar to *A Nation at Risk* in its ahistorical and ill-informed approach to school reform, *Charting a Course* (1989) was produced by a National Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools. The shallowness and arrogance of this publication is most obvious when contrasted with the thoughtful works of its namesake 1930s commission. The far more progressive 1929 to 1936 Commission on Social Studies produced 16 volumes written by distinguished scholars on topics of
particular importance to social studies e.g., academic freedom, intellectual history, social knowledge, and civic education).

The 1930s commission argued against an imposed or recommended national social studies curriculum and the restrictions of narrow discipline-based social education (Beard, 1932, 1934; Nelson, 1990; Lybarger, 1991). In contrast, Charting a Course (without supporting research or carefully reasoned rationale) denigrated social studies as incoherent, and recommended a national curriculum dominated by traditional history. This 1989 report plotted a conservative and authoritarian return to standard history, with certain commission selected social science disciplines taught under the history rubric. Current social issues were not to be examined by students until the senior year of high school. This was proposed as the national social studies curriculum for the twenty-first century, but it is reminiscent in tone of the nationalistic and uncritical history curriculum of the early twentieth century. The 1980s commission claimed that the social studies curriculum was incoherent presumably because it included too many human issues and diverse views such as global education, law-related education, women’s studies, and multicultural education. Thoughtful critiques of the 1989 proposal noted its many severe deficiencies (see special issue of Social Education, 1990). Fortunately, Charting a Course has been forgotten for the most part.

The one volume produced under the auspices of the 1980s commission (Jenness, 1990) was authored by a social scientist virtually unknown in social studies education but employed by the commission as scholar-in-residence on social studies. The Jenness book was touted as a comprehensive, detailed study of social studies, but it neglected vast amounts of liberal and progressive literature, and completely ignored the existence of the large quantity of radical and critical literature on social studies (Gross, 1991; Nelson, 1991). Among the most frequently mentioned in Jenness were conservative reform figures (e.g., Chester Finn, Diane Ravitch, E. D. Hirsch, Allan Bloom, and Lynne Cheney), who made minor or nonexistent contributions to the social studies field or literature, but who were actively pursuing the conservative reform agenda. Jenness did cite the work of some progressive social educators, but often only in minor references to their works (e.g., Hunt & Metcalf’s (1955, 1968) important methods book was among the vast body of progressive social studies literature ignored in Jenness). More importantly, Jenness provided no citations or explanation of the work of such important progressive and critical social studies scholars as Michael Apple, Jean Anyon, Harold Berlak, Henry Giroux, Cleo Cherryholmes, Jack Fraenkel, Thomas Popkewitz, or William Stanley.

In contrast to the Jenness book, the most comprehensive treatment of social studies appeared in the same period: The Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning, (Shaver, 1991). This volume contains
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53 chapters by separate social studies scholars of varying political and educational ideologies, many of whom are not even mentioned in Jenness. And, again in contrast to Jenness, the handbook contains numerous references to works representing far more diversity, including traditionalist, progressive, and critical orientations.

Despite the weak and filtered coverage of progressive views and the entirely absent coverage of critical views in the national commission volume, after reflection Jenness did note that the "hallmark of good social studies in the schools...is a kind of creative and critical (that is, an evaluative) thoughtfulness" (p. xix). That and other comments in the book indicate that he came to understand better than the 1980s National Commission did that social studies is more important than the simple transmission of separate disciplines under the rubric of history. The 1989 commission report's political and educational bias, although not supported as strongly in the companion Jenness book, is a remnant of the larger conservative movement in the society.

Traditionalism and the NCSS

The traditionalist ideology undergirding the 1989 commission curricular proposal is part of the residual conservative political and educational thinking that still permeates social studies reforms and literature. Among current examples are efforts to implant restrictive national standards calling for increased traditional history instruction. National standards are highly controversial because of the social control and conformity that accompanies them. The current governmental approach to national standards also exhibits lack of a fair playing field to explore what kinds of social studies are best suited to such standards; unfortunately, it supports deadly conformity.

Goals 2000 completely ignores social studies, concentrating on history, geography, and civics. Federal funds are earmarked for national standards in history, a direct reflection of the traditionalist message inherent in Charting a Course and the result of several key persons involved in both efforts. Advocates of other approaches have no access to those federal funds. Early signs indicate that the history standards are just another example of efforts to undermine teachers and restrict student inquiry. Those involved with the center that has been funded to develop national standards in history are gravitating toward a long list of what they consider to be the most important specific historical dates and events. This is likely to produce a highly structured standard curriculum limited to those facts and required for all students, while broader and more active social studies knowledge is ignored.

The NCSS has shown some leadership, albeit late, in trying to influence social studies educators along more progressive lines. The most comprehensive approach to national standards for social studies
was undertaken entirely by NCSS, but that effort has no federal support or standing, and may be overwhelmed by the sheer political and economic power of the history lobby. The NCSS approach provides a social studies umbrella under which many varieties of knowledge and thought can contribute to the well-educated student. During the 1980s conservative reforms in social studies, the NCSS membership did not appear committed to the progressive ideas that are consistent with the roots of the field. It seemed to founder and splinter in response to traditionalist attack, nearly capitulating its leadership of the field by severely limiting the scope of debate over model curricula and by uncritically agreeing to participate on and offering support for the national commission (Nelson, 1993). Criticism of the 1980s conservative-traditionalist school reforms is now increasing; NCSS and the popular professional journals may foreshadow renewed, revised progressivism.

**Conclusion**

This essay review, a very brief examination of selected portions of the social studies literature from 1970 to the present, suggests that periodic political and ideological shifts in society have parallels in the social studies and in social studies literature. The progressive to traditional shift I describe within this period of literature may be questioned by more elaborate or more systematic research, but I will wait for that evidence. I believe that we are now on the verge of a shift toward the more progressive side, and although this has yet to be demonstrated clearly in the most popular journal of the field, it is beginning to emerge in the less popular literature and in some efforts by the NCSS. The long term trend toward more democratic and progressive education has suffered many conservative blows, but a proper assessment requires a longer period of examination.

The social studies field is understandably related to social ideas and orientations, including political, economic, intellectual, historical, and ethical views that have popular credibility in any time period. The social studies allows for an examination of society and social orientations, and it necessarily involves consideration of different contexts and competing ideologies. Indeed, one may wonder why so much of the literature is descriptive or prescriptive, why there is not more diversity and dialectic, and why the progressive roots of social studies are not found in the literature more often.

The progressive root deserves to be a major focus of social education with debate over its evolving nature and its form as the substance of much of the literature over time. Social studies at its best involves integrated knowledge and open inquiry into issues and ideologies; this is consistent with ideas of progressive education. The mainstream political shift to the right should have produced a strong
progressive response in the social studies, but that is not clearly evident in the literature examined. In fact, the less popular social studies journals carried the banner of progressive social studies throughout the conservative reform movement of the 1980s. The most popular professional journal reflected mainstream conservatism and narrow limits in the expression of diverse views. Further, the question remains whether NCSS will respond to traditionalist challenges and fulfill its role as the leading organization for social studies professionals. The current effort by NCSS to reestablish leadership in the field could foreshadow progressive strength in the twenty-first century, but at the moment, that is only an optimistic possibility.
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Abstract
This article is an examination of five early history methods textbooks. The textbooks reviewed here represent an overview of pre-1910 history curricula on a theoretical and developmental level, and offer a different view of history instruction. Historians Barnes and Fling and Caldwell created texts for the general or field market, Channing and Hart for students and teachers in public schools, and Mace and Bourne expressly for normal school and college preservice history teachers. Although Channing and Hart probably best represented and perhaps best captured the flavor of the recommendations made by the Committee of Seven, each of the five texts contributed to the traditional history curriculum by offering their descriptions and explanations of various facets of the overall program.

Introduction

Although social studies or history methods textbooks do not appear to enjoy the same popularity among teachers they once did, methods texts are often a preservice teacher's first contact with social studies teaching. At one time, the methods textbooks in the field most frequently cited (and presumably used) were those by Henry Johnson (1915, 1940), Edgar Bruce Wesley (1937, with numerous revisions), Maurice Hunt and Larry Metcalf (1955, 1968), and Donald Oliver and James Shaver (1966). No social studies methods textbook has emerged since to challenge the authoritative status of these books. In fact, most, if not all, current social studies issues from diversity and
multiculturalism to content focus and interdisciplinarity study are discussed on the pages of these texts.

Johnson (1915, 1940), Wesley (1937), Hunt and Metcalf (1955, 1968), and Oliver and Shaver (1966) represent four different approaches to social studies content and pedagogy: Johnson followed the program and mindset of the Committee of Seven (1899) in advocating a history-centered perspective. As more attention was given to social studies models, Wesley (1937) worked to bridge the growing gap between history and social studies approaches, although his text seemingly did not satisfy either social studies advocates or history-centered supporters. In the 1950s, Hunt and Metcalf became the first to break completely from subject-centered models by focusing instruction based upon controversial issues. Oliver and Shaver went a step further in their focus on public issues. While a study of these disparate, but well known texts would most likely yield important data on curricular matters, this discussion examines five popular history methods textbooks published before the influence of the American History Association (AHA) reached its peak in the 1910s and prior to the advent of social studies models.

In this article, I argue that early texts offer a different perspective on the use of social studies curricula in public schools. While advocates for history-centered instruction have sought to return history studies to what has been claimed as its rightful place in secondary curricula (Bradley Commission, 1987; Ravitch, 1988; Gagnon, 1989), others have sought different models (Banks, 1994; Engle & Ochoa, 1986). I do not intend to determine here whether or not social studies ousted history or if a return to a history-centered approach is more appropriate than a model in which history remains one of many subjects under the rubric of social studies; however, I believe that if educators are concerned about how to present history in schools or how to improve social studies, it may be helpful to examine carefully the nature and practice of history studies before the 1910s, a time when history study existed without any serious competition from other subject area models or paradigms.

Many scholars have added much to our understanding of history teaching from the 1890s to the 1910s through their examination of state and local curricular activities, school history textbooks, and case studies of local schools (Cuban, 1991; Dawson, 1924; Herztberg, 1981; Saxe, 1991; Sewell, 1987), few have considered or explored the nature and practice of history-centered instruction as found in popular history methods textbooks before 1910. Between the publication of the Madison Conference report on "History, Civics, and Political Economy" (National Education Association, 1893) and the release of the AHA's Committee of Seven recommendations in 1898 (McLaughlin et al., 1899), the purpose, content, and methods of teaching history appeared to
become more focused; however, the options for teaching history actually began to widen and diversify. The once dominant, provincial, and religiously driven approaches toward content stood in sharp contrast to history inspired and infused with the new scientific methods.

Although the educational atmosphere was ripe for curricular expansion and the sampling of different models for history teaching, many educators and administrators sought to consolidate and mainstream the growing curricular choices sanctioned by the National Education Association (NEA) Committee of Ten elective system. Following the seminal work of the 1892 Madison Conference (NEA, 1893) effectively introducing the concept of formal history instruction for schools, the AHA’s Committee of Seven (McLaughlin et al., 1899) sought to solidify history’s position in school curricula by proposing an ideal history program, particularly for grades 9 through 12.

The success of the AHA pattern among textbook publishers was so remarkable that Rolla Tryon (1935) claimed that any book failing to conform to AHA standards would have “hard sledding” among school buyers (p. 485). While the new style history textbooks (following AHA requirements) contained many teaching aids for instructors and students, methods textbooks were designed to move beyond these sketchy guidelines. Although the teaching aids made history textbooks appear easily accessible, methods texts were helpful to those teachers who most likely lacked formal training in history and/or pedagogy. Given that formal history instruction for schools was in its infancy and that the problem of ill-prepared or completely unprepared history teachers was readily acknowledged by contemporary educators (Hall, 1880), the upgrading of both history pedagogy and content through new methods texts was a logical step in the campaign to improve history study.

The full influence and significance of methods texts during the early part of the century may never be known, but these texts represent more than a symbolic effort to institutionalize history instruction. During the 1890s and the 1910s, contemporary school surveys suggest that history curricula grew substantially in both enrollment and offerings. By 1916, just as the NEA’s Committee on the Social Studies (Dunn, 1916) presented its program for grades 7-12, history courses associated with AHA recommendations ironically became the accepted

---

1For more on history in secondary schools during this period, see the U.S. Commissioner of Education Annual Report from 1895 through 1916, in addition to studies by William MacDonald (“The Situation of History in Secondary Schools,” The Nation, September 12, 1907); Hugo H. Gold (“Methods and content of courses in history in the high schools of the United States,” School Review, February, March, & April, 1917); and Leonard V. Koos (“History and Other Social Studies,” The Administration of Secondary School Units [Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 1], Chicago: University of Chicago, 1917).
models of history instruction for primary and secondary education (Saxe, 1992). Since history study as a professional university/college activity was relatively new (the AHA was founded in 1884) and since the AHA formalized its ideal secondary history program in 1899, the tremendous growth of history instruction between 1900 and 1916 is nothing less than striking. Still, the effect that the infusion of social studies ideas had on the growth of the suggested (AHA) history curricula even after the 1920s is not clear.

One of the best barometers of the health of the AHA's history curriculum (pre-1910s) might be found in the numerous history textbooks that conformed to the Committee of Seven recommendations. Tryon (1935) claims that all did. History methods textbooks illustrate that other models were also available to teachers. In this light and given the overabundance of inexperienced history teachers, the history methods textbook may have become a very important part of the teacher's library, perhaps the sole source of ideas and inspiration. In addition, methods textbooks may have had a greater influence than the inaugural committee reports on the individual teacher's day-to-day teaching.

Teaching Textbooks of the Traditional History Era

Between 1896 and 1902, five history teaching textbooks were published by American authors for secondary teachers (four immediately preceding the release of the Committee of Seven report, one following): Mary Sheldon Barnes' *Studies in Historical Method*, (1896); Fred Morrow Fling and H. W. Caldwell's *Studies in European and American History* (1897); Edward Channing and Albert Bushnell Hart's *Guide to the Study of American History*, (1896); William H. Mace's *Method in History*, (1897); and Henry E. Bourne's *The Teaching of History and Civics in the Elementary and Secondary School*, (1902). (See Appendix for summary of these texts.)

Collectively, these texts may be viewed on a continuum: Barnes as well as Fling and Caldwell on the left with their source method advocating the direct use of original materials; Mace on the right with guiding principles focused on capturing certain philosophical ideals; and Bourne, Channing, and Hart occupying the center position with interpretations of history closely allied to the rather sedate recommendations of the Committee of Seven, neither specifically calling for source use or the grounding of history study on philosophical principles. The fact that five methods textbooks directly tied to history teaching were published within a very short span for such a limited potential market is a testament to the interest and commitment of placing history in schools during this period.
Mary Sheldon Barnes’ Studies in Historical Method was one of the first teaching textbooks to follow the Madison Conference. Consistent with the concept that teachers should be familiar with a variety of teaching methods, Barnes presented an approach that she developed in earlier school texts, one that required teachers to know and understand a set of aims or goals prior to selecting a proper historical, investigative, and pedagogical method. Barnes’ text was targeted deceptively for the general history teacher population. With clever innuendo, she appealed to those few teachers who had “originality or leisure” or those who were “not so much by nature a student or investigator, but [had] rather the gift of adaptation” (1899, p. 2). This was, of course, an intellectual challenge. Barnes envisioned a future where the history teacher corps would become a viable contributing force in the search for historical truths and knowledge on the same footing as college and university specialists. Unlike earlier history methods texts by G. Stanley Hall (1886) and Burton Hinsdale (1893), which included bleak pictures of the status of history teaching, Barnes’ text was uplifting and inspirational, and above the “treadmill of routine” (1899, p. 2). Although few teachers (not to mention their students) were capable or equal to the task of detailed original source work, Barnes encouraged teachers to explore other learning methods beyond simple memory work.

In presenting the source method, Barnes divided her brief 144-page book into five parts. The first three were devoted to a description of the source method, the fourth to practical applications, and the final section to a detailed bibliography of selected sources. Barnes described the source method as a thorough examination of original sources through the application of systematic tools of analysis. In an earlier teacher’s manual to accompany Studies in American History, Barnes wrote about the source method with great passion. Contrasting it with the narrative method, she argued that “after one has one worked with sources,” a teacher might begin to realize the foolishness of trying to compact “the wisdom of all time in four hundred pages (of student text)” (1892, p. 12).

As an antecedent to the later social studies debate, Barnes attempted to strike a balance among contemporary, ancient, and medieval histories: “We can neither understand the man of the past,” wrote Barnes, “without knowing the man of today, nor the man of today without knowing the man of the past” (1899, p. 43). Barnes understood the major tenet of the traditional history curriculum—chronology. If a school had the resources (primarily a well-stocked library) essential for maximizing original source work, then ideally one could begin in the earliest times of recorded history and work toward the present. If a
school had an inadequate library of ancient or medieval records, then history could not be studied thoroughly from its inception; thus in order to utilize the source method and capitalize on original materials, contemporary sources became the teacher's only option. If contemporary materials were unavailable, then whatever community resources available were to be used exclusively. This reliance on community resources predated later, similar reform views such as those of John Dewey, Thomas Jesse Jones, David Snedden, Clarence Kingsley, Arthur William Dunn, and other social studies advocates.

While the history experts of the committee reports held a broad view of history, they largely excluded the social sciences; Barnes' definition delineated the social sciences as specialties of the discipline. In an eloquent essay published in the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* and reprinted in her textbook, Barnes measured the contributions of the various social sciences as auxiliary subfields of history that provided a fuller picture of the past. Barnes defined history in terms of its relationship to the social unit, declaring that one "studies the progressive personality of a people, as it develops through environment and action into social success or failure" (1895, p. 130). To Barnes, historical facts that made no connection or failed to link the past to the present were simply useless. "Facts to us are dead," she declared, "until they relate themselves to us and our world. This relation of facts to life and the world is what every soul and every generation demands as light upon its pathway" (1899, p. 130). To be viable then, history had to be made relevant to students.

To achieve this, school teachers needed to understand the application of historical pedagogy. According to Barnes, this meant recognizing that original sources contain the individual facts necessary for studying history (1899, p. 144). Barnes asserted that primary sources should be viewed as "the mothers of history, on which all historical narratives and judgments must rest, and to which all historical narratives and judgments must appeal" (1899, p. 8). Specifically, she suggested that teachers begin by outlining the content of history, and including a wide interpretation of the social sciences as auxiliary supports to history. In this context, the content of history would be integrated with the data of social sciences "as the tools with which to work out a destiny, a character, a continuous change for better or worse," and tell "the story of the march [of history], with its goal, its hardship and heroism, its success or failure, its continuity of cause and effect,...not to repeat what [the social scientist] has told, but to relate it" (1899, p. 4).

Barnes argued that history was sometimes literary, sometimes political, and sometimes military. In addition, it involved what people thought, think and feel, and how all human activity "surged
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together" (1899, p. 5). In sorting through the events of the past, she added, the task of the historian is complicated by the trend toward specialization of studies, a trend that has divided the font of all wisdom, the old Greek philosophy, into "a hundred fields of science" and generated "a mass of edited documents, a collection of verified fragments" with which the historian must contend (1899, p. 6). Here lies the most troubling of historical questions: "How, then, [can the historian] work all these fragments into a connected and related whole" (1899, p. 6).

Barnes suggested that the historian create a new form of expression for the popular market that would make history more drama than narrative, something that might have, for example, "a history of Greece...open with a series of pictures which will give us the setting of landscape and town in which the drama plays" followed by Homer, Herodotus, Plutarch, Pericles, Socrates, Plato, and Thucydides "each taking his turn before the audience in his own speech, while page after page of pictures put forth the glories of Greek art" (1899, p. 6). From Public Broadcasting System (PBS) programs such as James Burke's Connections, Jacob Brunowski's The Ascent of Man, and Sir Arthur Clark's Civilization to Ken Burn's The Civil War and Baseball as well as a host of historically founded motion picture productions, we see that Barnes' formula for reconceptualizing the words and pictures of the past abounds.

To utilize the sources of history one must first know their content and second, their location. The raw material records of the ancient past were most likely kept in books and chronicles and, therefore, found in libraries. Other sources, such as artifacts, presented the historian with other problems, primarily their scattered and immoveable status; thus, "to make these sources accessible and intelligible, they must first be collected and studied; we speak, therefore, first of collections, and second of schools" (1899, p. 8). Neither the school teacher nor the college professor could possibly collect and study all the sources of data for an investigation of a person, event, or cause and effect. Barnes acknowledged this but did not see it as problematic. She proposed:

[The worker in sources collects, classifies, dates, and places [the sources], verifies their authenticity, [and] gives them a legible, clean, trustworthy form. The historian then selects such materials as bear on his [sic] own set work; from these, in turn, he chooses the forms most typical and complete, and interprets them with such truth as his own genius and sympathy permit (1899, p. 12).

Notwithstanding the tedious nature of collection, Barnes insisted that the labor of history should consist of examining sources and
“wherever possible, the original investigation of these materials” (1899, p. 11). It is possible, she reasoned, for a student to work through historical methodologies with contemporary and/or local and community resources. This strategy opens the possibility for students to use prepared collections of source materials for those topics beyond immediate capabilities—ostensibly for ancient, medieval, and modern histories—and employ the source method fully to those historical topics within their community resources. Students would then be exposed to a broad chronology of history while contributing to the creation of historical knowledge, seemingly an excellent compromise.

Barnes proposed another type of investigative study that would proceed inductively toward a historical product. She suggested that students be given a mass of historical data to analyze, out of which they could then identify similarities and differences, label data accordingly, and draw inferences through what she called historic sense. Students would “seek to find principles,” argued Barnes, “by observation and comparison of such facts as relate to historic sense” (1899, p. 46). An archeological/anthropological framework provided the best application of this because its historical record consists of continuing commentary that is never final, a type of history that Barnes argued is difficult to achieve. In her view, some historians wrote only of memorable events, while others were highly selective, looking for particular issues to illustrate singular theories; some historians wished to “preserve only what is beautiful, glorious, and striking,” while others waxed morality (1899, p. 55). For Barnes, scientific history (the inductive approach) worked against these competing versions, which tended to produce fixed and sacred accounts of the past that were, in effect, “almost impossible...to change, alter, or add in behalf of what may prove to be the truth” (1899, p. 55).

In contrast to inductive history study, Barnes presented another variant of the source method for teacher consideration—studying history according to a predetermined aim or purpose. To decide the aim most appropriate for a particular study, Barnes directed a series of rhetorical questions at the classroom teacher regarding what history, period, or focus to choose. In order to establish a complementary pedagogical method, Barnes added this commentary:

[O]ur teachers of history, even college professors [need to] ask themselves such fundamental questions as What is history? Why do I teach it? and How can I attain my aim?...If [the teacher] is to guide action and form character, will he [sic] present his history from the sources or from the authorities? Will he try to have his pupils see how things really happened, or will he conceal certain actions and motives as immoral and cowardly, and unbefitting....In
other words, will he have his pupils learn by investigation or by authority? Here, again, aim determines his method (1899, pp. 106-107).

She summarized her answers to these questions simply; teachers should choose history that develops from local and contemporary needs; teach from these sources; train students to form judgments and to recognize these judgments as partial, only to be improved by wider knowledge of the sources from which they are drawn (pp. 109-100).

Barnes asserts that to accomplish these objectives the teacher must first address the "two horns of the dilemma. On one hand, history in the high school must still partake of the nature of general information; on the other, the method of presenting it should be concrete enough to develop a certain amount of historic sense" (1899, p. 132). To ignore information study would most likely leave large voids in a student's overall knowledge of history; however, to ignore historic sense derived through independent inquiry with original sources would perhaps precipitate a greater disaster by not allowing students the chance to make up their own minds.

To resolve the dilemma of passive versus active history study, Barnes struck a compromise: Rather than participate in mundane reading or bland recitations, students should study specific facts from original collections, and draw their own inferences. With original sources, reasoned Barnes, students examining artifacts and other materials would be able to "form their own opinions at the fountainhead of reality before they hear or know the opinions of another" (1899, p. 138). Barnes argued that once students were able to work through the steps toward warranted historical assertions, they would be able to deal better with other interpretations.

Aside from the crucial theoretical concerns, two problems with the application of the source method, both readily acknowledged by Barnes, emerged for educators: (a) given the great cost, how would public high schools obtain adequate history collections; (b) given the specific qualities needed to expose students to the source method, how would public high schools obtain trained history teachers? First, to obtain adequate history collections, Barnes argued that it might be necessary for teachers purchase materials the library didn't own. Second, she argued that administrators need not employ only those educated in "good university seminaries" (1899, p. 44). In sum, for the source method to work, history collections did not have to be extensive and teachers did not have to be university trained.

Notwithstanding practical and theoretical obstacles, Barnes' argument and description of the source method was a valuable contribution to the emerging traditional history curriculum. Although not generally accepted in the mainstream of the traditional history
curriculum, it was considered seriously in some communities because of its emphasis on utilizing local sources.

Fling and Caldwell's *Studies in European and American History*

Fling and Caldwell's 1897 text was a detailed expansion of Barnes' source method. Drawn heavily from the revolutionary Sheldon-Barnes secondary history textbooks as well as other writings by Barnes, Fling and Caldwell tendered a simple, pragmatic view of history. From their University of Nebraska base, they advocated popularizing both school history and the source method. Although the history movement was largely an urban affair, with the greatest growth of history curricula occurring not in the countryside or small schoolhouse, but in the burgeoning urban school systems, Fling and Caldwell conceived their text as a casebook for largely untrained small town teachers who, in their rural environment, were most likely to be beyond the reach of a thorough university education. Other teaching manuals that emphasized the need for formal history training at the university level, such as those by Burton Hinsdale (1893), Channing and Hart (1896), Mace (1897), and Bourne (1902), were more applicable to urban educators.

During their tenure as associate editors of the *North-Western Journal of Education* (later the *North-Western Monthly*), Fling and Caldwell (1897) produced a series of articles "to enable the teachers of the state [Nebraska] to see what the method [source method] means and how it can be applied" (p. 34).

[The] object of these papers [is] twofold: (1) to help you [the teacher] immediately in your class work, and (2) to show you how to secure a better understanding of the matter and method of the subject that you are teaching. To accomplish this, I shall divide my monthly papers into three parts: (1) general examination of the subject matter for the month; (2) presentation of this in the class-room, consisting of an examination of the material in Sheldon's Studies; and (3) additional references for the teacher (Fling & Caldwell, 1897, p. 34).

Apparently none of the articles were edited or revised for the book. Even the authors admitted the "haste that characterized the papers" (p. 34), and this neglect is apparent. The book follows no coherent outline other than a chronological division between European and American studies. Consequently, the entire book must be studied carefully. Despite the lack of continuity, however, Fling and Caldwell's textbook deserves to be credited as the first history
teaching guidebook devoted exclusively for in-service use. Although some critics may find fault with its direct approach outlining a step-by-step account of how a teacher should prepare and present a history lesson, it must be remembered that Fling and Caldwell’s audience—rural teachers of Nebraska—had virtually no background in any of the modern approaches to the discipline. The fact that Fling and Caldwell attempted to reach them at all deserves mention since the traditional view inferred that success with pedagogical methods was first dependent upon equivalent university training.

In the spirit of helping inexperienced history teachers, the authors suggest for example that on the first day of school, the teacher of a European history class should

place the books [Mary Sheldon Barnes’ *Studies in General History*] in the hands of the pupils; explain what they are, i.e., the difference between a source and a narrative; assign half the questions on page 33, telling your pupils that all can be answered from a study of the map on pages 30-31, and the note on page 32; describe the use of the note book and the way in which questions must be answered, and explain the successive steps of outline making and narrative that will complete the work. This talk should be carefully prepared, should be simple and clear (pp. 44-45).

Obviously, neither extensive training in pedagogy nor history was needed. Unlike the predominant narrative-recitation methods, the source method was an active study where the student learned the principles of historical investigation, especially historical criticism, with hands-on experience. This pragmatic approach stood in opposition to other history advocates such as Hinsdale, Mace, Channing and Hart, and Bourne, who sought to upgrade the teaching corps by lobbying for increased formal training in both history and pedagogy. Nevertheless, Fling and Caldwell (not to mention their concept mentor Barnes) accepted the teacher with or without a university background, and emphasized that it was possible not only to learn the source method, but to use it successfully without attending any institution of higher learning.

Fling and Caldwell sought to appeal to two different groups of educators. For day-to-day application of the source method, they addressed the classroom teacher directly in their writing. To sell the method to principals, they referred to teachers in the third person. Thus they petitioned teachers on a personal level to explain the practical nature of the method, and cautioned principals that the method required time and patience for successful implementation. More than any other authors of history methods texts during this era, Fling
and Caldwell stressed the importance of cooperative efforts between teacher and principal for learning a new pedagogical technique.

Following Barnes' paradigm, the first requirement of teaching history was use of original sources in all historical study, sources whose importance resided in the historians' ability to reconstruct the past from them. Nevertheless, Fling and Caldwell suggested that teachers could use collateral sources, namely analogy, while thinking through interpretive possibilities:

> [I]nterpretation of the sources is obtained from analogy. 
> There exists to-day upon the globe, societies representing many stages through which our civilization has passed. 
> Throughout the study of existing societies, much light is cast upon the obscure places in past development (p. 15).

Fling and Caldwell intended to use anthropological data to corroborate historical data; specifically, to use social science data to compare the workings of distant and what Fling and Caldwell described as developing civilizations with their contemporary counterparts.

Another integral part of the source method was the examination and analysis of sources. According to Fling and Caldwell all material collected by whatever means was to be tested and its value determined: "[U]pon the success of this criticism of sources depends the value of the reconstruction" (p. 16). The researcher needed to weed out the worthless from the important. Unfortunately for their readers, Fling and Caldwell neglected to address how a Nebraska history teacher with meager resources was to sift through the materials like an Oxford or Harvard archivist in order to judge the authenticity of sources. The task of determining whether or not, for example, a sixteenth-century record was genuine or forged must have been overwhelming for a neophyte practitioner. Realizing this limitation, Fling and Caldwell omitted what would certainly be a quagmire of details that in all likelihood would detract the teacher from even contemplating the source method. The authors stated simply that they did not have the "space to enumerate the tests by which evidence is tried to determine its genuineness" and moved quickly to the next point (p. 16).

The next step in Fling and Caldwell's method was to consider an event or person(s) relative to the source(s). Here, the authors provided a list of questions. Note that sources were restricted to eyewitnesses, which seemingly excluded the possibility of using other sources. Secondary historical information (loosely defined as accounts derived from primary materials) was not considered.

1. Who was the writer?
2. When did he/she live?
3. Where did he/she live?
4. Was he/she an eye and ear witness?
5. Was he/she able to tell the truth?
6. Was he/she willing to tell the truth?
7. When did he/she make the record (p. 18).

Given this list, the teacher would then have all the tools necessary to effect a critical analysis of the source(s). Each question could be answered without much effort, except 5 and 6, where only supposition could be used. Since few records if any would dispute a student's answer one way or the other, such questions were reasonable for classroom debate. Apparently the greatest potential for seriously hindering the reliability of a source lay in whether or not the source author was alive or present when the event occurred or when the person in question lived. Accordingly, anything less than an eye and ear witness was regarded with suspicion.

Skepticism aside, the student could move to the next step, establishing the facts. Applying von Ranke's dictum to search for historical truths, students were to gather all the sources available and reconstruct what might have actually happened. As with the testing of sources, Fling and Caldwell offered teachers only general guidelines and the disclaimer that they did not have "space to point out in what manner they [the facts] are modified [put into order] in application" (pp. 18-19). Generally, if the witness was of good character and if the account "harmonize[d] with our general knowledge of the period," it was acceptable (p. 18); however, "the evidence of the most reliable witness must be set over against the least reliable and when they disagree, the evidence of the unreliable [is rejected]" (p. 18). Given a body of facts, the student was then called upon to either "arrange them in their order" (in time and place) or place them in order topically. The accomplishment of this objective was dependent upon what "the historian had in mind, and is nothing more than putting his [sic] notes in order that he may see what they mean as a whole, and what development has been" (p. 19).

After the sources had been gathered, checked for accuracy and truth, and criticized for their relative value, and after the facts of the sources were checked for accuracy and truth and organized by chronology or topic, the student was allowed to progress to the final step of the source method: interpretation of the combined data, and examination of each individual fact to determine its meaning as well as its relative place in the body of facts.

Sources were also organized according to interpretation: "Having now fixed the facts and interpreted them," Fling and Caldwell wrote with an air of finality, "it is necessary to combine these interpretations that we may get a view of the whole subject" (p. 20). Essentially, this
meant considering data from the social sciences. Fling and Caldwell also suggested that students correlate their interpretive data with the "influences of nature [geography],...psychology of the individual [psychology] and of the masses [sociology], and the institutions [political science] under which the individual lives" (pp. 20-21). The task that remained for the student-historian was to "commit it [the study] to paper, supporting his narrative throughout by proof. His work is done. Such is the way in which history is written" (p. 21).

Fling and Caldwell apparently believed that the average teacher with the simple "desire to know the truth and a willingness to search patiently for it" could adopt himself or herself to the source method (p. 21). They encouraged teachers (a) to acquire a collection of sources [citing the Barnes-Sheldon texts as the only source books available]; (b) to obtain a good narrative textbook to supplement the source books [a list for each period of history was provided]; (c) to supply each student with a copy of both the source book and the narrative text; (d) to follow the historian's method in having students answer questions, keep class notebooks, develop outlines, and write narratives; and (e) to provide appropriate guidance that will give the student a clear understanding of scientific-historical study (p. 20).

Fling and Caldwell's approach was debated not only in Nebraska schools, but in other places as well. Throughout the second part of the text devoted to American history, Fling and Caldwell included several frank discussions with teachers concerning application of the source method. While the tone was essentially upbeat and positive, many criticisms and weaknesses of the method were noted. Fling and Caldwell's matter-of-fact approach balanced positive and negative comments from teachers with candor and honesty. Despite the shortcomings, Fling and Caldwell believed the source method to be well grounded and the only proper way to deal with history. Unfortunately, the Committee of Seven (1899) did not agree:

While we believe that pupils can advantageously use the sources, chiefly as illustrative matter, we are not now arguing for the "source system" or insisting that they should be trained to handle original material. Skill in finding facts in documents or contemporary narratives, however desirable that may be, is not the sole end of historical instruction anywhere, and above all in the secondary schools....History, we say again, has to do with the sequence of events in time: and what we contend for is such a course in history as will enable one to see sequence and movement. We believe that the pupil should study history, and not something else under the name of history—
neither philosophy on one hand, nor the art of historical investigation on the other (in McLaughlin, pp. 51-52).

Notwithstanding their earnest efforts, Fling and Caldwell’s approach was unable to counter the considerable weight of the Committee of Seven. Without the committee’s recommendation, Fling and Caldwell were viewed as renegade prophets of a misguided method. Consequently, the source method was abandoned. Note that Fling and Caldwell’s unique combination of history and social science is very similar to the Dunn (1916) model that was to surface 20 years later in another format, under a different banner: social studies.

Channing and Hart’s Guide to the Study of American History

The seminal American history teaching textbook of the traditional history curriculum (defined here as the AHA’s proposed four-block program) was Edward Channing and Albert Bushnell Hart’s Guide to the Study of American History. At the time of its publication in 1896, authors Channing and Hart were professors of history at Harvard and among the most respected historians of the day. Having served on both the Committee of Ten history subcommittee and the Committee of Seven, Hart was one of the founding fathers of traditional history. Channing, who at the time of publication was preparing A Student’s History of the United States, was also concerned with public school curricula. The European trained Hart (Ph.D. Freiburg, 1883) and the domestically educated Channing (Ph.D. under Henry Adams at Harvard, 1880) were among those historians who sought to bring serious scientific treatment to the newly emerging discipline. Although their text was specifically written for college-level students of American history, its utility for school teachers was apparent.

The book was divided into three parts: methods and materials of historical study; topics and references in colonial history; and topics and references in United States history through the Civil War. Although parts two and three contain many useful ideas, topics, and references for American history, they were prepared primarily for college students engaged in historical studies. By contrast, the first section addressed not only college students, but also pedagogical assistance for teachers of history and acquisition suggestions for school librarians, and thus is emphasized in the discussion here.

While Fling and Caldwell existed perhaps on the outer fringe of curricular development in terms of methodology, Channing and Hart stood at the center of the so-called traditional history curricula, a group of models loosely defined by the program suggested at the Madison Conference and the ideal program proposed by the AHA.
Committee of Seven. The program, often referred to as the four-block system, suggested courses in ancient, medieval and modern, American, and English or French history. Despite the pre-existing framework, Channing and Hart did not conform to a developed approach, but were among the most influential authors of the traditional history curriculum. In view of this understanding, their textbook takes on considerable importance.

Part one of Channing’s and Hart’s text was composed of five major sections: subject matter; general methodology; a bibliography of American history; discussion of the importance of libraries and notes on specific books required for historical study; and specific teaching methods. Channing and Hart (1896) recognized that historical collections and writings based upon such sources would alter the nature of historical study; competent historians no longer worked with "themes [that] were designed to commemorate the supposed deeds of some ancestor, or to arouse the patriotism of American youth by the relation of stories of doubtful historical foundation, and of very questionable value from an ethical point of view (p. 1).

Documenting the fresh approach toward history study supplied by the growing volume of historical materials as well as the application of new scientific research methods, Channing and Hart found that this activity reinforced the discipline’s unity and furnished history with professional, academic standards equal to any other discipline. Notwithstanding great advances in historical research at the university level, Channing and Hart reported that history teaching at the secondary level and below still lagged behind research and teaching at college and university levels.

Departing from the rote recitation method in favor of scientifically derived history appealed to educators. Although the subject of American history as well as history in general was “widely accepted by school communities and college trustees, by teachers and by thinking people outside of schools and colleges, as a proper discipline and source of pleasure” (1896 p. 3), the material was, however, “still much disorganized, and the methods of dealing with it [were] in many places crude and unformed” (p. 3). In answer to the need for both better organization of the discipline’s materials and improved methodologies, Channing and Hart offered their text “[t]o open up highways and footpaths into this literature and thus to contribute to sound learning and accurate judgment of cause and effect” (p. 3).

Having established a rationale for their book, Channing and Hart highlighted the limits of American history for the purpose of research and teaching: American history should exclude any history of the northern or southern hemisphere that did not contribute to learning about the United States; thus, Channing and Hart quite clearly defined what American history should and should not include. They were not
interested in hemispheric history. Their interest lay strictly in promulgation of a United States history and in the progress and continuation of democratic principles as first developed in England. Moreover, while these authors did not discount the history of countries outside of the United States, they emphasized that American historians and students of history should understand their own American history and its historical antecedents first.

Channing and Hart attempted to accomplish three basic objectives: (1) to emphasize the importance of historical studies; (2) to raise the status of American historians and to establish a body of American historical literature through extensive historical research; and (3) to spread both the historical research and methodologies throughout the American school system. To effect these goals and objectives, special emphasis was placed on the proper training not only of researchers, but also of teachers.

Channing and Hart were also interested in secondary school curricula, and they astutely measured the secondary school as an integral part of training for future history practitioners. Unabashedly the authors rated historical training as best in graduate schools, followed by colleges, normal schools, high schools, and self-study, in that order. Until the 1920s, public school history teachers were not likely to hold a bachelor's, master's, or doctorate degree or even to pursue advanced training after they began teaching school. Nevertheless, repeating the plea of the Committee of Ten, they urged educators to employ "only teachers who have had adequate special training to teach these important subjects" (p. 21).

In sum, the ideal history teacher was a good student of history who was also experienced in pedagogical methods. The educational value of history study, according to Channing and Hart, was its effect on a student's intellectual abilities:

The first thing that is needed for American history in schools [was] the conviction that it is a serious subject, not studied for mere information, or simply to make good citizens, but as a valuable means of training the mind to collect material, to distinguish between truth, probability, and falsehood, and to assemble and analyze the materials for forming an opinion (p. 23).

Channing and Hart (1896) emphasized that "the principal reasons for the study of history are that it trains the memory, is a steady practice in the use of materials, exercises the judgment, and sets before the student's mind a high standard of character" (p. 7). The teacher of history should have mastered the application of these elements, and
also should have a solid background in history and in the requisite teaching methods before stepping in front of a class.

Channing and Hart followed the Madison Conference program very closely. The number of history subjects they proposed fell within the recommended eight-year program: two years of "American history and allied subjects, such as civil government, with the balance divided among elements of ancient history, and of French and English history and one year of intensive study, which in many cases would be given up to an American subject" (p. 23). For general methodology, they again repeated the recommendations of the Madison Conference by suggesting that students use a single comprehensive textbook with appropriate collateral readings. They proposed that history study be repeated in later years with a more sophisticated text paralleling study of government and economics; geography should be fully integrated with history throughout the length of the program. Teachers were expected to use interesting materials to engage students. Finally, all students should have a capstone history experience where they can study a particular topic intensively.

In terms of specific methodological suggestions, Channing and Hart outlined four areas of classroom activity: class exercises that emphasized recitations; the proper use of textbooks, reviews, memorization, student reports, and illustrative methods; reading that stressed the necessity of reading, different approaches to general and topical readings, lectures by teachers, note-taking, and the use of notes; written work that emphasized written reviews, brief written recitations, special reports, and essays; and evaluation that consisted of tests, recitations, essays, and oral exams).

Channing and Hart evidently believed that fact-based informational learning and scientifically guided independent inquiry and criticism were important for both the college student and the secondary student. They did not consider the issue of balancing these seemingly incongruent approaches to be problematic. They argued that students need a basic framework of ideas and factual data from which to form their initial opinions to be tested later through research. Despite their disclaimer that memorization was not to be the end product of history study, however, problems emerged later in practice, when memory work came to constitute a disproportion amount of classroom time.

Channing and Hart's ideal program for American history highlighted 109 dates correlated to 109 events, issues, or personalities that they expected students to recall verbatim in chronological order. Included in this list were "the things best worth remembering as a basis for the study of the history of America," from the Norse discovery of America through the Civil War (pp. 156-168). Students were also expected to memorize the presidents and their dates in office, the
names of the then 32 states and their dates of admission to the Union, population data from the census, and finally selections from the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, and the United States Constitution. Although parts of Articles I, II, and III in the Constitution were represented as well as Amendments 9, 10, 13, 14, and 15, most of the Bill of Rights was not deemed important enough to commit to memory.

While the notion of memorization lists remains at the center of current debates over history instruction, Channing and Hart did not find the issue troubling. They acknowledged that students learn little in memorizing exact passages from textbooks "by heart", but they argued that certain facts of history needed to be "fixed in the memory" of students just like "multiplication tables" (1896, p. 156). The teacher's role, in their view, was to connect historical events by way of contrast and comparison in order to determine cause and effect. It was the student's responsibility to "remember whatever adheres naturally to the events" (p. 156). Channing and Hart argued that through this dual process, students gain not only the simple factual data, but the fuller account and correlative connections as well. This approach, however, demanded more than most students could deliver and may have unwittingly contributed to the fodder used by social studies advocates in the 1900s to attack traditional history courses as too focused on mindless memorization.

Channing and Hart further argued that "no proper work [can] be done in history by the use of a single book....[I]f history [is] really to be taught at all, in every school there must be a collection of books" (1896, p. 143), and they included an extensive bibliography for librarians to use as a guide for text and other material selection. Moreover, in the interest of economy, they provided recommendations for inexpensive collections of history materials ranging from a "five dollar, ten dollar, and twenty-five dollar collection" to a working library valued over $100" (p. 144-148). In the selection of source materials and secondary school texts, they attempted to balance a variety of interpretations "either by treating different phases of American history or by taking sides on the same general question" (p. 144).

In parts two and three of their guidebook, each of the 137 topics included a brief summary of the topic followed by general sources (standard accounts of the subject); a list of special sources (important documents, individual accounts, maps, charts, and other works of a secondary nature); a catalogue of available original sources; and a bibliography source. Compared to the other history teaching texts of the period, none surpassed the number and variety of original and secondary sources found in Channing and Hart's text. Not only did the book service elements of the traditional history curriculum as espoused by the Madison Conference and the later Committee of Seven, Channing
and Hart’s text became the standard student reference text of American history until 1912, when it was replaced by a revised edition prepared by the authors with the assistance of Frederick Jackson Turner. This revised text was used in schools for the next several decades. Channing and Hart also continued their own work by writing classroom texts following the traditional history model. These texts were reprinted well into the 1920s.

William H. Mace’s Method in History

A fourth, prominent, pre-1910s history methods textbook was William H. Mace’s Method in History for Teachers and Students. Unlike those by Barnes, Fling and Caldwell, or Channing and Hart, Mace’s text was the first specifically designed to train pre-service history teachers at the normal school or college/university level. Later historians Edgar Bruce Wesley and Edgar Dawson listed Mace’s Method in History, without explanation unfortunately, as the first milestone in the history of social studies (Dawson, 1924, p. 395; Wesley, 1937, p. 7). Mace’s place in the pedagogical literature of history is largely unreported, however, and deserves wider reading and recognition.

Each of the texts examined thus far indicated a need for better qualified teachers trained for the single purpose of teaching history. To this end, Mace’s text is not exceptional, yet its pedagogical direction was unusual. Instead of presenting a simple, prescriptive, how-to book, Mace asked his readers to explore a different approach to history, one not rooted in a static methodology (as supposed in Barnes and Fling and Caldwell’s source method) nor derived from experience, imitation, or intuition (as suggested in Channing and Hart), but that lay in understanding the general principles of teaching.

Using an anthropomorphism, Mace explained that “[e]xperience makes mistakes, and therefore is not the only guide, but itself must be guided....Mere imitation make[s] one the slave of forms, while teaching under the guidance of principles gives inspiration and confers freedom” (p. xii); therefore, to teach history, the instructor was obligated (a) to discover the principles of the discipline including its nature and elementary laws; and (b) to learn how to apply these principles in practice. It is important to note that Mace did not simply advocate the promulgation and dissemination of a body of scientifically derived principles of history. He expected the individual teacher to know, understand, and apply the dynamic principles of the subject according the specific needs of the classroom. Mace (1898) explains:

The objective of the book was to look into history and discover there the processes and products that the mind
must work out in organizing its facts into a system. Accordingly, the first step analyzes a number of historical facts to discover some of the essential concepts of history, and at the same time allows the facts discovered to indicate something about the general way in which the mind must move in the subject. This is followed by a more detailed inquiry into the general processes involved in organizing the material of history into the form of a system....[and] an attempt to make more definite the general principle of historical organization, and to show more fully their educative value by looking into the various periods and subperiods of American history. The purpose here is not to organize the periods in detail, but rather to demonstrate the possibility of doing so (pp. xvi-xvii).

In Mace's view, the preservice teacher does not begin with a separate study of history apart from pedagogy or with a detailed explanation of methods apart from content, but must integrate both to enable the teacher to organize content, develop specific objectives, devise methods of presentation, and make evaluations. No predetermined set of methods or fixed body of factual data was offered. Instead, Mace asserted that the principles of history and teaching would guide students to "the formation of a noble character" (pp. 274-275).

Mace began his text with what he called the last or third phase of history teaching: interpretation (a term he alternated with reflection and inquiry). He suggested that teachers organize history into workable units, complete with objectives, appropriate teaching strategies, and methods for lesson preparation and presentation. He categorized the other two phases—the sense phase that furnishes the memory materials of history and the representative phase that makes history come alive with stories and illustrations—as elementary history suited for the younger and more immature student. The interpretive phase was more appropriate for the high school or college student. Consequently, the bulk of this text designed largely for secondary teachers was concerned primarily with historical interpretations (p. 46).

Mace proposed that the first lesson should outline the general nature of history and the processes involved in the organization of historical materials, and should include learning the essential elements of history. By necessity, this effort was divided into two steps: (1) study of the "essential attributes" of ideas and (2) the "mental forms and processes that history calls forth" (p. 4). Mace was quick to emphasize that history was not a record, and that to regard it
so was superficial and harmful because it led to “the belief that the book is the subject, and suggests that the proper thing to do is to transfer the record from the book to the pupils mind by means of verbal memory” (p. 3). Instead, history and its study were conceptual entities guided by five ideas:

1. One set of historical facts is made up of the acts of people and the other of their thoughts, feelings, ideas, and emotions, and these two sets are parallel in time and together in place.
2. Deeds or events are the signs or expressions of a people’s thoughts and feelings.
3. Events constitute the outer form of the subject matter of history, while thoughts, emotions, and so on constitute the essence or content of history. The problem of history lies in the mastery of content, while the events perform the function of means.
4. Events occur, but ideas continue. Events are transient while ideas are enduring. Only ideas recur; connections and continuity in history must be sought in ideas rather than among events.
5. Primarily, events are effects, while thoughts and feelings are the causes (pp. 6-7).

Gleaned from the above, the real essence of history according to Mace is “the life of a people, [their] life of thought and feeling...[as they] tend to realize themselves by growth” (p. 7). Growth, noted Mace, was marked by changes in the ideas themselves, and change was influenced by the two laws of history: continuity and differentiation. The law of continuity underscores growth, the idea that history is dynamic and alive, not static and fixed with “no breaks or leaps in the life of a people” (p. 8). It makes “history a unit, and is the basis of the organization of its facts into a system” (p. 8). The law of differentiation recognizes that growth of thoughts, ideas, and feelings appear and reappear in new variations over time. “Continuity retains something of the old, while differentiation brings something new” (pp. 9-10).

From these general principles and laws, Mace drew the following conclusions:

1. The life of a people is an organic whole;...this life is one mighty stream of five currents [the five institutions of man: government, church, education, industry, and the family] moving toward one goal...one life with one destiny.
2. The student must transverse and intricate, as well as parallel, lines of growth in the subject of history;...he must take each great event and each great series of events, and discover the extent to which many or all of the institutions are effected (p. 18).
This understanding of the nature and laws of history helps the teacher to then lead the student in the process of taking "what appears to be disconnected and isolated facts of history and organize them into a consistent body of knowledge" (p. 18). According to Mace, each fact and event is part of a whole that is part of another greater whole, and so on. The end result of the universal process of interpretation is that the mind (student) could eventually discover the "leading facts of history...not [as] isolated and diverse facts, but as one great fact—the growth of institutional life" (pp. 46-47).

To apply this process, Mace instructed teachers to select which facts to study and which to omit. In deciding the facts and events that have contributed most to the growth of a people, teacher exercised "historical emphasis" or "historical perspective" (p. 68). Given the selected material/content, the teacher then selected the necessary methods for presentation, and developed appropriate evaluative measures to test student mastery of the lesson material.

Although Mace provided a detailed analysis of the theoretical workings of the disciplines, for those more functionally inclined he unfortunately neglected to provide a practical explanation of teaching methods. In practice, Mace believed that the teacher would apply theory by utilizing the standard methods of the day, with the exception of rote memorization. He mentioned recitation (both oral and written), secondary textbook reading, use of original sources, and manipulation of illustrations, maps, charts, and diagrams, but gave them little attention. Admittedly, Mace attached no utility to the term method in the conventional sense; that is, method was not recitation or lecture in a concrete form, it was application of abstract thought.

To Mace, so-called conventional methods were mere devices and expedients, external manipulations of little value that were disembodied from an understanding of the principles of history (p. xi). Notwithstanding the value of that pragmatic knowledge to the secondary history practitioner, theory without application is as useless as method without substance. Mace's concept of fact selection relative to value was to become an integral part of the later social studies definition of history, one that was expanded and ably articulated by his fellow NEA conferee James Harvey Robinson in the reports of the 1916 National Education Association's Committee on Social Studies (see Robinson's statement in Dunn, 1916).

Bourne's The Teaching of History and Civics

The history teaching textbook that perhaps best represented the apex of the traditional history era was Henry E. Bourne's The Teaching of History and Civics in the Elementary and Secondary School.
Published in 1902 ten years after the Madison Conference (NEA, 1893) and three years after the AHA’s 1898 proposal (McLaughlin, 1899), Bourne’s text reflected a maturing of the discipline in terms of both content and methodology. In this text Bourne attempted to summarize the salient points of traditional history curricula. Where such writers as Hinsdale or Channing and Hart cited selected authors and ideas in footnotes, he openly discussed the various interpretations and applications of history teaching in the main body of his text.

Bourne noted that the book was written for the untrained student of history to gain a greater sense of the variety of definitions, values, and methods found in the field. The text contains a general overview of typical content found in history and a general review of the field's methodology. Bourne's formula for commentary and review was to become the standard model found in history and even later social studies teaching textbooks (see Johnson, 1915, 1940; Wesley, 1937). This work also provides the general form of a school history text; each chapter (representing a different topic) is introduced by a bibliography of the leading works on that topic.

Important ideas and concepts are set in the margins throughout the text to facilitate student comprehension of main ideas or concepts found in a particular passage. Through critical commentary Bourne outlined a particular position on history teaching. He delineated the content of traditional history, however, more clearly than the methods of preparation and presentation; that is, most educators and academic historians agreed that some form of American, ancient, medieval, and modern histories should be offered to secondary students on a regular basis. Bournes argued that these histories should be taught in chronological order (beginning with ancient history) in two cycles: in elementary school and in secondary school. He believed that all histories should be assigned a grade level to reflect the intellectual and psychological growth and abilities of the students. In comparison to the difficulties of the elementary history curriculum, Bourne (1902) noted:

A common standing ground has been reached. It is agreed that a four-year course is the ideal toward which the schools should steadily work, and many schools have already assigned time to history during each of the four years, although they have rarely, if ever, been able to give as much time as had been recommended by the Committee of Seven (pp. 114-115).

As designed, the Committee of Seven was an ideal program, a goal, but Bourne cautioned educators not to accept compromises. Since many schools were certainly unable to adopt the plan in its entirety,
the Committee of Seven emphasized that the history program be abridged in some fashion to meet local conditions. Despite a variety of solutions in matching the ideal program to the reality of the classroom, however, Bourne stressed that the ideal should not be given up and that "[t]he friends of history should be disinclined to compromise the matter" (p. 116). Because the dilemma of theory application persisted not only in the history program but with all curricular offerings suggested by national committees, Bourne presented his text in the spirit of outlining the most appropriate content and methods corresponding to a set of fundamental values of history, and he stressed the importance of persevering toward the ideal history program.

In order to continue progress toward that goal, it was necessary to define, detail, and describe the various facets of the discipline to the preservice and untrained history teachers. Astutely, Bourne believed that the key to success lay not with special emphasis on developing topics or listing important dates for memorization, but with the individual classroom teacher who must know and understand the history program and continually work to achieve its goals. After describing the growth of history in American schools together with an investigation of history in European schools, Bourne concluded his text with a vision of history that rests upon the successful preparation of its practitioners. Bourne remarked:

Although history does not yet receive the recognition which is due to so important a subject, its value is better understood, its objects are more clearly defined, the methods of teaching it are more fully developed. Some things remain to be done. At present...the subject is assigned to teachers who know little about it and who have never been adequately trained to teach it. A little study of history in college is not enough, and even this is lacking. The remedy here can come only through strengthening of the college work in history and through more adequate courses of instruction in the normal schools....Another decade should not pass before the work in history in the American schools is made comprehensive and is entrusted to as well-trained teachers as is the case in France and Germany (p. 76).

The remedy required teachers to be well trained, not through self-study as condoned by Barnes, Fling and Caldwell, Channing and Hart, and Mace, but through college and university courses in history and pedagogy. For Bourne, the measure of a successful history program was in the competency of its practitioners. With this challenge, he presented his ideal history curriculum. Drawing heavily upon the
Bourne reemphasized the meaning and values of history as an essential discipline of public school curricula. Where Channing and Hart may have inhabited the center of the traditional history curriculum, Bourne was certainly very close; however, while Channing and Hart believed that history should be driven by science, Bourne believed that there were "serious difficulties which must be overcome before history may be regarded as a science" (p. 18):

[Perhaps] history will have for the pupil, as for the citizen, its greatest moral value when it remains faithful to the comprehensive conception of its work which has been built up by those who from Herodotus to Ranke have spent their lives in its study (p. 20).

To Bourne, the study and teaching of history should remain faithful to the pursuit of historical truths providing students the fullest, most accurate picture of events possible. The underpinning of this view was, of course, the source method, an approach recognized but relegated by Channing and Hart to the subordinate position of providing illustration for history lessons. Bourne believed that because many students and adults did not understand the basis of school textbooks, and assumed that they were drawn from original and secondary sources, it was vital for readers to learn the truth about the production of historical knowledge. Even if teachers could not provide students with original materials, students should understand that generalizations are not necessarily facts, and history textbooks do not all contain accurate accounts of the past. Furthermore, counter to Mace's opinion, knowledge of historical criticism was just as vital to understanding history as historical interpretation. To Bourne, knowledge of the past gained from historical records passed under the watchful eye of the historian-critic. This insightfully gained knowledge was at the core of history's purpose: to place the past in perspective for the present and to give the present meaning through an understanding of the past (pp. 36-37).

Remarkably, the source method espoused by Barnes as well as Fling and Caldwell was fashioned especially to work as a scientific study. Although Bourne and Barnes both were devoted to the Von Ranke tradition, Bourne stopped short of conceding that history was a science on the order of physics or biology. This element of his position avoided the extremity of the claims by Barnes and Fling and Caldwell. In the tradition of Von Ranke, the guiding tenet of historical study was discovering the entire story of a civilized people or at least as much as practically possible. Bourne tempered this view by calling for teachers.
to determine the facts of most worth; highlights rather than the entire past reduced the load of original sources for students to examine.

Similar to Hinsdale and Mace, Bourne believed that the teacher had the responsibility of selecting the essential facts to study. Given original materials then, students would work to discover the essence of history on his or her own. Bourne understood the practical problems that the source method presented. Rather than relegating sources to a secondary position in relation to narrative, he suggested that sources serve as a companion. In other words, history textbooks were still necessary. Bourne argued that textbooks preserved the unity of history, a strong basis for collateral readings, and helpful interpretation of special topics. In Bourne's model specifically, the teacher would present students with a conventional account from an excellent narrative history so that they could grasp some working knowledge and a sense of the idea, period, event, or personality in question. Students would then work through other available sources to gauge the validity of the text account and to write their own history of the event.

In spite of a predisposition to the spirit of the source method, Bourne recognized the value of narrative text, recitation, topical work, excursions, and illustrative materials such as maps and charts as well as other teacher aids; however, he acknowledged the dangers associated with each approach, including the source method. Choosing not to endorse or champion any particular method, he emphasized that the "practical management of classes cannot be described in a paragraph or two. It must be given in the normal school or must come through experience" (p. 153). By example, he argued that a textbook, even his own, could not compete with the education of the normal school or of actual classroom experience.

Like Hinsdale's and Mace's texts, Bourne's book was later cited by Edgar Bruce Wesley (1937) as "a significant step in the development of social studies" (p. 30-31). Bourne presented the case for more civics and current issues in the curriculum but not at the expense of history. He also encouraged the study of local affairs and/or the community. For Bourne, the primary purpose of such study was to "awaken further curiosity about them, in order that the deeper interest so created may vivify the study of more remote institutions" (p. 104). Of the five methods textbooks discussed here, Bourne's is perhaps the most reflective of prevailing methods and current curricular models for history teaching.

Conclusion

The teaching textbooks reviewed here (see Appendix for overview) together with the Madison Conference and Committee of Seven reports present a conspectus of pre-1910 history curricula on a
theoretical and developmental level. Historians Barnes and Fling and Caldwell created texts for the general or field market, Channing and Hart for students and teachers in public schools, and Mace and Bourne expressly for normal school and college preservice history teachers. Although Channing and Hart probably best represented and perhaps best captured the flavor of the recommendations of the Committee of Seven, each of the five texts contributed to the traditional history curriculum by offering their descriptions and explanations of various facets of the overall program.

In this article I have sought to draw a composite picture of history curricula as found in history methods texts. In addition, although I have highlighted the nature of traditional history models, it is important to note that a variety of models were developed during this formative period of history instruction. The success of history programs as determined by the successful transition from theory to practice has been established by contemporary status studies (Bagley & Rugg, 1916; Dawson, 1924; Koos, 1917; Tryon, 1935). These findings suggest that traditional history curricula shared the following: (a) they were spread throughout the country; (b) their courses of study were based chronologically in ancient, medieval, and modern English and American histories; (c) their values revolved around the development of intellectual skills; (d) their methodologies centered on a narrative, authoritative textbook supplemented by collateral readings including original source materials; (e) their success was bound absolutely to the careful and thorough training of practitioners in both the discipline and pedagogy.

As the NEA’s Committee on Social Studies (Dunn, 1916) deliberated several years later, critics of traditional history did not distinguish between the subtle and obvious differences among history models. Many social education advocates simply dismissed the richness and variety of history instruction (Snedden, 1914). Inasmuch as the traditional history program was ideal for introducing students to history, the present discussion hopefully reveals to readers that in addition to the traditional history ideals found in AHA literature, a number of alternative models for teaching history existed. If educators are serious about exploring and selecting appropriate models for history instruction, while examinations of the models set forth in Johnson (1915, 1940), Wesely (1937), Hunt and Metcalf (1955, 1968), and Oliver and Shaver (1966) are clearly instructive, pre-1910 history methods textbooks should also become valuable sources for ideas, information and inspiration.
Appendix

Following is a summary of each of the five teaching textbooks discussed in this article with reference to: value of history, course of study, teaching methods, and suggestions to educators.

Studies in Historical Method (1899): Mary Sheldon Barnes

Value of history: History is an intellectual pursuit suited: to add to the sum of human knowledge; to add to the diffusion of knowledge; to form intelligent and patriotic citizens; to discover new truth; to popularize truth; or to shape character and action.

Course of study: To help students acquire historic sense, (1) history must be developed from local or community sources based on contemporary needs, and (2) history must be taught from these sources. To assist students in gaining an understanding of historical progress (chronology), informational studies are surveyed from ancient, medieval, modern, and American histories.

Teaching methods: To help students attain historical sense, the source method is recommended: studying specific facts from original materials, drawing inferences, and writing personal historical accounts. To acquire general information, memory work, recitation, textbook study, and collateral readings are suggested as well as data derived from auxiliary studies (social sciences).

Suggestions: Employ teachers who are trained and experienced in historical investigation—i.e., the source method—or are willing and able to commit themselves to learn the method. Schools need to provide requisite library materials for students and to encourage independent study.

Studies in European and American History (1897): Fling and Caldwell

Value of history: History is a method for determining what actually happened (objective history) or what might have happened (subjective history) in the past. It helps students discipline their minds and learn how to form sound, independent judgments.

Course of study: Follow conventional offerings of ancient, medieval, modern, and American histories.

Teaching methods: The source method is presented in a scientific spirit. Students should approach sources critically; arrange facts in topical and/or chronological order; and form interpretations. Good narrative texts are helpful for basic information, and linking history to geography, psychology, and political science is recommended.

Suggestions: Acquire a collection of reliable source materials and good narrative texts, and provide copies for each student. Encourage historical research methods; e.g., keeping notebooks, developing
outlines, and writing narratives. Administration should have patience and understanding of source method, allowing it time to succeed.


Value of history: The primary reasons for history study are to train memory, practice using history materials, exercise judgment skills, and apply skills to determine cause and effect. Developing a high standard of character is a collateral effect.

Course of study: The suggestions of the Madison Conference and Committee of Seven should be supported, particularly the eight-year plan of ancient, medieval, and modern English and American histories, including a full year of intensive historical study.

Teaching methods: Teaching should cover the whole field using a standard textbook with supplementary readings from established historians. Wide readings of other materials, topical work, parallel study, and some source work should also be stressed.

Specific methods: Textbook use, selected memory work, student reports, lectures, written work, recitations, special reports, and evaluation techniques are recommended.

Suggestions: Employ history teachers trained and competent in discipline as well as pedagogy. Acquire a viable working library of history materials, reinforce unity of discipline, and support raising professional/academic standards of history.

Method in History for Teachers and Students (1898): Mace

Value of history: The primary aim of history is to formulate the noble character. Its secondary aim is development of intellectual skills of analysis and interpretation.

Course of study: Discovering the principles of history, including its nature and elementary laws (continuity and differentiation) is recommended. Any field is acceptable; division between subjects in history is not suggested. The various subjects of history should all be viewed as integrated and interconnected. Historical study proceeds from the transference of historical principles.

Teaching methods: Students should organize disconnected and isolated facts of history into a consistent body of knowledge, and read secondary and original materials to facilitate objectives. All means of historical investigation are indicated, especially selection and ranking of facts, organization of facts, development of specific objectives, and interpretations of data. Historical criticism and conventional teaching aids are strongly deemphasized.

Suggestions: Employ teachers who know and understand the principles of history through their college and university training. Provide the necessary materials.
Value of history: The primary purpose of history is to teach moral values. Intellectual skills—e.g., judgment and inference—and citizenship are secondary but important.

Course of study: Standard offerings as recommended by the Madison Conference and Committee of Seven reports are indicated. The ideal program, strict maintenance of the four-block plan are recommended. Study of local and community affairs is also appropriate.

Teaching methods: No preference is given for any of the conventional methods discussed in text. The author cautions against exclusive use of any single method, and suggests a balance of narrative text use with the source method.

Suggestions: Follow the Committee of Seven recommendation and employ trained and experienced history teachers in both discipline and pedagogy. Teachers who know and understand the traditional history curriculum and key to the success of the history program. Normal schools and colleges are the only practical source for such teachers.
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The Rise and Fall of MACOS: A Blip on the Historical Screen?


Review by WILLIAM W. GOETZ, School of Education, Kean College of New Jersey.

Many may find it disconcerting to think of Man: A Course of Study (MACOS) and the New Social Studies (NSS) movement as history, but the clock has been ticking. Three decades have passed since the social studies profession was captivated by this movement promoted in feverish language and supported by a significant number in the field. In Schoolhouse Politics, Peter B. Dow, who worked with MACOS beginning in 1965 and served as project director from 1967 to 1974, assumes the role of both historian and participant observer, bringing the Sputnik era to life in a case study of the NSS movement's most celebrated and controversial project. With disarming candor, Dow takes us into the inner life and dynamics of MACOS from its conception in 1959 until its apparent last breath in the mid-1970s, giving us a unique view of the various forces, values, and personalities that produced a fascinating if short-lived era of curriculum creation in the history of social studies.

Dow traces the conception of MACOS to the celebrated Woods Hole Conference of 1959, convened under the sponsorship of the National Academy of Sciences to review science projects funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). It was in this heady environment composed of academicians—chiefly scientists and psychologists who were still reacting to Sputnik and rebounding to trenchant critiques of American schools—that Harvard psychologist Jerome Bruner first advanced the "importance of structure [of the disciplines]" as a prime instrument for reforming American schools (p. 35). Although some participants questioned his thesis, a consensus was reached that "cognitive processes" should comprise the core of academic work on all levels (p. 36). The summary report written by Bruner was published a year later as The Process of Education that became a 97-page marketing and cultural phenomenon selling over 400,000 copies in 22 languages. Out of such stuff curricular revolutions are made.
We also learn what was not addressed at this conference: the history of schooling, curricula, and the social implications of both (p. 61). This is hardly surprising since Dow tells us that many of the new reformers shared Arthur Bestor's pre-Sputnik view that the problems of American schooling were attributable to "the interlocking directorate of American educationists" (p. 18) who had detached themselves from scholarly knowledge in favor of educational methods (p. 28). Professional social studies education could be ignored according to this process: Cognitive processes produce good minds and therefore good citizens.

Follow-up conferences in 1962 and 1963 were convened by the dynamic and charismatic physicist Jerrold Zacharias, a participant in the Manhattan Project and developer of the highly heralded new physics curriculum (PSSC). Dow reports that the conference on social studies was "spirited" (p. 42) and marked by an embarrassing confrontation between social scientists and historians. Sociologist Robert Feldmesser called for the "slaughter [of] the sacred cow of history" (p. 42) to make way for the development of social science. Historian Ted Fenton believed that this threat to the dominancy of history could have salutary effects (p. 43) but Charles Keller, the historian who had been vigorously promoting reform of secondary history teaching, was deeply offended and alienated (p. 52). Despite these reservations, a consensus was produced that social studies should include both the social sciences and humanities (p. 44).

Instructional theory and materials received special attention at this conference. The participants agreed that "teaching should always begin with raw materials from which new knowledge can be generated": the inductive method, a key tenet of Bruner's (p. 47) and Zacharias' pedagogy (p. 44). Students would thus learn that academic knowledge was both "relativistic and speculative" (p. 46). Leften Stavrianos, who had unwittingly distributed his new text, A Global History of Man, at the conference unfortunately became a timely target. Zacharias recalled, "What a clamor! We just raised hell with the poor thing because it was a collection of bits—everything—all of history, all of mankind....You turn that loose in a school and you've got nothing" (p. 45). The stage was set for MACOS under the aegis of NSF-funded Educational Services Incorporated (ESI).

The original—and controversial—proposal for an elementary social studies curriculum had been proposed by Harvard anthropologist Douglas Oliver, and it was organized around a historical/evolutionary sequence of "The Human Past" (K-6) that traced human development from the hunting and gathering stage to more complex cultures, and concluded with an intensive study of classical Greece in the sixth grade (p. 61). At this critical moment, however, a personal crisis precipitated Oliver's sudden resignation and significantly affected the nature and
future of the program. Irven DeVore, another Harvard anthropologist who was uneasy that Oliver’s “vertical structure...treated Western civilization as the acme of human progress,” now proposed in its place a “lateral structure” based upon a comparison of cultural roles, social organization, and technology (p. 66).

Bruner, who had assumed the directorship of the elementary social studies program and who apparently shared many of DeVore’s sentiments, began developing a crosscultural and cross-disciplinary curriculum for the middle grades. The sweeping K-6 design was soon abandoned for a single multidisciplinary curriculum that Bruner hoped would serve as a model for future curricular development in social studies. According to a member of the ESI staff, Bruner’s other goal was to dislodge American history, a highly visible stamp of the old social studies, from its entrenched home in the fifth grade.

It may be of some consolation for those who struggled with the concept of structure to learn that Bruner himself was wrestling with it himself when he developed MACOS (p. 78). Despite the great fanfare created, Dow, now on board and a participant observer, maintains that MACOS mostly involved “a looser, more intuitive way of knowing” (p. 137). We also learn from Dow that Bruner believed that “courses in social science should be derived from moral and philosophical propositions, not the technical requirements of a particular discipline” (p. 72): a provocative revelation. Bruner wanted youngsters to grasp the proposition or concept, “What is human about human beings?” For those who argued that fourth, fifth and sixth graders were not capable of such conceptualization, Bruner the psychologist dismissed this argument as a “mischievous half truth” (p. 75). His memorable and historical dictum should be recalled: “We begin with the hypothesis that any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development” (p. 37).

Reflecting DeVore’s influence, four organizing themes to help children understand culture finally emerge: social organization, language, mythology, and technology. These themes dictate where the postholes will be struck. Two additional pedagogical approaches, contrast and models, were developed to enhance the cognitive power of children. Contrast would come from exercises comparing the life cycles of fish and animals such as salmon, herring gulls, and baboons (p. 138) with the social behavior of humans—in this case, the Netsilik Eskimos. Models would be created in the form of simulated problem-solving situations, in which children applied principles learned in games to a new set of circumstances. It boggles the mind at this point in time to read of the vast staff of artists, media consultants, and writers employed by ESI to create “the raw materials” and “to accommodate a variety of teaching styles” (p. 73).
The first step in the MACOS journey from "Weidener to Wichita" took place in the Newton (Massachusetts) schools during the summer of 1965 when the program was tested in the real world of teachers and children (pp. 91, 139). To the chagrin of the developers, while meticulously researched baboon films were instantly successful, the middle schoolers were more taken with the anthropomorphic characteristics of the baboons than with the differences between nonhuman and human species (pp. 100, 119). The developers also found—lo and behold—that the youngsters playing the carefully designed games were more interested in winning than learning! Bruner himself was surprised by the amount of detail needed for students to conceptualize from raw material (p. 96) and was perplexed by teacher talk in the classroom (p. 101). Teachers were uncomfortable with both the content and methodology and were anxious about the proposed issues to cover (p. 146). Doubts even began to surface concerning Bruner's theory of getting "maximum travel from minimum information" through post-holing (p. 77). The 1965 experiment proved a powerful learning experience not only for the children and teachers of Newton but also for the developers.

Two years of long-winded discussions ensued regarding how much content was needed, how the materials should be used, and whether the structure of concepts should be redesigned or permitted to evolve (p. 109). Teacher training programs were added to enhance the anthropological and biological background of teachers. One must admire both the tenacity and commitment of the ESI staff in addressing these complex instructional and curricular issues and also the largesse of its leadership who continued to fund the project. The latter, however, became increasingly anxious over the delays and grew weary of Bruner's "mellifluous" explanations (p. 110). Meanwhile back in the trenches, social studies professionals including this fledgling supervisor, inspired by articles in Social Education, waited anxiously for the projects of the New Social Studies to report.

The final package of 95 teacher guides, 30 children's booklets, 16 records, 5 filmstrips, 3 games, 54 artifact cards and assorted odds and ends received numerous awards for creativity and quality. Despite the accolades, publishers resisted commercializing it because of its logistical complexity. The Educational Development Center (formerly ESI), however, continued to fund the development and promotion of MACOS, including regional workshops for teachers. By 1968, 6,000 students were using the program in 200 classrooms nationwide and by the fall of 1969, the count was over 1,000 classrooms. In February 1970, MACOS developers signed a contract with Curriculum Development Associates, an educationally oriented corporation, but its apparent success was short lived.
In the fall of 1970, just after the contract was signed, a fundamentalist minister in Lake City, Florida (population 10,000), whose daughter was in a sixth-grade class using MACOS, requested a copy of the materials from the local school board. (The program had been selected in the hope that its crosscultural approach might ease integration in its schools.) Having examined the materials, the minister denounced MACOS to the school board and on the radio as “hippie-jippie philosophy” and “sensual in philosophy” with links to humanism, socialism, gun control, and evolution (p. 179).

Dow, now the project director, sent out questionnaires to the 167 school districts using MACOS. Of the 134 replies, 100 rated the materials excellent, 28 gave good ratings, and only 14 reported complaints about the switch from history, for example, sex education, and explicitness about Eskimo life (p. 185). The minister, however, had touched a nerve and soon an avalanche of hostile criticism was unleashed upon MACOS. Human Events (a publication of the John Birch society), the Heritage Foundation, conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick, and even the Council for Basic Education (an early supporter of social studies reform) all attacked MACOS. In Schoolhouse Politics, Dow wonders why MACOS made itself so vulnerable by emphasizing such harsh realities such as senicide and infanticide in a program designed for the middle grades.

The MACOS connection to federal funding through NSF exacerbated the political situation, and soon the halls of Congress were ringing with denunciations led by Congressman John B. Conlan of Arizona. In a blistering attack, he charged that such a curriculum was “designed to mold children’s social attitudes and beliefs” with “lessons that include communal living, elimination of the weak and elderly in society, sexual permissiveness and promiscuity, violence, and primitive behavior” (p. 200). Other conservatives energized by this intrusion of federal government questioned the role of NSF and federal funding for curricular projects. Three separate congressional investigations of NSF were soon underway, and a bill was introduced to authorize congressional supervision of all NSF funding. By this time, Bruner was safely ensconced at Oxford, and Dow was left to defend the project before hostile congressional committees.

Amid the turmoil, Dow encountered Margaret Mead by chance in Washington, D.C. Having been briefed on the controversy, Mead was visibly upset over the MACOS representation of Eskimos that, for her, distorted the anthropological record of kind treatment by Eskimos toward older people (p. 205). Dow defended the MACOS perspective as a values strategy designed to present a “moral dilemma” in which Eskimos “must struggle with questions of right and wrong” (p. 205). He suggested that it should “contribute to the appreciation of diversity” as a corrective to “a very ethnocentric curriculum” in the schools (p. 204).
Mead softened and, after chastizing Dow for his political naivete, delivered an eloquent and moving defense of MACOS before a congressional committee. Even though the Conlan Amendment was defeated, both MACOS and the NSF had taken a beating. Sales of MACOS took a "precipitous fall" and never recovered (p. 228). After 1975, MACOS was becoming a historical footnote. Dow reported elsewhere (1975) that NSF spent in total with some qualifications approximately $6.5 million on MACOS, of which approximately $4.3 million were for materials.

The rise and fall of MACOS raises significant issues relevant to the history of social studies. Dow attributes its demise largely to the politics of education: "Reforms that appeared to be purely scholarly in nature turned out to be profoundly political in their application" (p. 228); he also laments that "public support of education" was so short lived (p. 175). Profound changes were occurring in American culture, and the curriculum was tied to the reigning intellectual-cultural ethos, to borrow MacDonald's (1971) term. The historical timing for MACOS and the New Social Studies could not have been worse. Caught in the crossfire between social upheaval, a counterculture movement, and a neo-conservative reaction, cognitive processes and relativistic social studies were doomed from the start.

This, of course, is not the entire story. Dow admits to an arrogance bordering on hubris at the inception of MACOS (p. 158) that assumed federal funds and intellectual acumen could guarantee success. "Fuzzy headed" social studies educators (Zacharias' characterization) might have helped these developers realize sooner the powerful and various roles that teachers, parents, and students play in the curricular process as well as the social forces that have traditionally affected social studies (p.54). At the same time, it may be well to recall how many of us—like myself—jumped on the New Social Studies bandwagon with uncritical alacrity. Critiques by Krug (1965) and Leinwand (1966) were lost amid the frenzied excitement created by Bruner. Much remains for us to ponder in this segment of social studies history.

Is social studies different now because of MACOS and other NSS projects? Dow considers that era to be the "most productive period of innovation in our times" (p. 252) because of the insights produced regarding the teaching process and curricular materials. Shaver, however, contends that social studies education did not change discernibly (in Lybarger, 1991), and Cuban (1991) seems to concur. Jenness (1990) cites evidence of MACOS materials that are still "widely used and admired" (p. 135) and claims that the "best of NSS projects...have had a long, if subterranean effect" (p. 139). He also notes that commercial texts have continued to use aspects of NSS such as analytical questions and concepts. This later observation is supported by Block (1987), who in an analysis of history texts found a significant
increase in the intensity and usage of historical terminology in the period after NSS (p.155). In my own experience as a K-12 supervisor, I rejected MACOS but strenuously promoted the use of other NSS materials that remained in use with some success for two decades (Goetz, in press). This amalgam of NSS style and "the newer social problems/self-realizaton approach" of the 1970s is noted by Hertzberg (1981, p. 131), and needs further investigation.

While the impact of MACOS and the NSS movement may be problematic at best, by telling the MACOS story Dow has also revived issues that remain unresolved: the pedagogical difficulties in teaching historical coverage, conceptualization of social studies content, the role of scholars and of the social sciences as well as the advantages and disadvantages of large-scale curricular projects. I would suggest that the reemergence of the tyranny of the textbook, a favorite expression of NSS enthusiasts, in many curricula and classrooms makes these issues even more critical. Below the surface of cognitive processes lurks the question of the cultural value system that MACOS could not circumvent: How much is open for inquiry and speculation? There must be a message in the fact that the very definition of social studies continues to be debated as these words are written (McBride, 1993).

Was MACOS and the NSS movement an aborted effort that might have precipitated a major breakthrough in social studies curricula? Does it deserve another look, or was it doomed to early death by its esoteric quality and detachment from the social studies tradition? The undaunted Dow suggests reviving the NSS concept. Interestingly, he casts his argument in Dewey's terms: bringing scholars and teachers together to serve not only the best minds but the needs of all students in "a changing society" (pp. 273-274). The author of Schoolhouse Politics should not be surprised if the history he has compiled is used against his recommendation. Whatever one's position, Dow has given us a valuable historical source against which to assess the persisting problems of social studies education.
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