Theory and research in social education 19/01

National Council for the Social Studies. College and University Faculty Assembly

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/coedu_pub

Part of the Education Commons

Scholar Commons Citation
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/coedu_pub/68

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Education Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.
THEORY AND RESEARCH in Social Education

Vol. XIX No. 1 Winter 1991

Millard Clements A Note From The Editor
Benjamin Rigberg What Must Not Be Taught
Alan Sears & Jim Parsons Towards Critical Thinking as an Ethic
Lucien Ellington & James Muntean Economics Teachers' Attitudes About and Treatment of Japan
Peter H. Martorella Consensus Building among Social Educators: A Delphi Study
James E. Akenson Linkages of Art and Social Studies: Focus Upon Modern Dance/Movement

Book Reviews

Legacy of Silence
Facing History and Ourselves: Elements of Time

EcoNet

Information for Authors
Theory and Research in Social Education

Editor: Millard Clements
Associate Editor: Donald Johnson
Assistant Editor: Anna Mockler
Book Review Editor: Jane J. White

Theory & Research in Social Education (ISSN 0093-3104) is published quarterly by the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies. Membership is $20/year, $15 of the dues are allocated for subscription to Theory and Research in Social Education. Institutional and non-CUFA subscriptions are $35/year. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC and additional offices. Back issues may be obtained for $10 each when available. Postmaster: Send address changes to: Theory and Research in Social Education, 3501 Newark St., NW, Washington, DC 20016.

Address manuscripts and editorial correspondence to:
Millard Clements
New York University
200 East Building
New York, NY 10003

Address book reviews to:
Jane J. White
University of Maryland - Baltimore County
Department of Education
Catonsville, MD 21228

Address correspondence related to permissions, subscription and membership, back issues, and change of address to:
Membership Department
NCSS
3501 Newark Street NW
Washington, DC 20016

Address correspondence about advertising to:
Peter Stavros, Meetings and Marketing, at the above address.
Reviewers

The editors would like to thank these reviewers for the thoughtful attention they have given to the manuscripts they have considered:

Beverly Armento, Atlanta, GA
James Banks, Seattle, WA
James Barth, West Lafayette, IN
Linda Biemer, Cortland, NY
Diane Common, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, Alberta
Harold Drummond, Albuquerque, NM
Ronald Evans, San Diego State University
Jack Fraenkel, San Francisco, CA
Bernita Jorkasky, State University of New York at Brockport
Theodore Kaltsounis, University of Washington
Wilma Longstreet, University of New Orleans
George Mahaffy, San Diego State University
Francis Maher, Cambridge, MA
Howard Mehlinger, Bloomington, IN
Carol Metsker, Denver, CO
Wilber Murra, Phoenix, AZ
Ana Ochoa, Bloomington, IN
Donald Oliver, Concord, MA
Linda Rosenzweig, Pittsburg, PA
Walter Schultz, Munster, IN
William Stanley, University of Delaware
Myra Zarnowski, Jamaica, NY

Note: Glen Blankenship’s article in the Fall 1990 issue of this journal, “Classroom Climate, Global Knowledge, Global Attitudes, Political Attitudes” contains typographical errors. Mr. Blankenship’s corrections reached this office too late to reach the printers. Corrected copies of the article can be obtained by addressing:

Glen Blankenship
Emory University
Division of Educational Studies
201 Fishburne Building
Atlanta, GA 30322
(404) 995-2377
ATTENTION ALL AUTHORS

The incoming editor, Jack Fraenkel, is the proper destination for all new manuscripts.

Dr. Jack Fraenkel
Research and Development Center
Burk Hall 238
School of Education
San Francisco State University
San Francisco, CA 94132
(415) 338-2510

Dr. Fraenkel will assume the position of editor beginning with TRSE’s Summer 1991 edition.
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millard Clements</td>
<td>A Note From The Editor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Rigberg</td>
<td>What Must Not Be Taught</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Sears &amp; Jim Parsons</td>
<td>Towards Critical Thinking as an Ethic</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucien Ellington &amp; James Muntean</td>
<td>Economics Teachers’ Attitudes About and Treatment of Japan</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter H. Martorella</td>
<td>Consensus Building among Social Educators: A Delphi Study</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Akenson</td>
<td>Linkages of Art and Social Studies: Focus Upon Modern Dance/Movement</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Reviews</td>
<td>Legacy of Silence</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoNet</td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information for Authors</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Note From The Editor:

The General Assembly of the United Nations, in 1982, established The World Commission on the Environment. Its charge was to:

Propose long-term environmental strategies for achieving sustainable development by the year 2000.

Recommend cooperative activities among developing countries and among countries at different stages on economic and social development.

Identify procedures by which the international community may deal with environmental issues.

Identify long-term environmental issues, and an agenda for action in the decades ahead.

In 1983, the Secretary-General of the United Nations asked Gro Harlem Bruntland to establish and chair this commission. She was at that time party leader and Prime Minister of Norway. She had a background of political struggle, nationally and internationally, as an environment minister.

With some reluctance she accepted the challenge of the appointment, because she thought it was abundantly clear that, "We need a mandate for change."

Then and now many political leaders, many educators, and many social studies teachers demonstrate little understanding of the environmental issues we face today on our damaged planet.

Scientists around the world have brought to our attention the facts of global warming, the threats to the ozone shield, and the transformation of agricultural land into deserts.

Although the majority of people in Japan, Korea, Canada, and the United States have adequate shelter, food, health services, and education, because of the growing world population, there are more hungry people on our planet today than ever before, and their numbers are growing as are the numbers of people who cannot read or write, the number of people without safe water, a safe home, and the means to cook and warm themselves. The gap between the rich and the poor nations of the world is growing wider.

We in the industrial nations think of environmental issues such as plastics, solid waste, toxic waste, perhaps nuclear wastes, and greenhouse gases. We do not think of the gap between the rich nations and the poor as being an environmental issue, and yet it is the major environmental challenge we face today.

Each year six million hectares of productive dry land becomes a desert. In 30 years this would be about the size of Saudi Arabia. More than eleven million hectares of forest are destroyed yearly and this over 30 years would be about the size of India. Much of this land is turned into low-grade farm land that is unable to support those who settle it. The burning of fossil fuels...
produces greenhouse gases that are changing the character of climate on the planet. The result may be rising seas, and the destruction of coastal areas.

At the present rate of population increase, the five billion global citizens of today will have to take care of, plan for or deal with another five billion people early in the next century. Who is going to provide food, housing, shelter, and education for ten billion people? About 90% of this increase will be in the poorer regions of the world. About 90% of those people will live in cities. Poverty, population growth, food, clean water, and shelter are interrelated issues that students, teachers, and researchers must come to understand, face, and resolve.

Industries that rely on environmental resources and are most heavily polluting are growing rapidly in the poorer regions of the world. Environmental refugees of the future may number in the millions.

Many national leaders have responded to reports of global warming and the growing gap between rich nations and poor by assigning environmental responsibilities to institutions and agencies without the power or authority to cope with them.

In the United States, the Reagan administration disregarded environment-development issues, disregarded public health and world population issues, and engaged in the lax enforcement of existing laws. The U.S. lost eight years of responsible action in environmental restoration and preservation.

Social studies researchers and teachers face two significant environmental realities today:

1. Environmental degradation arising from affluence and overconsumption of industrial nations.
   *The environmental crisis of affluence.*

   And,

2. Environmental degradation arising from poverty and the efforts of the impoverished to produce food, shelter, and hope by destroying forests, and overconsuming other natural resources.
   *The environmental crisis of poverty.*

The most dangerous, the most threatening environmental issue is the crisis of poverty and hunger because there are no trends, no policies, no programs that are narrowing the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations of the world.

Improvement of the way of life of the poor nations of the world in the style of the polluting industrial nations will produce global calamity. The challenges of affluence are connected with the despair of hunger and poverty.

The main claim of *Our Common Future* is that there are no environmental problems, there are no environmental solutions. The environment does not exist separate from human actions, ambitions, and economic affairs. Environmental issues are intimate aspects of energy policy, transportation, industrial development, financial activity, and urban ways of life.
Development, in the Third World, too often is simply thought of as helping poor nations of the world to be rich in the fashion of the rich nations of the world today. Development that is not sustainable is part of the problem rather than being part of the solution to the environmental challenge. There are development-environment issues both in Third World countries and in the affluent industrial nations. Poverty is the major development-environment issue wherever it is to be found. In the industrial nations, too often developers destroy wetlands, forests, and seashores for the profit of privileged individuals. Greed in the industrial nations, and desperation in the less developed nations, result in environmental destruction.

The report of this commission, *Our Common Future*, dealt with difficult and controversial matters. Members of the commission, from different nations, with different traditions, considered the development-environment connection, the meaning of population growth from around four billion to eight or 10 billion in the next century. The Commission considered human rights on a planet without enough food, the investment in arms and military equipment in the face of the tragedies of Bhopal, Chernobyl, and African famines.

Members of the commission made a unanimous report that should be read and evaluated by every teacher, every social studies researcher, every government official, every citizen of all of the countries of the world.

Here are members of the commission who wrote *Our Common Future*. Teachers, researchers, and students should know who they are.

**Chairman:** Gro Harlem Brundtland (Norway)

**Vice Chairman:** Mansour Khalid (Sudan)

Susanna Agnelli (Italy)
Saleh A. Al-Athel (Saudi Arabia)
Bernard Chidzero (Zimbabwe)
Lamine Mohammed Fadika (Cote d'Ivoire)
Volker Hauff (Federal Republic of Germany)
Istvan Lang (Hungary)
Ma Shijun (People's Republic of China)
Margarita Marino de Botero (Colombia)
Nagendra Singh (India)
Paulo Nogueira-Neto (Brazil)
Saburo Okita (Japan)
Shridath S. Ramphal (Guyana)
William D. Ruckelshaus (United States)
Mohamed Sahoun (Algeria)
Emil Salim (Indonesia)
Bukar Shaib (Nigeria)
Valdimir Sokolov (USSR)
Janez Stanovnik (Yugoslavia)
Maurice Strong (Canada)
Ex Officio: Jim MacNeil (Canada)

This book is divided into three parts and two annexes.

Part I: Common Concerns
   A Threatened Future
   Towards Sustainable Development
   The Role of The International Economy

Part II: The Common Challenges
   Population
   Food
   Species Preservation
   Energy
   Industry
   The Urban Challenge

Part III: Common Endeavors
   Managing the Commons
   Peace, Security, Development, and the Environment
   Proposals for Institutional and Legal Changes

Annex 1 Legal Principles for Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development

Annex 2 The Commission and its Work

I will look briefly at each section and consider what Our Common Future has to say to social studies teachers, to public officials, to citizens of the various nations of the world, and to those who would do significant research in social studies education.

Part I: Common Concerns
A Threatened Future

One can think of our threatened future in light of the environmental crisis of affluence: there is the panoply of affluent issues such as solid waste disposal, sewage disposal, air pollution, water pollution, toxic wastes, and deforestation, all of which have implications for climate stability, clean water, and a livable world.

One can think of our threatened future in light of the environmental crisis of poverty: the number of people living in shanty towns and slums is rising; the numbers without clean water and sanitation are rising; there are large differences in per capita income that range from $190 a year in low-income countries to over $11,000 a year in industrially developed countries.

Over half of the poorer countries of the world have experienced a decline in per capita domestic production in recent years. Behind such numbers as these are real people living in hunger and despair for whom forest preservation, toxic waste, and environmental preservation have little meaning.
Economics and ecology, environment and development must be linked if we are to wisely face the challenge to restore and preserve the quality of life of human beings, birds, fish, trees, clean air, clean water, and the fertile lands of our planet.

A metaphor for all of our common concerns, for our common future, is the rising instance of disasters. In the 1970s, six times as many people died of natural disasters each year as died in the 1960s. Victims of droughts and floods, the results of deforestation and overcultivation, increased from 18 million in the 1960s to 24 million in the 1970s; 5.2 million people were victims of floods in the 1960s; 15 million were victims in the 1970s.

**Sustainable Development**

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of people living today without compromising the ability of people yet to be born to meet their needs. We should not leave to our grandchildren contaminated water, dead seas, dead rivers, and a Greenhouse atmosphere.

Every researcher, every student, every politician, every parent, every social studies teacher should think of sustainable development as they use paper, buy food, drive cars, heat their houses, and go to school.

**The International Economy**

*Our Common Future* identifies two principles that should regulate the international economy:

1. Economic Sustainability.
2. Equity in Exchange

Neither is being met today through initiatives of government, citizen action or business initiative. Social studies researchers, especially those who are interested in economic issues, should address the educational implications of this reality.

**Part II: Common Challenges**

**Population**

Each year the number of people increases, but the natural resources with which to sustain this population, to improve its quality of life, and to eliminate mass poverty is finite.

Present rates of population growth cannot continue because there will be not enough clean water to drink, food to eat, and livable space to occupy. Wars over clean water, famine, and disease may reduce these numbers in the future, but education, health care, and security is a wiser way to regulate the size of the population of our planet and the quality of life that will be led.

Population growth rates are not just a matter of the low-income nations. An additional person in an industrial nation consumes far more and creates far more environmental stress than an additional person in the Third World.
Choice about family matters is a way of assuring—especially for women—the basic human right of self-determination. Through the Reagan years and the Bush administration, the United States Government has opposed most efforts to provide such health services. Religious turmoil about abortion has obscured a fundamental global issue. With a population of four billion today there are many people homeless and hungry, both in the industrial nations and in the less developed nations. Can we ever be prepared to provide a quality way of life for eight billion human beings, for 12 billion human beings, for 20 billion human beings? We must learn to be prudent in the use of natural resources, in the use of clean water, in the disposal of our refuse in the air, in lakes and rivers, or in the oceans. We must be prudent in our choice of family size.

When population exceeds the capacity of available resources it diminishes human welfare. But people are the creative resource of every society. To nurture well-being through better nutrition, health care, and education contributes to sustainable development. Unlimited population increases are not sustainable. A healthy, educated people can restore the environment, and understand the connection between human health and the life systems of the planet. If the lakes die, if the coral disappears, if the birds vanish, our species will vanish with them. We occupy a niche in a complex life system that we should try to understand, and in which we should seek to find a sustainable home.

Food

There is more food produced today than ever before in human history. And there are more people living in hunger today than ever before because there are more people living on our planet than ever before. The challenge of increasing food production to keep pace with increasing population, while maintaining ecologically sustainable production systems, is complex and of enormous magnitude.

Sustainability requires the renewal of natural resources. Sustainable agricultural production requires land, water, and forests that are not degraded.

Food security from a global perspective requires reducing incentives that encourage overproduction and non-competitive production in the developed market economies and enhancing those that encourage food production in the development areas.

Species

Extinction is a fact of life on our planet. Species come and go. Past species extinction usually have resulted from natural processes including climate change and solar events. The average duration of a species is about five million years. Perhaps 900,000 species have become extinct every million years during the last 200 million years.
The average rate of extinction has been estimated to be about one species every 1-1/9th year over the long period of life on our planet. The present rate of human-caused extinction is estimated be many hundred times, perhaps a thousand times that rate. What does it matter that coral cease to live in our oceans? That plant species disappear? That fish vanish from lakes and rivers? That waterfowl do not return? There are several arguments. Species that disappear may have been of vital survival use to human life in ways that are yet to be discovered. Some species may prove to be of great economic importance. Some species now make life possible and their disappearance may have deep implications for human life in the future. On a deeper level, human life is a part of the life of this planet; as fish, plants, and birds disappear they may be warning of disappearances yet to come to species such as our own.

Energy

Energy is a fundamental environment-development issue. Future development, reduction of hunger, homelessness, and despair, depends on the long-term availability of increasing quantities of energy that is dependable, and environmentally safe.

At the present time there is no single source or combination of sources that can meet this future need for the eight billion or so human beings who are coming into existence in the years ahead. Consider these realities:

Fossil Fuel. This is a source in limited supply. Oil supply will be in sharp decline in the next century; gas supplies may last another 200 years; coal may last several thousand years at present rates of use. But fossil fuels are associated with global warming, and heavy use of such fuels is now and may continue to be very dangerous.

Our Common Future recommends that we should engage in a vigorous oil conservation policy. We should regard fossil fuels as a precious resource to be used with prudent care.

Nuclear Energy. The production of nuclear power is dangerous; it requires very careful supervision, and accidents can cause damage over extensive areas of the globe as Chernobyl demonstrated. At best, nuclear plants are very hazardous.

The most significant limitation on nuclear power development is that there is no solution to the safe disposition of nuclear waste products. Some nuclear wastes have been dumped into the ocean; some have been disposed of in poor and small states without the means of assessing their dangers.

Until there is a safe means of disposal of nuclear wastes, nuclear power is a dubious long-term energy resource.

Wood Fuels. Rural wood supplies appear to be steadily collapsing in many countries, especially sub-Saharan Africa. In many parts of the world wood is being collected faster than it can regrow.
Renewable Energy. In principle, renewable energy sources could provide all the energy needed for the present rate of consumption. In fact, renewable energy supplies only about 20% of the energy consumed today worldwide. Renewable energy sources are generally environmentally sensitive and are becoming cost-effective.

Our Common Future recommends that solar, wind, geothermal, and other energy sources have high priority in national energy programs, in business, and in the development of energy-efficient housing. Citizens of the United States should recall that one of the first decisions of President Reagan was to eliminate federal support for alternative energy projects.

In face of the risks associated with fossil fuels and nuclear energy, the development of renewable energy sources should be a high priority of governments, business, and people everywhere.

The study and appraisal of energy issues should be an integral aspect of social studies education in all of the nations of the world because energy issues are central to sustainable development.

Conservation. Conservation can make a significant contribution to efficient uses of energy. Some nations have encouraged conservation by increasing energy prices, other have discouraged energy efficiency. Energy efficient homes, schools, transportation, and industries can make an important contribution to prudent uses of energy resources.

A fundamental challenge to social studies researchers and teachers is to transform every school into a model of conservation and ecological responsibility.

Industry

Resource and environmental consideration must be integrated into industrial planning and decision making of government and industry. Industry must establish environmental goals, regulations, incentives, and standards to preserve the environment to produce efficiently. In general an industry (within any particular city, state or nation) should:

1. Not harm the health and environment of other communities, states, or nations.
2. Be liable and compensate for any transfrontier pollution.
3. Guarantee equal right of access to remedial measures by all parties.

Pollution-intensive, resource-based industries are rapidly growing in the poorer countries of the world. Many developing states need technical help in assessing the long term risks associated with industrial production that can be sustained.

The Urban Challenge

In most Third World cities the housing used by the poor is decrepit, and city buildings are in disrepair. So too is the infrastructure of the city. Water systems leak; sewage seeps into the water supply. Approximately half the
global population will live in cities by the year 2000. Cities in both the Third World and in the industrial world face serious environment-development challenges.

In the industrial cities there is often the means and sometimes the will to face these issues. In the Third World cities there may not be the means because development even with toxic wastes and polluted rivers is better than starvation.

Part III: Common Endeavors

Managing the Commons

Restoring and preserving the commons, the oceans, space, Antarctica, the atmosphere is a responsibility of all nations because all nations will suffer the consequences of development without environmental sensitivity and prudence.

President Reagan refused to support the Law of The Sea. He argued that each nation should do as it wished, and no effort should be made to preserve the commons through international agreement. Social studies teachers and researchers can provide leadership in developing public understanding of the importance of preserving the global commons.

Peace, Security, Development, and the Environment

The investment in military hardware and preparation for armed conflict are major obstacles to sustainable development. Investment in weapons uses scarce resources. The military preempts human resources that could be used to restore the environment, resources that could be used to develop strategies to confront the poverty and social inequity that contribute to political insecurity. Military confrontations create climates of opinion antagonistic to cooperation among nations whose ecological interdependence requires the reduction of national and ideological antipathies.

The overinvestment in military activities reduces the energy directed to sustainable development both in the industrial societies and in the developing world.

Proposal for Legal and Institutional Change

Our Common Future reports that the interdependent ecological systems of the planet are unrelated to national systems of government and the divisions and agencies of government that exercise responsibilities of commerce, energy, foreign policy, labor, health, education, sanitation, and the environment. Those who are responsible for the management of natural resources and the protection of the environment, in most nations, are institutionally separate.

Separate policies and institutions cannot wisely deal with the interrelated realities of environment and development. Perhaps the most difficult challenge of the environment is to invent new institutions that can deal with the interrelated realities of the living systems of the planet.
Annex 1: Legal Principles
The following are the legal principles that the commission proposes:

General Principles
1. All human beings have the fundamental right to an environment adequate for health and well being.
2. States shall conserve and use the environment and natural resources for the benefit of present and future generations.
3. States shall maintain ecosystems and ecological processes essential for the functioning of the biosphere, shall preserve biological diversity, and shall observe the principle of optimum sustainable yield in the use of living natural resources.
4. States shall establish adequate environmental protection standards and monitor changes in and publish relevant data on environmental quality and resource use.
5. States shall make or require prior environmental assessments of proposed activities which may significantly affect the environment or the use of natural resources.
6. States shall inform in a timely manner all persons likely to be significantly affected by planned activity and to grant them equal access and due process in administrative and judicial proceedings.
7. States shall ensure that conservation is treated as an integral part of the planning and implementation of development activities and provide assistance to other states, especially to developing countries, in support of environmental protection and sustainable development.
8. States shall co-operate in good faith with other states in implementing the preceding rights and obligations.

These are principles that students and parents and citizens may wish to consider as they appraise the performance of their elected leaders and the policies of their government, and these are principles that students may analyze in schools as they consider environmental issues. How may they, for example, be adapted to regulate schools as models of ecological living?

This is an outline of the message of *Our Common Future*. What does it imply for research in social education in the United States?

*Our Common Future* and United States Social Studies Research and Education Today

Public education, especially social studies education, has a special responsibility for directing attention to issues identified in *Our Common Future* because the solution to our environment-development issues lies not in science and technology, nor in government, but in our common understanding of the crisis of life on our planet today. If the environment is to be restored and preserved, students, teachers, parents, men, and women will preserve it in their homes, their schools, in their work places, in the streets, and as
citizens engaged in the affairs of their community. The resolution of environmental issues, if they are to be resolved, is through public education and public understanding.

Researchers in social education can play an important role in addressing this responsibility.

Our Common Future suggests that students and teachers around the world should give attention to these issues:

1. The Rich Nations and the Poor. Rich nations have an interest in the development of the poor nations because if the poor nations develop without environmental sensitivity, life on our globe will be at risk as result of global pollution. Poverty does not contribute to global security, and development that is environmentally destructive is dangerous to all life on the planet. The fate of coral, rainforests, birds, and human beings, rich and poor, are intimately connected.

2. Sustainable Development. Sustainable development, development that does not jeopardize the quality of life of future generations, is the responsibility of students, teachers, researchers, parents, and citizens living today.

3. Four Billion People, Eight Billion people, 10 Billion People. Our species must limit its growth in prudent, caring, and responsible ways.

4. Food: There is not enough today; there may be less in the future. The food problem of the future may be more a matter of distribution than amount. There is not enough food today and the degradation of agriculturally productive land continues.

5. Species Preservation. Human activities are destroying many species of plants and animals at a very rapid rate. There are many utilitarian reasons for reducing this rate of destruction. There may be important market values to species now being callously eliminated. At a deeper level, the disappearing species, the disappearance of birds, fish, and plants may be a portent of our own demise. We are part of a living world. If it dies we will die with it.

6. Energy. Alternative energy sources; solar, wind, and geothermal must be developed in schools, homes, businesses. This should be one of our highest priorities. Schools can be models of energy conservation, and models of alternative energy usage. That should be a mission of education. Providing leadership relating to this issue is another challenge of social studies education and research.

7. Managing the Commons. The oceans, space, and Antarctica should be preserved as a global commons for the use and enjoyment of generations to come.

If students, teachers and citizens generally understand the environmental issues they will not vote for political leaders who do not understand them. If we understand the issues we will not tolerate government appointees who ignore such life and death matters. If we understand the issues we will conduct our public schools and our personal life sensitive to the ecological realities of the living systems of the planet.
In effect, our challenge as social studies teachers and researchers is to make our schools environmentally responsible institutions. Students and teachers may work to restore and to preserve the environment in their schools and in their communities. In an ecologically engaged school, critical reading, effective writing, social analysis, and scientific work will have an important place. The mission of social studies education in the 21st century should be to engage students in the responsible work of restoring the environment.

Our factory system of education and our industrialized curriculum can be transformed into ecological learning communities. Our engineering studies can be redirected into scholarship that calls attention to global issues and clarifies how they may be addressed in schools.

Global education is not a matter of learning more or less abstract ideas about our living planet. Global education or environmental education is the act of engaging in the work of restoration and preservation in schools, communities, and nations, and it is the act of engaging in communications with other students around the world who are also engaged in environmentally responsible work.

School-to-school-computer telecommunications using such systems as EcoNet (Institute for Global Communications, 3228 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, California, 94115, (415) 923-0900), Web, Alternex, or Pegasus can connect students in Brazil with students in Korea, Canada or Japan. The EcoNet computer conference called unep.nyu.youth, for example, can be one avenue of communication regarding environmental matters.

Researchers and teachers must think globally about food, about water, about pollution, about the growth of the human population, about energy, about deforestation, about toxic wastes. We must communicate globally with other students, teachers, and environmentalists who are thinking globally about these issues, and we must act locally in our schools and communities.

Think globally, communicate globally, act locally is the business of social education in the 21st century.

The environmental challenge is an opportunity for social studies researchers and teachers to engage students in the work of the world, to analyze local issues, to communicate with others, to petition governments, to make schools sustainable ecological communities.

For many decades social studies has been the least liked or respected feature of the school curriculum. Perhaps this disrespect is deserved. We now face an opportunity to make social studies a vital aspect of the global struggle for a livable world. Dare we face this challenge to heart and mind and scholarship? Or shall we continue in our children-factory mentality, ignore the world around us, and devote our attention to rigorous engineering studies of trivial matters?

Social studies teachers and researchers and students can learn to see our interdependence with the life of coral, earthworms, bees, and krill. Not to
see this interdependence, is to ignore the living world in which we find ourselves and within which we will experience our common future.

Millard Clements
Editor, TRSE
What Must Not Be Taught

Benjamin Rigberg
Professor Emeritus of History
Monmouth College
West Long Branch, New Jersey

Abstract

The impetus for the present study derives from a United States district court's condemnation of 44 history and social studies texts for failing to include any references to religion in shaping America's past. Further examination of nine of these texts, all senior high school American history works, reveals them to be defective in providing a historical framework for understanding another of the most fundamental changes in American life, that is, the extension of the United States market over the entire globe. Four "imperial" wars provide the basis for this analysis: the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and the Cold War. The conclusion reached is that historical continuity, on which an objective analysis should be based, is almost totally lacking.

Introduction

The impetus for the present study derives from a recent federal district court decision removing certain history and social science textbooks from the public schools of the state of Alabama (Smith et al. v. Mobile County, 1987). The "convicted" books were charged with omitting the role of religion in the development of American history and institutions. The charge, but not the censorship, is valid.1

The Alabama case is important because the books in litigation are representative of those in general use throughout the country.2 Ten of these controversial books are high school American history texts, and they constitute the basis for the analysis presented here.3 If, then, these texts almost completely ignore the influence of religion upon our past, might they not also be deficient in other major ways? The decision of the presiding judge, while devastating in its attack upon learning as well as upon the First Amendment, is a significant example of the attention now being directed toward the contents of American history texts, both by critics on the Right and other pressure
groups, who seek to refashion textbooks in accordance with their own biases, and by teachers and scholars in general, whose aim is to make high school narrative history more consonant with the past "as it actually happened."

Of the studies of selected topics in high school American history texts which have thus far appeared, none has focused upon the treatment of one of the most fundamental changes in American history—the transformation which a major school of historians regards as the central theme of our past and present—that is, territorial expansion and the extension of the American market over the entire globe. Such global expansion has also generated global conflicts with other states motivated by similar aims, and it is this expansion and these conflicts which are the themes of the present study.

Because of limitations of space, this paper will omit the examination of our continental expansion to the Pacific as well as the acquisition of Alaska and Hawaii and proceed directly to examine the treatment in these texts of the worldwide extension of the American market as reflected in its "imperial" wars: the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and the Cold War. The methodology followed will be to present an "ideal" narrative of each of these four topics and then to measure the textbooks' accounts, identifying their limitations and defects.

What is History? Objectivity and the Problems of the Historian

Before entering upon an analysis of the treatment of our topic in these curriculum materials, it is necessary to say a word about what the historian should be doing when she/he is writing history: i.e., what is history? What are the absolutes, if there are any, by which one can measure the product of the historian's analyses?

Though history, as the term is used here, is the study of the past as a systematic discipline in order to arrive at the true depiction of former times, it is perhaps better for our purposes to note at the outset what history is not. The historian sets for her/himself the task of recreating the past as it actually occurred. This is, of course, impossible, because individual emotions, preconceptions, ideological perspectives, and other baggage of the mind—to say nothing of the adequacy and completeness of the archival sources—will direct the historian's choice of what seems to have occurred. Those who would sit down to write history, must therefore first stand up and lay out all of their own intellectual and emotional biases. Some examples from the texts under review illustrate their editors' failure to confront their own prejudices. For example, when a 20th-century American history text offers as justification for the savagery, murder, and cruelty which the White people of North America have inflicted upon the American Indians in several centuries of domination, the explanation that the Indians were "ripe for conquest"—this is not history, but very skillful racist propaganda, designed to soothe White consciences. When such a text invariably favors employers and denigrates unions and union activity, when the strikes discussed are only those
which labor has not won, it is not being historical for it is taking sides in a struggle between two contending groups. In thus taking sides, it seeks to implant in young minds a disdain for unions and union activity. It is unhistorical also for such a text to scorn the radical labor movements of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, mocking their programs and caricaturing their leadership, as do a number of the texts examined here. If history and geography texts are permeated with racist concepts, as indeed they all were in the 19th and early 20th centuries, then the product is not history. If the texts encourage in the students uncritical acceptance of every act of their government in the interest of instilling a higher nationalism, if Providence is called upon to certify a given order of society as eternally valid, then this, too, is not history, and the aim is to establish prejudices in young minds rather than truth. Also, a text which shows unflagging hostility to the prevailing institutions of any particular time or place is unacceptable as history.

What does the historian do, then, and what are her/his responsibilities? The most important obligation is not to serve the interests of any particular group or even an entire society. This does not mean that the product is to be lifeless, or that the historical imagination cannot enrich it, or even that it must be devoid of moral judgment. What the historian must do is to soak up all the relevant material about a given episode, subject, or movement; and then, keeping in mind her/his own biases, present the causes and results of the episode, subject, or movement in the fairest possible terms. To point out the consequences of an historical action, both anticipated and unanticipated, is not a bias, but an indispensable aspect of the craft. There is no single account of the past valid above all others, but rather a myriad of views which are sound—so long, that is, as the sources are fully and faithfully adhered to, and so long as fundamental facts are not overlooked or distorted. If this is done, then the goals set by this exacting discipline have been fulfilled, and the inquiring student is given the opportunity to utilize her/his critical faculties for the understanding of the past and for applying that understanding to comprehend the present. To what extent the textbooks under review adhere to such a definition of history will be summarized at the end of this paper.

Another caveat is in order. The fact that accounts about an era or a subject differ widely in their interpretations does not mean that all truth is relative. Though many historians believe that facts by themselves are identified only through our interpretations of them, there remains a basic core on which agreement cannot be in dispute.

Two of the texts under review are illustrative of the foregoing remarks: Boorstin-Kelley’s *A History of the United States* (1986), which was the only text approved for use in the case cited above, and Todd-Curti’s *Rise of the American Nation* (1982), which was among those condemned.

One example of Boorstin-Kelley’s limitations is noteworthy. A kind of hysteria permeates its treatment of Communism and the U.S.S.R., and this results in producing a very defective picture of a significant segment of re-
cent history. Communism appears in the index 32 times but is never once explained. Marx and Engels are not listed in the index. Out of a total of 763 pages, the text takes up all or part of 57 pages with topics related to Communism. These include R. Mitchell Palmer's raids, the Cold War, the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, internal United States security, and other accounts of Communist activities in relation to the United States. In the discussion of the Haymarket "anarchist" riots of 1886, for example, the authors refer to the activities of "Communists" in the bombing. There were, of course, no "Communists" in 1886. The word dropped out of use after the European revolutions of 1848 and was not resurrected until February 1918, when Lenin proposed that the name of the Bolshevik Party (Social Democrats) be changed to the Communist Party. The perpetrators of the Haymarket tragedy were never adequately identified. To refer to those convicted and hanged as "Communists" is inaccurate. Many anarchists were opposed to class struggle and to the use of violence. The word "Communist" is used so loosely and pejoratively that it demeans the lofty ideals of all those not in agreement with the authors. This is indeed poor history writing.

In contrast to the Boorstin-Kelley text, the prohibited Todd-Curti strives for objectivity. Notable are the sections dealing with the struggle of women for equality; the post-World War II problems of the American Indians; and the difficulties confronting Hispanic minorities, especially Puerto Ricans and Mexicans. The section on the Black Civil Rights movement includes discussions of the burning of the inner cities, the rise of Black Power, and the Black Muslim movement. This section, which is entitled "Reaching for Greater Freedom and Justice," is one of the most thorough in any of the textbooks examined here. Vague or difficult terms are defined. Such words as "culture" and "civilization" are placed in boldface in the text and explained in footnotes. Despite the excellences noted, this textbook does falter in its discussions of World War II and the Cold War.

The Spanish-American War

The Spanish-American War offers an opportunity to present in great clarity the subject of American economic expansion and political domination into areas outside the United States. This first "colonial" war of the United States must be seen in its larger perspective as part of a continuing movement of expansion into Central and South America and the Pacific, based upon the need to find safe markets for surplus manufactured goods, sources of raw materials, cheap labor, and places for the investment of capital. Popular passions intensified by newspaper rivalries and the idealistic appeals to which Americans are prone did indeed play their part in this conflict, but the fundamental drive of the business interests of the country for continuing extension of the market was the basic cause of the Spanish-American War. And when, with the acquisition of Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Guam, and the Philippines, the vista of empire opened up, "racism, paternalism, and talk of money mingled with talk of destiny and civilization" (Zinn, 1980, p. 306). That the
independence of Cuba was not desired by the American government and the business community is evident from the fact that during Cuba’s War for Independence from Spain (1895–98), the American government did not grant belligerent status to the insurgents. Had this been done, it would have enabled the United States to assist the rebellion without actually committing its own troops. But if the rebels had won on their own, might they not have limited United States access to the Cuban market? Moreover, since a very significant number of the rebels were Black, might not a Black Republic have emerged from a Cuban victory? Would it not be better, asked the young Winston Churchill in 1896 (perhaps expressing the sentiments of some Americans also), to keep Cuba under the Spanish flag rather than allow this eventuality to occur? (Churchill, 1896, cited in Zinn, p. 296).

The opportunity to present a solid historical analysis of the Spanish-American War is missed by most of the nine texts. None of them presents the era as part of the continuing expansionist development of the United States. As will be seen later, subsequent occurrences of expansion and domination which appear in these texts are simply episodic events.


The remaining six stress such bizarre notions as patriotism, missionizing, a love of adventure, security, and the export of democracy. For example, one text offers the opinion that all the American people after the Civil War “hungered” for new markets, but it provides no systematic account of the causes for this “hunger.” Neither does it demonstrate that such a hunger really existed. Another uses the slogan “Manifest Destiny,” which first became current in the 1840s in connection with westward expansion, in its explanation of the Spanish-American War, entitled the section “1898—Manifest Destiny or Great Aberration?” (Bragdon & McCutchen, 1981, pp. 569–577). The word aberration means something out of the ordinary, a deviation from the norm, something not planned. The use of this word here directs the textbook reader to reach a totally mistaken view of the forces shaping American foreign policy. As any mature student of the subject knows, expansion and conquest were in the minds of the Founding
Fathers and of the statesmen who followed them, providing a continuous outward look to our foreign policy. Literature on this subject is available in any good history of American diplomacy (see especially Williams, 1959). The use of this word here reminds one of the dictum of the British historian J. B. Seeley that Great Britain acquired its empire in a "fit of absence of mind." In the same way, the text states, "With almost no one foreseeing what was going to happen, this country acquired an overseas empire." With the acquisition of empire came the "commitment to keep order in the entire Caribbean region" (Bragdon & McCutchen, 1981, 569-577). What this commitment has meant to the peoples of the region is only too well-known today to those who care to read—loss of sovereignty, poverty, starvation, exploitation, and death squads. With such superficiality spread out upon the pages of the text, it is hardly surprising that the discussion of imperialism—a term that is not defined in this same book—must leave the student completely befuddled.

The story is told that when the Spanish government, in a secret telegram to President William McKinley, offered to yield to every North American demand except one (and the Spanish government indicated it would willingly negotiate on this point also, which had to do with the independence of Cuba), the President put the telegram in his pocket and sent the war declaration to Congress. Sometime later the President was asked about that telegram. He snapped his fingers and said, "Shucks! I forgot all about it!" The story may be apocryphal, but the facts are not. The Spanish government did indeed offer to yield because it knew that if war were to break out, it would be crushed by the new American giant, and McKinley did not tell the Congress. None of the textbooks under review mentions this very significant episode.

The Spanish-American War is a dramatic moment in the continuing process of domination of other peoples and places by the United States government and American business interests. An understanding of the fundamental reasons for such expansion would have offered the student the tools for analyzing contemporary American foreign policy involvements. This, unfortunately, has not often been the case, and consequently the efforts of the American government to dominate such places as Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Panama are as mystifying to the average American today as were the initial expansionist drives of an earlier era.

**World War I**

How well do the nine texts under review deal with the first worldwide struggle of the 20th century? Materials on the origins of World War I are especially abundant. The conflict generated such extreme passions and was so unprecedented in the havoc it wrought that historians were early attracted to the study of its roots. Germany, which according to the peace treaties was saddled with the total responsibility for having caused all the death and
destruction by starting the war, quickly responded to the charge of guilt by publishing 40 volumes of international correspondence on the diplomatic origins of the war. Such frankness in revealing the secrets of international relations so soon after the war's end compelled the other great powers, embarrassed by the revelations, to open their archives and publish their own accounts of events. For the month of July 1914 alone, for example, there are 60,000 documents to scrutinize. As a result, historians have published many excellent monographs on the origins of the war.\textsuperscript{12}

It is useful to follow the pattern established by standard historians who distinguish between the fundamental or underlying causes and the precipitating or immediate cause of the war. The establishment and extension of colonial empires by the European powers and the collision of interests arising among them from disputed claims in areas which today are called the Third World were the first underlying cause.\textsuperscript{13} In turn, the drive to establish and extend colonies was based upon the search by the major Powers for raw materials, the need to find markets for the sale of manufactured goods, and the effort to obtain places for the investment of surplus capital. This imperialist fever burst forth anew among the European Powers in the 1880s and 1890s, and their competing struggles led to a series of international crises which drove Europe ever closer to the brink of war.

A second underlying cause was the aspiration of Europe's subject nationalities for independence, which represented the centrifugal force threatening the continued existence of the Austro-Hungarian, German, Russian, and Ottoman Empires. Groups like the Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenes, Poles, Serbs, Croats, and others sought to establish independent nation states. Since peaceful solutions to this nationality question were unattainable—Winston Churchill has noted that no government exists to preside over its own dissolution—war alone could bring about the consequent freeing of subject nationalities. Thus, imperialism and nationalism are the two major underlying causes of the war.

Both the rivalries and the convergence of common interests among Great Britain, France, Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy within Europe and in the colonial world led to the formation of the alliance system so that between 1907 and 1914 two groups of Great Powers confronted one another repeatedly. Britain, France, and Russia became known as the Triple Entente, while Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy were referred to as the Triple Alliance. The sense of crisis thus generated by interminable international confrontations slid easily into World War I.

Serbian policy (the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes constitute the Yugoslav nationality) aimed at annexing neighboring Bosnia-Herzegovina, which lay within the domain of Austria-Hungary, but was wholly inhabited by Serbs. The assassination of the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, in Sarajevo, the capitol of Bosnia, by Serbian patriots on June 28, 1914, who hoped thereby to bring about the unification of all South
Slavs into one nation, was the precipitating or immediate cause of the war.

In any discussion of the reasons for American entry into the war in April 1917, the following must be stressed. The United States had become a great power under the friendly eyes of Pax Britannica. The most powerful navy in the world was also the guarantor of North American security. There was no assurance that Germany, if it were victorious, would be as tolerant of America’s burgeoning greatness. As a matter of fact, there was evidence to the contrary, as the Zimmerman note revealed. This futile diplomatic gesture by the imperial German government in 1917 promised Mexico the restoration of California, Texas, and other parts of the American Southwest which had been seized after the Mexican War, if Mexico would throw in its lot with the Central Powers.

The financial support which the United States provided the Allies in the form of war loans as well as the commercial ties were of preponderant significance in the opinion of many historians who refer to “economic necessity.” Whether the affinity of common language, culture, and traditions was another fundamental reason for the United States’ entry into the war is uncertain. Woodrow Wilson’s personal predilection for becoming the Savior of Humanity plays a part, although this, too, may be controversial. The major, immediate causes for the United States’ entry into the war were the German policy of unrestricted naval warfare and the discovery of the Zimmerman note. This is the current consensus among many American historians.

Given such amplitude of documentation and interpretation, what is to be found on this topic in the nine texts under review?

Todd-Curti is the only textbook examined which follows the pattern of a division between fundamental and immediate causes of the war. The text uses the South Slavs (Yugoslavs) as an example of nationality strivings, and is thus able to point out very clearly the precipitating cause of the war (1982, pp. 569–577).

A second text loses its momentum upon entering the 20th century, so that there is no adequate account of the great events of this period (Bass, Billias & Lapsansky, 1982, pp. 649–657). Another pays scant attention to the underlying causes as well as to the precipitating events (Risjord & Haywoode, 1982, pp. 538–545). A fourth shows an abysmal ignorance of European history by ascribing World War I not to nationalism and imperialism, but to the loves and hates of the European monarchs before the Age of Nationalism (Boorstin & Kelley, 1986, pp. 443–451). According to this book, the European continent is pictured as a “battlefield of national ambitions, religious persecutions, and language barriers.” This was certainly true in some earlier centuries, but it is hardly appropriate to speak about religious persecution and language barriers as the causes of World War I. This same text describes the assassination of Franz Ferdinand without any reference to Serbian nationalism or to Austro-Hungarian efforts to suppress it, and the assassin Gavrilo Prinzip is referred to as a “Slavic nationalist.” South Slav,
or Yugoslav, would have been more accurate. Just why the European powder keg exploded in 1914 remains a mystery to high school history students who make use of this work.

The remaining texts similarly mislead the inquiring student. One of the texts reaches the height of absurdity when it answers the question of what brought about World War I with the statement “We cannot answer with certainty” (Bragdon & McCutchen, 1981, pp. 546–555), thus ignoring the existence of vast historical scholarship.

Another is even more puerile, when it tells its readers that following the assassination of an Austrian “prince” by a Bosnia student, Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia (Schwartz & O’Connor, 1984, pp. 466–470). Still another is misleading in relating that Serbia wanted to “free its other Slavic neighbors” from Austria-Hungary. This is, of course, not true. Serbia wished to free its fellow South Slavs, not the Poles or the Czechs or any other Slavic nationality lying wholly or partly within the Habsburg Empire. In this same work, militarism is given as one cause of the war, but as is well known, militarism is always a by-product of deeper forces at work. It is a consequence, not a cause (Smith, 1980, pp. 364–368). Yet another text is equally vague in talking about nationalist ambitions without identifying the process of nationalism. Imperialism is totally omitted. This text blunders in ascribing Great Britain’s entry into the war to Germany’s violation of Belgium’s neutrality. Colonial rivalries and the growing menace of a strong German navy were far more fundamental to Britain than the violation of Belgium, which served as a pretext to provide the British people with an “honorable” reason for entering the war. (Drewry, O’Connor & Freidel, 1984, pp. 485–493).

Confusion throughout characterizes eight of the nine texts in their explanation for America’s entry into World War I. There is no differentiation between underlying and precipitating causes. Nations do not enter lightly into great wars; decisions do not take place in a vacuum or for trivial reasons, contrary to what some of the texts so clearly imply. There is no thoughtful appraisal of this momentous step by the United States government in these works. Instead, one or more truths are partially stated, ignoring some of the more likely explanations. For example, one text states that Woodrow Wilson sought to reform international relations and that he could do so only by entering the war (Risjord & Haywoode, 1982, pp. 538–545). Another, while stressing some of the elements leading to American participation in the war, speaks of “moods” as driving forces: delegates to the Bull Moose convention of 1912, at which Theodore Roosevelt was nominated for another term as President, singing “Onward, Christian Soldiers”; Americans joining in a crusade to “make the world safe for democracy”; doughboys singing “Over There” as they marched to the slaughter (Bragdon & McCutchen, 1981, pp. 546–555).
Basic elements do appear as well, and it is to be hoped that the experienced high school instructor will know how to separate the grain from the chaff. There are discussions of trade and war loans, submarine warfare, the possibility expressed in one text that a future great German empire would be hostile to United States interests, massive allied propaganda in the United States, and the Zimmerman note. None of the texts, however, provides fully adequate materials for an understanding of this all-important topic, which is a pity.

The foregoing review of the contents of many widely used American history texts reveals the deprivation to which the high school student is subjected in the study of history. Only one book out of nine examined makes any pretense of fullness and objectivity in presenting so fundamental a topic as the root causes of World War I. If one keeps in mind the connection between this war and the other great events of the 20th century—the Bolshevik Revolution, Japanese aggression, the coming of Adolf Hitler, and, finally, World War II and its consequences—one hardly needs to plead for a better treatment of a topic that so urgently begs to be understood. The texts are virtually unanimous, with one or two modest exceptions, in denying the presence of United States imperialism in the modern world. The implications of this omission will be discussed in the concluding paragraphs of this paper.

World War II

The inadequacies of the high school texts are most disheartening in the treatment of World War II and the Cold War. Both topics thus require fairly extensive introduction in order to reveal the contrast between what actually happened and what the textbooks relate.

Any consideration of the causes of World War II must stress the all-important fact that this conflict and World War I were a single great episode in the history of the 20th century. The 20-year interval between them was simply a long truce. But there were other elements involved as well (see Kennedy, 1987, pp. 275-333). The causes underlying both wars seem identical although some additional factors, to be noted below, do come into play in the period preceding World War II. Since this connection is absent in all of the texts reviewed, the events of this most frightful of 20th century occurrences become disjointed, rather than interrelated as they truly were. Another element distorting the understanding of events is the inveterate hatred toward Communism which has persisted in the West since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and its climactic aftermath. This hostility pervades almost all American historical writing of international relations involving the Soviet Union and its late satellites and was intensified as many historians internalized the doctrines of the Cold War. This distortion provides a stark contrast to today's changing attitudes toward Eastern Europe: the "Evil Empire" has vanished. Together these sins of omission and commission combine to vitiate the usefulness of the texts under review.
One may look upon World War II, then, as merely the renewal of the armed struggle begun in 1914 to redivide world markets and trade and to rectify nationality borders within Europe. Additional elements which emerged in this inter-war period were the rise of fascist dictatorships, the adoption by Great Britain, France, and (to a lesser degree) the United States of the Policy of Appeasement, and the emergence of the last named state as the richest and most productive on earth. The three fascist states of Germany, Italy, and Japan became "aggressor" states in this era because each of them felt cheated in the division of spoils following World War I. Italy, though fighting on the winning side, had made an inadequate contribution toward the final victory and thus received a share of booty far below her expectations. Germany, besides losing her overseas colonial empire and suffering territorial losses in Europe, was compelled to accept sole culpability for starting the war and to pay reparations for all the damage caused in the struggle. And Japan was checkmated by the United States when, during World War I, she attempted to establish dominion over China. Each of these three countries was "dissatisfied" and strove to undo the settlements reached at the conclusion of the First War. Each sought a redistribution of the lands and resources of the Third World. For them, the treaties ending World War I were not written in imperishable granite. To the extent that they wished to undo these settlements, they were the "aggressor" nations in the inter-war period. In the same way, England and France were "peace-loving" between 1919 and 1939 because they were the victors who had garnered all the spoils and thus sought to maintain existing boundaries.

The complement to the aggressive stance of three dissatisfied states was the doctrine of Appeasement which emerged in international affairs during the decade of the 1930s. Putting aside for the moment his rantings against the Jews, the leitmotif of Mein Kampf was Hitler’s belief that Wilhelmine Germany had blundered in fighting World War I on two fronts simultaneously. In his book, Hitler vows that this mistake would not recur and that Germany look to the East for expansion—the so-called Lebensraum. The doctrine of Appeasement was intended to assist Hitler in his eastward move of conquest against the “Bolshevik Menace” by destroying the Soviet Communist government and annexing parts of its territory. The possibility of Communist Russia and Nazi Germany exhausting themselves in protracted warfare against one another was not overlooked by the Western Powers. Additional underpinning for Appeasement was the belief of British and French statesmen that their countries and empires might not be able to sustain a second world conflict, even if they were to be victorious (this, of course, did prove to be the case).

Appeasement consisted of two parts: one had to do with loans and trade concessions to strengthen Germany militarily; the other involved yielding to Hitler in the international crises that preceded the outbreak of the war,
sacrificing Austria and Czechoslovakia in the interest of sending the Nazis eastward.

The United States' entry into World War II was the result of longstanding American efforts to block Japan's colonial expansion into the mainland of Asia. The Japanese had been threatening United States markets and raw material supplies in their take-over of China in the 1930s, and success on the Asian mainland would have led the Japanese to exclude the United States' trade throughout East Asia. The alarm in the United States was very great when Japan moved into Southeast Asia in 1940–41, dispossessing the British, French, and Dutch, and taking over the tin, rubber, and oil of that region. Most of the United States' tin and rubber came from this area. The American government responded in the summer of 1941 with an embargo of scrap iron, oil, and other materials, and froze Japanese assets here. Such sanctions, it was well understood everywhere, might readily lead to war. Sometime before Pearl Harbor, the State Department expressed the view that our strategic and diplomatic positions would be weakened by the loss of markets in China and elsewhere in East Asia. Two weeks before the attack on Pearl Harbor, a White House conference anticipated a war in the Pacific and discussed how it might be justified in the eyes of the American people. The attack on Pearl Harbor was thus the climax in a long series of mutually antagonistic acts between Japan and the United States.

Such is the background of World War II. What does one find in the texts under review? Not a single book points to a connection between World Wars I and II. Three books imply that the basis for World War II lay in the conflict between fascism and democracy (Boorstin & Kelley, 1986, pp. 537–552; Risjord & Haywoode, 1982, pp. 610–619; Todd & Curti, 1982, pp. 663–679). This was not the case, despite the enduring popularity of the belief. Three examples will suffice to negate this view and show instead that the democracies encouraged the Fascist states to grow ever stronger. When the Italian invasion of Ethiopia began in 1935, the US continued selling oil to Italy for Mussolini to transport troops and supplies across the Mediterranean. In the end, Fascist Italy was strengthened by its conquest of Ethiopia. In the second case, the Spanish Civil War of 1936–39, the Western democracies allowed the democratic Socialist government of Spain to cave in against Fascist rebel assault by withholding from that government the military aid sanctioned by international law. In the third case, England and France allowed Hitler to absorb democratic Czechoslovakia (September 1938 and March 1939), strengthening Germany's strategic position for the forthcoming assault upon the Soviet Union. Thus, whatever the popular view may have been, the democratic states lacked a history of opposition to Fascism.

In most cases where the attempt is made to describe the rise of Fascism in Europe, there is no explanation given for Hitler's rise to power—not a word about Germany's disastrous loss of World War I or the depression of
1929 and the resulting chaos and economic decline of Germany's lower middle class. The Italian and German dictators are presented as operating in a vacuum, without any reference to the past histories of their countries.

Two texts point to Russia as a threat to world peace in the 1933 to 1939 period (Boorstin & Kelley, 1986, pp. 537-552; Todd & Curti, 1982, pp. 663-679). The actual facts do not support this view. The Soviet Union's futile but well-documented effort to lead the League of Nations in opposing Nazi aggression between 1933 and August 1939 has obviously been overlooked.

Other errors of fact abound in the texts. One text plays down the German people's attraction to Hitler by saying that he appealed to the "rabble." Actually, his constituency included the middle classes, many intellectuals, and a large segment of bankers, industrialists, and merchant princes, as well as groups among the working people. The same text asserts that Hitler invented the concentration camp. This dubious honor belongs to the British in India and South Africa. Also, this text errs in placing the most extreme horrors of the concentration camps, the gassing and incineration of Jews and others, as between 1933 and 1939, rather than between 1941 and 1945. Again, it leads the reader to believe that the American government tried to persuade a skeptical public of the horrors of these camps when, in fact, the government was insensitive to the slaughter for most of the war. Irrefutable proof of the existence of death camps became available to the State Department early in 1942, but this knowledge was largely withheld and not acted upon until January 1944. Instead, thousands of European Jews could have been saved had the State Department chosen to use up the visas already available for immigrants from Central Europe.

Another text states that on March 5, 1933, the German Parliament voted Hitler the power "to carry out a program for the conquest of central and eastern Europe and the acquisition of overseas colonies" (Bragdon & McCutchen, 1981, pp. 655-659). The text is obviously referring to the Reichstag's passage of the Enabling Act, which granted Hitler dictatorial powers for four years. It did not contain any of the above nonsense about a blueprint of conquest.

What material is available in these texts to provide the student with an understanding of the background to Pearl Harbor, the precipitating cause of America's entry into the war? The answer is, practically nothing. Several of the texts provide details of how America entered the war, but there is no why. The remainder are superficial in the extreme. Facts are hurled at the student without any attempt at integrating their significance. One text compresses a description of the steps leading to World War II into five sentences (Schwartz & O'Connor, 1984, pp. 539-540). Others are simplistic and trite (Drewry, O'Connor & Freidel, 1984, pp. 563-570), lacking the continuity so essential for the student of history.
Yet another states that the great powers were “indifferent to the rise of Hitler. . . . Only Mussolini did not underestimate the fanaticism and determination of the Führer (leader) to conquer all of Europe” (Risjord & Haywoode, 1982, pp. 610-619). The Great Powers were not “indifferent” to the rise of Hitler, as the documents do indeed show. In every major country there were groups both outside and inside the governments watching Hitler’s moves with growing anxiety. The fact that he constituted a danger to the status quo may have been underestimated in some cases, but there was no indifference. Also, there is no evidence that Mussolini knew about this plan of conquest at so early a date because Hitler himself could not have foreseen clearly the course of events ahead.

The foregoing are among the worst errors in these texts. There are many others of equal or lesser magnitude. All in all, the treatment of World War II, a subject which is almost half a century away in time, is another pitifully weak section in the high school American history texts under review. This is so because no understanding of the basic historical forces at work and no real continuity are provided for the student.

The mistrust between the Soviet Union on one hand and the Western Powers on the other hand never subsided totally, and reemerged in the closing months of World War II as the Cold War, which in many ways was a continuation of World War II.

**The Cold War**

Four motifs must be explored in order to provide an adequate setting for this topic. Although the first of these appears in its clearest form in the Cold War, it permeates the conduct of foreign policy of every state on the globe and applies to each of the topics presented earlier. This is the basic rule of international relations—the concept of sovereignty. Each independent state holds supreme dominion over a territory and people and need answer to no one—“there is no greater authority than the sovereign egotistical nation-state” (Kennedy, 1987, p. 440). Expansionist tendencies are restrained only by the country’s own resources and by fear of the greater power of another state bent upon similar aggrandizement. The greater the state, the more likely it is to attempt to subjugate its neighbors. It stops only when confronted by the strength of a more powerful state or combination of states. In international relations, the law of the jungle prevails. No morality, no sense of justice, no feelings of humanity have ever restrained the expansionist ambitions of a state or a combination of states. In the famous dictum of Lord Palmerston, the British Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister in the mid-19th century, England had no permanent friends, but only permanent interests.

Treaties are observed so long as their terms suit the signatories. Alterations and repudiations can be countered only by the threat or use of force. Great powers invariably surround themselves with a cluster of satellites on
their frontiers and beyond. Because the pursuit of this policy of conflict to its extreme would lead to incessant warfare among all the states, a rough balance of the powers ultimately comes into existence, and temporary acceptance of one another’s territorial claims results, affording a period of peace. A dynamic of instability is built into this system because the relative and absolute strengths of the powers shift from one decade to another. Those states which are “satisfied,” i.e., those which benefitted from the last territorial arrangement, inevitably face challenges from those which are “dissatisfied” with the status quo, i.e., those who had been vanquished in that same previous struggle or who had grown more powerful in the intervening years. When war does break out anew and territorial expansion is again under way, the precarious boundaries shift, and the victors take what they can, establishing a new equilibrium until such time as it, too, is upset by the continuing dynamic of change. This description of the “classical” system of international relations was largely confined to Europe until the late 19th century, when, because of the spreading influence of the industrial powers, it extended to encompass the entire globe and now includes extra-European powers like the United States, China, and Japan.

The great powers, in pursuit of their interests, are at odds with each other even during long periods of peace. When war comes, the attempt to achieve these earlier goals is merely intensified.

This anarchic process is extensively documented in Paul Kennedy’s *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (1987), which examines the ebb and flow of domination, colonial expansion, and decline of the great states of the globe. Spain, the Netherlands, France, Great Britain, Sweden, China, Russia, Japan, and the United States—each is or has been at various stages in this cycle in the course of the past five centuries. The very ample index of Kennedy’s work has no listings under “ethics” or “morality,” and the book nowhere discusses these topics. From the point of view of the critical historian, the central theme pervading Kennedy’s book is the unabashed greed motivating the empire-building states as they search for ever more bags of treasure, bushels of grain, heaps of minerals, forest products, and human slaves.

The governments of these states are loath to reveal undisguised aggression in their public foreign policy utterances, clothing it in lofty humanitarian precepts. The archival material which is the actual documentation of these base motives generally remains inaccessible to historians and political scientists because states prohibit access to these documents for varying time periods. In the United States it is 20 years after the events in question, in Great Britain 50, and in some states, like France and the U.S.S.R., access is almost never granted.

It must be understood, then, that the realities of United States foreign policy are antithetical to the lofty principles which the American government professes. Does the United States have an empire? The answer is yes. It may not have a large empire which can be shown territorially on the map, like
the former colonial empires of Britain, France, and the Netherlands. The thrust of American expansion is not primarily political domination of colonial territories, even though this, too, is vital. American control insures sources of raw materials, markets for manufactured goods and the investment of capital, and opportunities for the exploitation of cheap, unorganized labor. This policy often results in the establishment under American "protection" of pliant governments in as many areas of the world as American strength can be effective. There are a great many countries, particularly the 20 states of Latin America, whose economies are dominated by the United States, sometimes under the guise of democracy, more often as naked dictatorships, whose head, the "president," comes usually from the native elite but who is invariably confirmed by the State Department (see Appendix I). The ideological struggle of the Cold War thus masks the true nature of the conflict taking place, which is the maintenance and expansion of commercial and industrial power on the part of both the United States and the Soviet Union.

Two examples must suffice here to illustrate the operation of the anarchic state of international affairs described above. The first deals with the United States and Great Britain during World War II. Even though the two allies were united in the overriding aim to defeat Germany, Italy, and Japan, they opposed one another continuously because each had different ambitions and goals which existed in the pre-war period and which generally could not be attained except at the expense of the other (see Appendix I).

If one were to examine the diplomatic documents dealing with the United States and its World War II allies, one would find a far more acrimonious struggle going on between Washington and London than between Washington and Moscow. What were the issues in dispute between the United States and Great Britain during the war? The United States and Great Britain differed strongly about where to strike at Hitler, with the Americans favoring a direct assault across the Channel on the northwest coast of France, while the British urged landings from the Mediterranean, "the soft underbelly of Europe." Churchill favored the "underbelly" both in order to safeguard the sea lanes to Britain's Asian Empire (Egypt, Palestine, India, Burma, Malaysia, and Hong Kong) and to keep the Russians out of the eastern Mediterranean. The United States, on the contrary, wanted to see Britain and its Empire weakened. The United States hoped to see Britain emerge from the war not too weak but not too strong. Washington's aim was to end the long-established system of imperial preference which denied American manufacturers and merchants equal access to the markets of Great Britain and the British Commonwealth and colonies. This aim had been pursued in the 1920s and 1930s and now, during the war, American pressure for the achievement of this goal mounted as the British became increasingly dependent upon their ally for supplies of all kinds, including war materiel and foodstuffs. The United States now used a kind of blackmail to achieve its goal. After much diplomatic
wrangling, President Truman, on V-E Day (May 8, 1945), abruptly cancelled Lend Lease for Britain, without giving any prior notice, ignoring the written pledge of his predecessor. This move had the effect of prostrating Britain, which needed American supplies merely to survive and had counted upon American support for rebuilding its shattered economy. Truman soon offered Britain a loan, but its conditions included the realization of the United States’ long-held ambition to penetrate British imperial markets fully (see Kolko, 1990, p. 490). The British yielded because they had no choice.

The second example deals with the Americans and the Russians. In a very perceptive biography of his grandfather, David Eisenhower (1986) presents an excellent example of the anarchic state of international relations even among allies in time of war. At Teheran in December of 1943, Stalin had promised his western allies that Russia would open an offensive on the Eastern Front simultaneously with Eisenhower’s landings on the northwest coast of France. After the landings on D-Day, June 6, 1944, two frustrating weeks passed before news came of the Russian move forward. Eisenhower felt this anxiety keenly because there was nothing that he or anyone else could do to compel the Russians to keep their promise; there was only Stalin’s word that the Eastern front would be activated in concert with the landing.

A second motif pervading the background to the Cold War is important. George F. Kennan, the distinguished diplomat and scholar, points out that the outcome of World War II was already prejudiced by what had preceded its outbreak in 1939. The three most powerful military states on earth, he says, were Germany, Japan, and Russia. All were hostile to the Western democracies. If the three were to combine, the democracies could not possibly defeat them. Only Japan could be defeated by the Western democracies without invoking the aid of the other two. Germany and Russia could not be defeated if they were on the same side. “Individually, either of them could be defeated only if the democracies had the collaboration of the other” (Kennan, 1951, pp. 74-75). If collaboration were to take place between the democracies and either Germany or the Soviet Union, then there would occur the eventual strengthening of the collaborating power and its appearance as a “greedy and implacable claimant at the peace table” (ibid). If only because of the sweep of military operations, the collaborating power would take over most of Eastern Europe. That is, Eastern Europe would come under the domination of whichever country the Western democracies chose as their partner in their struggle against the other. Thus, the struggle over Poland between the United States and Great Britain on one side and the Soviet Union on the other, the immediate starting point of the Cold War, had been predetermined in 1941, when the Soviet Union joined the Western powers in the war against Nazi Germany.

The third motif is the ideological conflict itself stemming from the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and never quite dissipating. Cold War hysteria over the fear of Communism seemed quite real to many Americans, but for
Kennan, as for the present writer, ideology has been a fig leaf concealing other deeper forces at work. There is no doubt that ideology, which has played a role in other conflicts in different eras, appears to have greater force in the present epoch. The allure of an ideology is that it contains half-truths fashioned to appeal to almost all human beings. This was as true of the Crusaders, who believed that their sole mission in the East was to reconquer the Holy Land for Christ, as it is of present-day believers who accept the vision of a classless society without greed or human selfishness, characterized by the equitable distribution of goods and services—"From each according to his [her] ability and to each according to his [her] needs."

A fourth theme which became the primary concern of the United States dealt with the emergence of the Left in Europe and throughout much of the then colonial world. America's aim was to contain the revolutionary fires everywhere. Civil wars between Left and Right were springing up during the war in a number of states, e.g., in Greece, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia in Europe. In the Third World, the masses of people were impatient with the great sacrifices demanded of them by continuing colonial exploitation and now by participation in the war, and were organizing for revolutionary warfare in order to achieve a new beginning. But the United States did not wish to win the war only to yield Europe and possibly the entire Third World to the Left. World War I had brought about the Bolshevik Revolution and similar unsuccessful uprisings in Hungary and Germany. In World War II the emergence of the Left was worldwide. The American economic system could not possibly survive unchanged if the Left were to be generally victorious. The American government quickly took the lead in blocking almost all movements for such social change, and the United States thus became and has remained a status quo power (Kolko, 1990, pp. 343-346). It cannot be stressed too strongly that in most cases these revolutionary movements were not the creation of the Kremlin. If this were the place to expound upon the Moscow party "line" on revolution after 1945, a great many instances could be adduced to show that the Soviet Union was very often a status quo power also; that it did not, for example, favor revolutions in China or in the 20 countries of Latin America.22

If, then, all of the preceding is taken into account, the following picture emerges at the conclusion of World War II. The great empires of the world—French, British, Belgian, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, and Japanese—were in decay or dissolution. The major European states and Japan were rendered impotent by the military conflict, while Russia and the United States emerged as superpowers. Everywhere, territory was to be had, and people were to be subjugated on an unprecedented scale. A new race for power and influence, similar to the earlier colonial races for Africa and Asia, was underway between the two superpowers.

It is true that the forces of nationalism had to be reckoned with among the peoples of the Third World. However, hardly any of the states emerging
from the wreckage of the colonial empires at the end of the war would be able to stand on their own feet without considerable military and economic support from the outside. This was the point of entry for Soviet-American clashes.

The situation which emerged in 1945 was not unanticipated by American leaders. Cordell Hull, the American Secretary of State, announced early in the war that:

"Leadership toward a new system of international relationships in trade and other economic factors will devolve very largely upon the United States because of our great economic strength. We should assume this leadership, and the responsibility that goes with it, primarily for reasons of pure national self-interest." (quoted in Zinn, 1980, p. 405)

And in a book which provides one of the most detailed and documented analyses of the evolution of American Cold War policy, the authors of The Wise Men (1986, see especially Chapters 11 and 12), Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas, editors of Time magazine, speak with admiration and awe of the indissoluble partnership between Wall Street and Washington in the formulation of this program of post-war economic expansion. Such is the historical background which must be considered if one is to attempt a rational understanding of the origins and progression of the Cold War. (For a further discussion of American efforts to contain revolution, see Appendix I.)

Thus prepared, let us now look at the accounts of this great struggle as it has been portrayed in the nine texts under review. All nine accept the ideological struggle, not as a fig leaf, but as the basic element underlying the Cold War. Having thus "purified" American motives, they are uniform in denouncing the U.S.S.R. Not the slightest attempt is made to treat the phenomenon of the Cold War (now, in 1990, apparently coming to an end) as having any historical underpinning. The Russian people, having twice in a generation sustained enormous losses of life and property at the hands of the Germans, wanted very much to have their government prevent a resurgent Germany from making the attempt a third time, and took appropriate steps to throttle the Teutonic state and the latter's East European allies for a long time to come. One text is typical when it says that Soviet movements in Eastern Europe were not "the result of the age-old Russian search for security. They were the first steps in global conquest. They were Munich-style aggression under another name. They would therefore have to be resisted" (Risjord & Haywoode, 1982, pp. 666-674). It should be noted that until 1944, in choosing between military aid from the West and the attainment of political goals, the Russians preferred the former (Kolko, 1990, p. 18).

Because basic principles are ignored, none of the texts is able to find any continuity in the struggle between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and similar conflicts over the past five centuries. A sense of continuity, so fun-
damental for the understanding of the historical process, is therefore absent from them.

None of the texts sees the Cold War as anything but a struggle between good and evil. The U.S.S.R. is identified as the aggressor and the United States as the peace-loving knight in shining armor fighting to protect “freedom” against its enemy. In greater or lesser degree, each of the texts inculcates hatred of the Soviet Union. There is no understanding that the principle of the balance of power, which had formerly dictated that Hitler must not accumulate enormous strength and territory without restraint, was now to be applied by the United States to the Soviet Union. And the Soviet Union, of course, applied it to the United States. Most of the texts attribute a desire for world conquest to the U.S.S.R. while none of the United States’ real aims is identified anywhere.

Though Soviet documentation on the subject of its postwar foreign policy is far from complete, the new glasnost is bound to result in the publication in the near future of many doctoral dissertations on the Cold War by young Soviet scholars, enlarging our knowledge of Russian political aims after 1945. These will alter our perception of the origins and development of the Cold War. The present view of Stalin’s immediate post-war policy in Europe is that he aimed to extend Soviet control over Eastern Europe so that Russia and its allies could quickly occupy Western Europe in the event of an American attack on the U.S.S.R., thus preventing easy American access to the coasts of Europe.

From a doctrinal point of view, Karl Marx, a careful scholar, said specifically that his analysis of capitalism was limited to a tiny corner of northwestern Europe and nowhere else. He did not include the United States as coming within the pattern of his thought until after the American Civil War, and he was always ambivalent about the application of his doctrines to Tsarist Russia. Capitalism was indeed destined to disappear, but only as the result of forces undermining it from within, he said; it would not be destroyed from without. What the American history texts are doing, then, is attributing to Communist ideology an overriding thrust for world conquest that has not yet been documented.

Each of the thrusts of the two superpowers in places like Cuba, Malaysia, Afghanistan, Indonesia, and elsewhere was directed at causing the maximum amount of trouble within the opponent’s sphere of influence. Such moves were not a sign of attempted world conquest on the part of either superpower. What the American history texts are doing is engaging in self-serving manipulation—using propaganda to influence young minds to accept American foreign policy moves without question.

Yet another common failing to be found in a number of these texts is the view that the American government and people were motivated by humanitarian concerns in seeking to rebuild war-ravaged Western Europe and Japan (the Marshall Plan), ignoring the documentation which shows
clearly that other considerations were far weightier. Totally omitted from the texts is the fact that the United States needed a healthy Western Europe and Japan as trading partners for its own continuing prosperity. The alternative seemed to be a crushing post-war depression which many American industrialists feared would take place. There was also the possibility that the great social unrest which the economic chaos of the defeated states fostered among their people would lead to revolution—an eventuality that would only strengthen the position of the U.S.S.R.

One text misstates George Kennan’s views about Russia which appeared in his 1947 article in *Foreign Affairs*. Kennan’s statement that the opponent was not Communism but Russia is completely overlooked (Boorstin & Kelley, 1986, pp. 582–583).

Another text notes the shift in American attitudes, from isolationism before World War II to internationalism afterward, but gives no reasons for the transformation. It might have pointed out that the desire on the part of American businessmen and bankers to rebuild markets in Western Europe and Japan was one of the constituent elements of this change; that if the American people were to be prodded into accepting the huge financial and military obligations and sacrifices required in the rebuilding process, then the government would have to, in the word of Senator Arthur Vandenburg to President Harry Truman, “scare the hell” out of the American people. This was indeed done by invoking the threat of world Communist domination, an invention of American publicists that was ultimately enshrined in National Security Council Directive 68 in January 1950 (Risjord & Haywoode, 1982, pp. 666–674).

Yet another text makes a bow to “objectivity” by presenting three lengthy excerpts from the works of writers on the Cold War (Smith, 1980, pp. 512–519). The first is by the Cold Warrior David J. Dallin, who offers the conventional American wisdom as it is reflected in these texts: America’s aim was to contain Communism because Communism is an evil, and the United States must destroy it. The second excerpt, by Leslie A. Rose, attempts to express a more balanced view, but this is offered with such hesitancy that its dubiousness becomes more apparent than its fair-mindedness:

[A growing number of scholars]... have argued that aggressive American plans to shape the post-war international economic structure along the lines of free trade and capitalist supremacy led to attempts to create a global American empire, and this, in turn, caused the [development of bad relations with] Communist Russia and the beginnings of the cold war between East and West. (From *Dubious Victory*, cited in Smith, 1980, pp. 512–519)

The third excerpt is a statement by the American diplomatic historian Thomas A. Bailey, which asserts that the Cold War was a “natural” phenomenon. The historian wants to blame neither the U.S.A. nor the U.S.S.R. for a
phenomenon which comes as "naturally" as the sunrise. It is unlikely, given the biased context within which these three excerpts appear, that the average high school instructor would be able to utilize them adequately in classroom discussion.

The texts under review provide the conventional rationalizations for American expansion. One such book asserts that the United States had become one of the strongest powers of the globe, and "The American people came to understand that a powerful nation has great responsibilities" (Schwartz & O'Connor, 1984, pp. 667-672). In extolling the virtues of American capitalism, this text makes the startling assertion that most businesses and farmlands are owned by individuals. This may be true numerically, but it is not an accurate description of the distribution of wealth, income, and power in the United States. The overwhelming concentration of economic power in the hands of a dominant few, it may be noted, is no negligible element in shaping United States policy.

All in all, the cumulative impression of these texts is that their accounts of the Cold War bear no relationship at all to the actual writing of history.

Concluding Remarks

The word history was defined at the outset as "the study of the past as a systematic discipline in order to arrive at the true depiction of former times." The texts reviewed in this paper are history books intended for a high school American history curriculum, and a number of the authors are scholars of irreproachable authority. But do these texts, in the areas discussed in this paper, fit the definition of history? If not, why not?

In the discussion of each of the topics analyzed in this paper, introductory summaries were inserted stressing the main features that were to be identified in the textbook accounts. These introductions were not meant to be the last word on the topic. Variety is the keynote in the writing of history, because the sources are so extensive and individual historians differ in their approach. For example, in the discussion of World War I, the textbooks might have argued other causes, different from nationalism and imperialism, the causes stressed in this paper. They could have said, for example, that one of the root causes of World War I was militarism, or the system of alliances (Kennedy, 1987, pp. 249-256). Some scholars of the subject do indeed advance such views, and there is nothing wrong with discussing them as primary, even though, for the present writer, they seem to be the outcome of deeper forces at work. The present writer tends to emphasize economic systems as primary. The difficulty with the texts is that they do not present basic causes of whatever stripe or variety.

It is a lamentable fact that while authors like Merle Curti, Daniel Boorstin, and others of their class, are known internationally for their scholarship, the presence of their names on the title pages of these "history" books does not necessarily mean that the entire text was written by them, or that
everything contained in these texts is valid historical material. Frances Fitzgerald has described the method used by textbook publishers to assemble a history text (Fitzgerald, 1979). A bevy of surgical “specialists” in the publisher’s employ assemble whatever is supplied by the historian—one wonders at times if that is anything other than the historian’s name—and they operate. They hammer, they hack, they twist, they discard, they insert, and they model. As Fitzgerald points out, the outcome is not history; it is intended instead to satisfy the objectives of powerful pressure groups, among them, first and foremost, the business interests of the country, not least the publishing firm itself. It is also a matter of the mass market and large profits. Patriotism and unquestioning loyalty are highly prized; this is not an illogical conclusion, judging by the tone of the finished products. There is thus very little in these overweight texts that can be truly considered historical writing.

Four interrelated conclusions emerge from the foregoing analysis of the treatment in selected high school American history texts of the “imperial” wars of the United States and of its economic expansion overseas. First, there is no conceptual framework provided in them for the understanding of the causes of American expansion of territory and market, particularly with regard to the world tensions and conflicts generated by this outward thrust. Instead, the phases of this expansion are treated as separate episodes, obscuring the continuity of the process and concealing the motives for its development. Meaningful analysis thus becomes impossible. This is especially so because the profit motive—the motor driving American expansion—is never referred to, let alone analyzed. Secondly, when individual episodes are presented, they are for the most part one-sided, superficial, and incomplete. Thirdly, the texts offer very little material needed for sound historical and critical analysis. Opposing points of view are rarely presented with validity. This should of course be the texts’ main function. The presentation of conflicting positions can lead to a variety of interpretations. Comparison and contrast are possible only if diversity is stressed. Such exercises give the student the possibility for developing her/his skills and judgment. The homogeneity of materials actually appearing in these texts, however, is antithetical to the intelligent understanding of the past. And finally, because there is no attempt made to impart a critical perspective to the study of American history, this doting, ethnocentric presentation of the past leads to the uncritical acceptance by students of America’s proclaimed lofty intentions in its past record and in its present dealings with other countries. No realistic appraisal of the world today is possible on the foundations offered by these texts. Their discernible purpose appears to be to propagandize in favor of American policies at all times, whatever those policies happen to be.

The materials which have been presented in these pages demonstrate that the main purpose of the teaching of American history in high school is the indoctrination of students. One must conclude, regretfully, that it is historical
truth which is not taught. Because the American people are not adequately informed about the true nature of American foreign policy, it is usually impossible to obtain remedial action. As Jefferson said, if a democracy is to survive, its people must be kept informed.

What should be done? An 18th-century Jesuit priest once remarked that the best way to get rid of bad books was to write better ones. The time is long overdue for the development of history texts which will approximate more closely what has really taken place in the past. This could be done by teams of international historians under the sponsorship of the United Nations. Such texts could be published by the myriad of small new publishing houses which have sprung up in the United States. Their modest investments in book production would not require an appeal to a mass market and therefore, a doctoring of historical truth. Whether those groups having a vested interest in the distortion of history would allow such texts to be used in public high schools is a question that cannot be answered here. The fact remains that until the problem is remedied, high school students will continue to leave school woefully ignorant of our true past. In their own way the texts analyzed in this paper fulfill the definition of Sir Louis Namier, himself no mean historian, that the task of the historian is to "imagine the past and describe the future."

Endnotes

1. The presiding judge was correct in his criticism. The textbooks, like almost all other history and social studies texts, neglect to present the role of religious forces in shaping American history. The testimony of the plaintiffs' chief witness, Timothy L. Smith, Professor of American Religious History at Johns Hopkins University and a distinguished authority in the field, confirmed this. Professor Smith's testimony was not challenged in the trial proceedings. His testimony is further corroborated in an analysis undertaken by People for the American Way. All of the history texts in litigation were published in or before 1987. The study by People for the American Way examined history texts published for the most part in 1986 and concluded that even at this more recent date the books omitted almost entirely the subject of the impact of religion upon American society (Davis et al., pp. 9-13).

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit sitting in Atlanta soon overturned the original decree and the books could again be freely used in the state of Alabama.

2. At least two of the texts, if not more, were in use in all 50 states.

3. Altogether, 46 books were the object of the litigation. Of the ten high school American history texts, one was approved by the court and nine were condemned. The present study utilizes the one approved text and eight of the condemned. The ninth could not be obtained. See Appendix II.

4. Wie es eigentlich gewesen war. This is, of course, the famous statement
of one of the founders of the critical historical method, Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886).


6. See the excellent study by Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the Nineteenth Century* (Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press), 1964. Elson examines more than a thousand texts of history and geography that appeared in the 19th century.


8. Such "bare bones" facts as America's involvement in World Wars I and II and the Vietnam War, or the name of the first president of the United States under the present constitution, stand by themselves without interpretation, even though they do not have much significance standing alone.

9. In all cases, the citations in the text refer to the entire treatment of the subject in the texts.

10. One of the best studies of the subject of imperialism is Moon (1926).

11. Two such works may be cited here: Fay (1930) and Joll (1984).

12. President Woodrow Wilson himself identified the search for overseas markets and raw materials as one of the causes of the war (Louis, 1978, p. 3).

13. In rethinking these two subjects and in examining some of the primary materials and monographs, the conclusion seems inescapable that the Cold War was a continuation—although at a more rapid tempo and on a broader scope—of policies first undertaken at the beginning of 1918 by England, France, and the United States against the newly established Communist regime in Russia. This view, that the Cold War really began in 1918, is held by a minority of scholars on the subject, but it seems to the present writer to be the more valid one.

Several general developments which occurred during World War II and might properly be considered as part of that topic thus fit more appropriately into the topic of the Cold War. See below.

14. And in those few cases in which Fascism is defined by the text, the explanation is inadequate. Todd and Curti state, for example, that Fascism is a "system of government concentrating all political, economic, and cultural power in the state. It was dedicated to aggressive expansionism." While such power was indeed concentrated in the Fascist state, it was the leader who enshrined in himself all the powers of the state, and the unquestioning loyalty of the citizenry was to him. Moreover, most Fascist states were not dedicated to aggressive expansionism; this was especially true of Portugal, Spain, and some of the Balkan, Baltic, and Central European states, where
the glorification of force was absent. In addition, the policies of the Fascist state included not merely changes in international relations but the elimination of such longstanding internal democratic rights as individual rights, free labor unions, free press, and free speech (Todd & Curti, pp. 663–679).

15. All of these errors appear in Risjord and Haywoode, pp. 537–552.

16. The American Government's apathy about the unfolding knowledge of the concentration camps, a disgraceful failure of the Roosevelt administration, has been well-documented in such books as David Wyman's *The Abandonment of the Jews* (1984).

17. A good example of the ample documentation showing the underlying commercial and expansionist aims of the United States government during World War II is to be found in Gabriel Kolko's *The Politics of War: The World and United States Foreign Policy, 1943–1945*. He devotes 632 pages to the topic.

18. Russia suffered a similar fate when the United States abruptly ceased Lend Lease to that nation on May 8, 1945, also without prior notice. The American motive here seems to have been to restrain the Russians in their presumed program of expansion. In addition, one motive for dropping atom bombs on Japan on August 6 and 9, 1945, was to send a warning to Stalin (Kennedy, p. 356).


20. It is important to note that George Kennan, understanding the flow that post-war affairs would very likely follow, was ready in 1944 and early 1945 to concede to Russia all of Eastern Europe without further ado.

In giving the causes for the outbreak of the Cold War, John Lewis Gaddis, one of the best authorities on the subject, places security first. Unfortunately, he does not analyze the problem further because in international affairs, if honor, gratitude, and morality prevailed, there would be no need for two superpowers, newly emerged as partners in a war, triumphant, with no other threatening powers on the face of the earth, to be concerned with their security. Obviously, other motives were involved (Gaddis, 1978, p. 176). See bibliography for his other studies on the subject.

21. Fidel Castro and Che Guevara sometimes broke with the Kremlin on this issue. Also, in the recent elections in Nicaragua in February 1990, the Moscow dominated Communist party was part of the victorious 14-party coalition UNO opposing the Sandinistas. Interestingly, UNO received considerable financial support from the United States government.
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APPENDIX I

Though this is not, perhaps, the place to fully discuss a topic which is almost totally excluded from the high school American history texts under review, some additional details are worth mentioning.

The countries of the Third World, despite great progress in industrialization as in Brazil and among the “Four Tigers”—Taiwan, Hong Kong, South Korea, and Malaysia—remain peasant societies ruled by local oligarchies in whose hands are concentrated by far the largest part of the most fertile lands. Since the 20th century has been a century of revolutions, many countries under the domination of the United States have not been immune to such influences. From the viewpoint of the United States, a status quo power, movements aimed at transforming the land-holding arrangements—as in El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and the Philippines—are deemed to be “Communist.” In its efforts to obstruct fundamental change, which might imperil its domination, the United States in many cases has installed and maintained bloody dictatorships like those in El Salvador, Guatemala, and formerly in Nicaragua. The governments of Central and South America, in return, keep “order,” allowing American multinationals to make use of the raw materials, agricultural products, and cheap unorganized labor for their own profitable purposes, as has been noted above. Attempts at unionization are suppressed with great ferocity. Dictators who come readily to mind are the Shah of Iran, the Somoza dynasty of father and two sons in Nicaragua, Batista in Cuba, Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, and Marcos in the Philippines. Franklin Roosevelt once referred to such a despot who had been installed by American bayonets: “He’s a son of a bitch, but he’s our son of a bitch.”

Criticism of American imperialism is not a monopoly of the Left. In the 1980s, the most consistent condemnation of United States policies in Central America has come from organized religious denominations, from Catholics, Jews, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Baptists, Quakers, and others, who combined to establish the public sanctuary movement. This is a movement designed to place political refugees from El Salvador and Guatemala in safe haven in various churches and synagogues where they might, if they wished, speak out against the physical torture inflicted upon them by governments installed and maintained by the Department of State. At the height of the movement, there were approximately 400 churches and synagogues housing refugees in defiance of United States government policy.

Scholarly studies and criticism of American imperialism also are not confined to the Left. The late Parker T. Moon, the conservative Catholic historian at Columbia University (Imperialism and World Politics, 1926) and the late Walter LaFeber of Cornell University (Inevitable Revolutions, 1984) come readily to mind. A third is the late Smedley D. Butler, for many years Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, who wrote in 1935:
Like all members of the military profession I never had an original thought until I left the service. My mental faculties remained in suspended animation while I obeyed the orders of the higher-ups. This is typical of everyone in the military service.

Thus I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenue in. I helped in the raping of half a dozen Central American republics for the benefit of Wall Street. The record for racketeering is long. I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1909–1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for American sugar interests in 1916. I helped make Honduras “right” for American fruit companies in 1903. In China in 1927 I helped see to it that Standard Oil went its way unmolested.

During those years, I had, as the boys in the back room would say, a swell racket. I was rewarded with honors, medals, promotion. Looking back on it, I feel I might have given Al Capone a few hints. The best he could do was to operate his racket in three city districts. We Marines operated on three continents.... (Butler, 1935, p. 8)

Cases of United States violations of the sovereign rights of other nations total almost one hundred from 1831, when the American navy first bombed the Malvinas/Falkland Islands, to the most recent incursions into Grenada (1983) and Panama (1989–90). Methods of intervention include “destabilization” of governments—Iran (1950), Chile (1970–73), and Jamaica (1974–90); armed overthrow of legally established democratic regimes—Iran (1950), Guatemala (1954), the Dominican Republic and Indonesia (1965), and Chile (1973); and the imposition of dictatorships by the State Department and U.S. armed forces, such as the Diem regime in Vietnam.
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Introduction

*A disciple is not above his teacher, but everyone when he is fully taught will be like his teacher.*

Jesus Christ, Luke 6:40 (R.S.V.)

Recent writers in curriculum theory (Aoki, 1989; Freire, 1971) have disparaged the old notion that the business of teaching is made up of two often disparate elements—theory and practice. Instead, these writers have emphasized the essential unity of theory and practice, and have invoked the term “praxis” to refer to the embodiment of theory within practice. This is a noble and intellectually appealing idea. Still, the fact remains that within social studies education there is perceived to be a wide gap between those who work in theory, at the university level, and teachers involved in actual classroom practice (Conley, 1989; Engle and Ochoa, 1988; Leming, 1989; Metzger, 1985; Tanner, 1988; Webking, 1989).

James Leming, in his recent article “The Two Cultures of Social Studies Education” (1989), notes that this gap between theory and practice has existed for as long as the social studies has existed, “throughout the past 70 years” (p. 405). Of course, the theory-practice debate has its counterparts in other fields. Descartes’ mind-body schism immediately comes to mind. In social studies, the debate itself could be seen to center on the most fundamental question in social studies education: “What does it mean to be a good citizen?” Is a good citizen one who knows, or one who acts?

Other prominent writers in the field, such as Shirley Engle and Anna Ochoa (1988) of Indiana University, agree with Leming’s assessment that there is a perpetual gap between academics and practitioners within the social studies.
profession (p. 105). Leming (1989) characterizes these two groups as two "cultures," each with its own "body of customary beliefs, values, and practices constituting a distinct complex of tradition" (p. 404). Leming (1989) goes on to contend that the gap between these two cultures is so wide that: "Little dialogue, if any, exists between the two cultures; distrust and lack of respect are obvious. Stagnation and decreasing public credibility plague social studies education" (p. 405).

While other writers do not use such strong language, there seems to be a general agreement that a gap exists. There is also a general agreement that the social studies profession is suffering because of it. This paper will examine some of the attempts to explain the nature of this gap and the reasons it exists. The paper will then propose an alternative conception of the gap and suggest that one way to eliminate it lies in developing, within professionals in the field, an ethic of critical thinking.

The Nature of the Gap

Some might argue that to narrow the division that exists in social studies to two positions or "cultures," as Leming has called them, is to oversimplify the situation. After all, Barr, Barth, and Shermis in their important book, The Nature of the Social Studies (1978), identify three conceptualized positions of social studies teaching, and Van Manen and Parsons (1983) identify seven "program types." The essence of the debate, however, can be found in the title of Devon Metzger's (1985) article, "Process Versus Content: The Lost Illusion." A logical case can be made and supported that the division in social studies is really a split between those who view social studies education as a vehicle to develop the critical thinking processes of students and those who view it, in the words of Keith McLeod (1989), as a vehicle "to teach the requisite culture" (p. 6).

The term critical thinking is often a vague one. In this article, we will use it in a broad sense. Critical thinking incorporates more than just activities of the mind. Many theorists (Brandhurst, 1989; Engle, 1986; Tanner, 1988) trace the beginning of the modern emphasis on critical thinking in education to John Dewey. For Dewey thinking was much more than mental activity, which he saw as passive. Dewey viewed critical thinking as involving activity and experience as well. In his book, Democracy and Education, Dewey (1916) outlined the process of thinking, calling it "reflective experience" (p. 150). Reflective experience involved five features:

(i) perplexity, confusion, doubt, because one is implicated in an incomplete situation whose full character is not yet determined;
(ii) a conjectural anticipation—a tentative interpretation of the given elements, attributing to them a tendency to effect certain consequences;
(iii) a careful survey (examination, inspection, exploration, analysis)
of all attainable considerations which will define and clarify the problem at hand;

(iv) a consequent elaboration of the tentative hypothesis to make it more precise and more consistent, squaring it with a wider range of facts;

(v) taking one's stand upon the projected hypothesis as a plan of action which is applied to the existing state of affairs: doing something overtly to bring about the anticipated result, and thereby testing the hypothesis.

(p. 150)

Dewey's theories about the nature of critical thinking have formed the basis of social studies theory since 1916. Engle and Ochoa (1988) list an impressive array of intellectuals and scholars, both within the social studies profession and outside it, who have urged that the focus of social education be centered on relevancy, critical analysis, and action. This list of scholars includes people like Alan Griffin, Donald Oliver, Jerome Bruner, Margaret Mead, and Alfred North Whitehead (p. 106).

As Dewey did, modern advocates of critical social studies believe that the critical focus is essential to a democratic society. If democracy is to survive, it needs citizens who function in a critical and participatory mode—what Benjamin Barber (1989) calls "strong citizenship" (p. 355). It is no longer enough that citizens vote. They must become thoroughly informed about the issues, active in questioning leaders, and actively involved in building and implementing solutions to society's problems.

This notion of strong citizenship has a long and cherished tradition. It is part of the ethical fabric of many societies, especially those with a Judeo-Christian grounding. In the religious ethic of Christianity, for example, adherents are to be active—to be both "hearers and doers" of the Word. Fundamental to this whole process is something which Engle and Ochoa (1988) refer to as "counter socialization," which they describe as emphasizing "independent thinking and responsible social criticism" (p. 30).

Why such a radical view of active social studies? The answer centers on the issue of "freedom" itself. Writers as diverse as the Brazilian Paulo Freire (1971) and Canadian political scientist Edwin Webking (1984) argue that a population without the ability to think critically can be exploited and marginalized even in a democracy. Webking (1989) warns that democracy has become equated with commercial and industrial processes, in which the end is the facilitation of business and commercial transactions. People have thus become the means of achieving this commercial end.

Despite this consistent emphasis on critical thinking processes, few social studies theorists would disagree with Leming (1989) when he writes, "social studies theorists have not been successful to any great extent in changing practice in real world classrooms" (p. 407). Marshall Conley (1989) elaborates in his article, "Theories and Attitudes Towards Political Education," when he writes, "teaching continues to be predominantly didactic, expository and
authoritarian. It socializes students and does little or nothing for their sense of efficacy, either generally or politically” (p. 152).

Social studies theorists write and talk about the central role of social studies being to prepare a critical citizenry. “In contrast, the ‘real world’ approach of the social studies teachers suggests that what is unique about the social studies is the content of the social studies curriculum” (Leming, 1989, p. 407). Metzger (1985) echoes Leming’s point when he laments, “content has dominated and will likely continue to dominate high school social studies education” (p. 115).

In contrast to the counter socializing role for social studies proposed by Engle and Ochoa (1988), Leming (1989) cites a number of ethnographic studies which indicate that most teachers view social studies as a vehicle to promote socialization and to prepare students to conform to the existing social structure, both in the school and in society. These studies also indicate that teachers purposely steer away from addressing issues and values questions and from using alternative sources of information, other than the textbook. To those who support a critical social studies, alternative viewpoints are essential elements of all critically active and reformist social studies proposals. One task of critical social studies is to come to see the importance of free individuals, freely expressing plural positions.

Critical social studies is never satisfied with one singular and authoritative point of view. Free thought brings with it the celebration of each unique and pluralistic society. But in the everyday world of social studies teachers, the seeming fixation with covering content is attributed to the pressure of external forces such as school administrators, parents, or upcoming examinations. In Alberta, as this article is being written, the biggest educational controversy is the blame placed directly on teachers in the Edmonton Public School Board for the low achievement test scores of their students. “School Board Holds Teachers Responsible” the headline declares. Teachers feel the pressure very personally. Their actions to “cover social studies content” reflect this pressure.

Joseph Onasko (1989) compared teachers who emphasized critical thinking in the classroom with those who did not. He found that most of the pressure to cover content felt by teachers who did not emphasize critical thinking came from within themselves. In other words, apart from external pressure, these teachers believed themselves that a wide range of content ought to be covered. Those teachers who stressed critical thinking in the classroom also felt some pressure to cover content, but this pressure was felt mostly from external sources. These teachers generally worked hard to see that this outside pressure did not deter them from what they saw as their principle task, the development of students’ critical thinking abilities.

Reasons for the Gap

Clearly, over the past 70 years a considerable gap has existed between social studies as conceived by university professors and social studies as practiced
by teachers. It is clear that the gap exists, but it is not clear why it exists. After all, if universities have been stressing the principles of a critical thinking approach to social studies for most of this century, then the vast majority of social studies teachers must have felt this emphasis as a regular component of their teacher education. Why wasn’t the lesson learned? What factors make the influence of the university experience so minimal in the later practice of teachers? The answers are not clear; however, many reasons have been suggested. We will review some of them here.

Richard Gross of Stanford University, participating in a panel discussion at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies at Orlando, Florida, in November 1988, addressed the question, “Why Has an Integrated Unified Issue Centered Vision of Social Studies Failed to Gain Acceptance?” He proposed ten possible reasons:

1. The concept is relatively new. Despite scattered early attempts, the most famous being Socrates, a critical social studies approach has only gained any favour in this century. More traditional content education has been around for much longer.
2. The approach has never been experienced by teachers in their own education.
3. There is a belief among many teachers that problem resolution needs to be based on a mass of background information that the schools ought to provide. These teachers seem to believe that thinking skill development will be a natural by-product of traditional teaching.
4. Content oriented, rather than skill oriented, teachers favour survey courses which do not provide time for a problems approach.
5. Textbooks and curriculum materials have been organized to cover content and not to deal with issues.
6. Many parents and community groups are skeptical and fearful of this approach.
7. Administrators have failed to promote this approach and organize school systems accordingly.
8. Tests and testing programs have always emphasized the “right” answer.
9. Many believe that this approach is unsuitable for young children and slow learners.
10. Teachers have been encouraged to be mini encyclopedias and are threatened by joint learning. (Gross, 1988)

Many writers echo, and elaborate on, Professor Gross’s comments. Metzger (1985) particularly emphasizes structural realities that mitigate against emphasizing the thinking process. He points out the dual problems of “teacher time” and “class time” (p. 118). Teachers are inundated with so many things to do that they gladly say “pass the content” (ibid.) rather than spend the time necessary to prepare for a process approach. He goes on to
point out that "the fifty-five to sixty minutes class time block allocated to the various social studies classes does not encourage the teaching of process" (ibid.) Walter Parker (1989), using stronger language, contends that "schools are organized not only to educate students; they are organized also to manage them" (p. 354).

A number of writers (Engle, 1986; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Metzger, 1985) lament the lack of experience teachers have in problem solving in their own education, especially at university. Engle (1986) writes:

For reasons I have never fully understood, most history professors completely change their colors when they step out of their role as research scholars and take on the mantle of ‘‘herr’’ professor. As scholars, they hold truth in great tenuousness; they are not all of one mind; their disciplines are hotbeds of controversy; they are forever correcting one another’s errors. But once they have laid aside their research eyeshades and donned the teaching robes, they become authorities whose mission is considered to be the transmission of their superior knowledge to students. Teachers, and this includes many college professors, either find it too arduous a task, or possibly inappropriate, to share with students the problems and questions in the field. Teachers are poorly prepared by their own education to confront the controversy and uncertainty that is the real bone and sinew of scholarship. They are poorly prepared to help students learn the skills of social criticism that are so important to democracy. One reason that the new social studies floundered is that it had limited access to teacher preparation. (p. 21)

These reasons for the gap between social studies theory and practice are valid and compelling; yet, perhaps there is a more fundamental concern that needs to be addressed. What is the nature of critical thinking itself? Is critical thinking only a useful teaching strategy or is critical thinking an ethic—a way of living? The remainder of this paper will suggest that critical thinking as a teaching method only, used in much the same way as an overhead projector, mistakes technique for ethic. To be fully powerful, critical thinking must derive from an ethical stance, a way of living in and addressing the world.

Strategy vs. Ethic

In his article, “The Path Not Taken: Dewey’s Model of Inquiry,” Laurel Tanner (1988) argues that modern interpreters of Dewey have missed his essential point. Critical thinking must be more than simply an abstract mental exercise. It must involve the child in a real, felt problem. Tanner points out that "critical thinking has gone the canned and packaged way" (p. 472). In other words, critical thinking has been reduced to a strategy, a series of steps or planned exercises that can be executed by a trained practitioner, the teacher. In its reduction, it has been weakened.
Barry Beyer, an important promoter of the critical thinking process, entitled one of his books *Inquiry in the Social Studies Classroom: A Strategy for Teaching* (1971). In that book Beyer introduces teachers to the concept of critical thinking and provides them with a process for teaching it. He calls this process "inquiry teaching." While it is important to provide teachers with organized, coherent, and workable strategies for implementing a process centered curriculum, as Beyer has done, this provision obviously has not been enough to alter the traditional content focus of the social studies in classrooms.

Why have insightful and useful provisions like Beyer’s not helped to change social studies teaching? We believe the answer is easy. Teachers feel little personal commitment to using a critical thinking process in schools. Almost all of them have been exposed to the concept of critical thinking and have utilized and practiced some strategies for implementing it in their university methods courses. Many new teachers then leave university fairly committed to trying these strategies in their own classrooms. But the road to successful inquiry teaching is not easy.

Inquiry is harder to teach. It takes more work and preparation. Not everyone likes it. Discussion and argument is louder than memorization, and administrators have good ears. Parents feel that content knowledge is safer and certainly more "objective" than unsanctified knowledge. Even students, who have been encouraged to memorize, feel safer when they do what they have always done. Almost everyone in the world believes in the concept of additive intelligence. A person who knows more stuff is more intelligent than a person who doesn’t.

These are only some of the problems that new teachers face. Unless they are extremely zealous or hard-headed, the difficulties almost force them to quickly abandon their commitment to critical thinking strategies and turn to something that works—content. In order for teachers to stick with their commitment to critical thinking, it must have become more than a strategy for them. They must hold it as an ethic, which is defined in *Funk and Wagnall’s Standard College Dictionary* (1968) as "a philosophy or system of morals." Only teachers committed to critical thinking as an ethic will persevere in the face of all the circumstances which make it difficult to implement a social studies program focused on critical thinking. The fact that most teachers cannot hold out does not make them weak, it simply makes them like most other people in the world. A historical analogy may help clarify this point.

*The Defiance Campaign in South Africa*

South Africa has a long history of racial inequalities and divisions, but the systemized segregation of society by law, known as Apartheid, is a relatively recent development. Almost all of the legislation that established Apartheid was passed into law by the National Party government, under Prime
Minister Dr. Daniel Malen, between the years 1948 and 1956. This is the period which T. R. H. Davenport (1978) refers to as “The Age of Social Engineers” (p. 263).

This period in South Africa saw not only the legal establishment of racial segregation and white domination, but also the politicization of large groups of non-whites and their organizations into active and committed reform movements. The first large scale anti-government action taken by these groups was the Defiance Campaign of 1952. Professor Thomas Karis (Karis & Carter, 1973) describes this campaign as “the largest scale non-violent resistance ever seen in South Africa and the first mass campaign pursued jointly by Africans and Indians” (p. 403).

The Campaign, which began in June of 1952, was based upon Mahatma Gandhi’s campaign of civil disobedience in India. The Indian campaign was still fresh in the minds of South Africans. Only four years previously it had led to Indian independence. One of the leaders of the South African Campaign was Gandhi’s son Manibal. The thinking of the Campaign itself could not be faulted. It was highly organized. Groups of protesters were sent out to break the Apartheid laws. The volunteers who were chosen to participate in the Campaign proved to be disciplined and, “in general, the acts of defiance were distinguished by their deliberately non-violent character” (Robertson, 1971, p. 83). When the government tried to provoke response, the leadership of the movement sent out repeated warnings urging their members not to be provoked by authorities and to “be peaceful, disciplined, non-violent” (Karis & Carter, 1973, p. 421).

Towards the end of the year the government began to focus its attention on the leaders of the Campaign. On November 27, the government moved against 52 non-white leaders, banning their public activities. On November 28, the government passed new regulations that instituted severe fines and three years imprisonment for anyone convicted of inciting natives to break laws or speaking to native gatherings of ten or more. This targeting of the leaders of the Campaign caused commitment to wane. In the Public Safety Act passed in early 1953, the government also instituted a set of provisions that called for whipping those who broke the law as a form of protest. However, these provisions were never used. By that time the Campaign had been broken.

As an example of passive resistance based on the Gandhian model, the Defiance Campaign was largely a failure. It did not succeed in morally convicting the government or in moderating the government’s position in any way. Not a single law was repealed. Indeed, the government’s resolve can only be said to have hardened as a result of the Campaign’s activities.

Why had Gandhi succeeded in India while this movement, following close on the heels of his success, failed? The answer to that question lies in the distinction between ethic and strategy. Gandhi worked from a single ethic—the idea of Satyagraha or “truth force” (Jones, 1948, p. 82). Truth force
was Gandhi’s simple explanation of his concept of non-violent civil disobedience. To Gandhi, the idea of truth force was more than a political strategy. It was a matter of principle and a way of living. In other words, it was his ethic. As an ethic, it was a powerful force; as a strategy, it was only as powerful as the moral steel of the people who used it.

Others were not so powerfully resolute. Because the idea of truth force was an ethic, Gandhi’s first concern was that his actions were morally correct, not that they were effective. Even if they were effective, if they were wrongly conceived and motivated by the wrong reasons a political victory would be worthless. To Gandhi, the strategic effectiveness of his movement was not as important as its inherent rightness. He was quite prepared to call off the movement, even when it was being quite successful, if he felt it had strayed from the strict principles of civil disobediences which he set for it. Conversely, even when the movement seemed to be faltering, Gandhi still believed in it and held to it. Neither delays in time nor severe repression would cause the Mahatma to back away from this ethic. “When the suppression of the movement would get strongest and most apparently triumphant, then the spirit of the Mahatma arose to exultation” (Jones, 1948, p. 97).

The failure of the Defiance Campaign in South Africa can largely be attributed to a lack of moral steel. The campaigners did not have the ethical commitment to non-violent resistance as the only morally acceptable form of protest. To the leadership of the movement, non-violent resistance was a political strategy, a technique. They used it; they didn’t live it. Because it had proved successful elsewhere, it was worth a try here. When it didn’t seem to be working, it was easy to dump it and replace it with another technique.

Janet Robertson (1971) suggests that very few of the leaders of the movement were genuinely committed to the principle of non-violent resistance. Rather, they were drawn to its strategic value given the government’s massive resources to defend itself and the limited capacity of non-whites to effect any other type of resistance. Indeed, a statement by the Joint Planning Council for the Campaign indicates the strategic, rather than moral, reasons for choosing this form of protest.

With regard to the form of struggle best suited to our conditions we have been constrained to bear in mind the political and economic set-up of our country, the relationship of the rural to the urban population, the development of the trade union movement with particular reference to the disabilities and state of organization of the non-white workers, the economic status of the various sections of the non-white people and the level of organization of the National Liberatory movements. We are therefore of the opinion that in these given historical conditions the forms of struggle for obtaining the repeal of unjust laws which should be considered are: (a) defiance of unjust laws, and (b) industrial action. (Report

The main reason for choosing non-violent civil disobedience as the form of action for the Defiance Campaign was that the organizers thought it would work. Given that the choice of non-violent resistance was made for its strategic value rather than its ethic, it is understandable that the people involved dropped the strategy when it proved unsuccessful and moved on to something else that they thought might work better.

Much the same thing happens to critical thinking in social studies classrooms. New teachers may leave their university classrooms with a commitment to the critical thinking process as a strategy—just like any other strategy in their cookbook of social studies teaching recipes. Their first task as a teacher is to test their strategies, their recipes, figuring out which ones work and which ones don’t. Like any other new curriculum implementation, teaching critical thinking has practical problems. Besides its newness, critical thinking has a double problem. It is controversial.

To administrators and others who have the power and control, critical thinking is potentially troublesome because it wrests some of the power of choice-making from them and gives it to the students. Should teachers face resistance from administrators, parents, students, and the system itself, they may quickly turn to other seemingly more effective and less problematic strategies. If critical thinking ever will become a valued part of the social studies curriculum, the central question for those committed to making it so must center on deciding whether they believe teaching critical thinking is simply one of many recipes in a cookbook or is a way of life in the classroom. In other words, is it an ethic or isn’t it?

Critical Thinking as an Ethic

Ethical action is always considered action. It is personal, and thoughtful. It is chosen among other, often easier, alternatives. One thing that must be noted is that an ethic cannot, and should not, be imposed on anyone. Teaching strategies have both up-sides and down-sides. The up-side is that they reduce the teaching experience to simple and easy to understand activities. The down-side is that the strategy approach to anything, including critical thinking, sees the teacher as the implementer of a system. This, in the words of Ted Aoki (1989), makes a teacher “a person reduced to a technical practitioner” (p. 18).

Following the Gandhian model again, the interaction of people with different positions and perspectives is a key understanding. Satyagraha “assumes a constant beneficent interaction between contestants with a view to their ultimate reconciliation. Violence, insults and superheated propaganda obstruct this end” (Fisher, 1954, p. 35). Our classrooms at the university need to foster beneficent interaction. We need to understand our teaching
“not only as a mode of doing but also as a mode of being with others” (Aoki, 1989, p. 18). Gandhi’s firm belief was that people’s minds could be changed by patient, kind, and firm reasoning and character. But they could never be changed by force. In other words, those of us committed to critical thinking as an ethic need to embody this ethic in our own dealings with students. James MacDonald (1988) writes: ‘As a teacher in the University, after many frustrating years, I have realized that if one wishes to influence others’ ideas and perspectives, one must literally embody these ideas and perspectives’ (p. 162).

As with any ethic or philosophical position, many principles underlie the ethic of critical thinking. These principles can be divided up differently and given different names. But, for the sake of beginning discussion, we will present seven fundamental principles. Suggestions will be given about how these fundamental principles ought to be “worked out” and presented in a class. Aspects of these principles do overlap, but each has a unique and important focus.

**Underlying Principles for an Ethic of Critical Thinking**

1. **Critical thinking requires the attitude that knowledge is not fixed but always subject to reexamination and change.**

   Like Gradgrind, the prototype teacher in Charles Dickens’ *Hard Times*, school has become a place for learning “the facts, the facts, and the facts.” They are places where children go to acquire the accumulated knowledge of the past. Most teachers and students believe that the “facts” that they are teaching and learning are permanent unchanging truths. Parents are happy when teachers teach the facts because (1) it is the way they were taught and (2) even if it is boring and tedious, it keeps their children away from “loosey-goosey” subjectivity and controversy.

   This attitude not only stifles the critical thinking process before it starts, but is fundamentally wrong. First, objective facts are always subjective. Second, rock-hard knowledge often crumbles given the test of time. Social scientists often point out how the same circumstance can be, and is, interpreted completely differently by different people—according to their ideological background. The term freedom, for example, never meant the same thing on different sides of the Berlin Wall. There are numerous examples of once solid scientific or historical facts that have been shaken by the tremors created by new evidence. One of the most exciting recent examples of this is the new theories being advanced about dinosaurs. The *Fredericton Daily Gleaner* (1989) recently reported that the world of paleontology is being shaken up by new theories about dinosaurs possibly being warm blooded, relatively intelligent, and more like mammals or birds than the reptiles they have always been thought to be. The report indicated that the American Museum of Natural History in New York City was considering major changes to its displays because of these new theories.
Facts are almost mythological in their structure. They are passed down, from generation to generation, almost without question. If it’s found in one book, it’s often found in all the others. Sometimes, however, new facts sneak up to startle sleeping scholars. For example, historians assumed for some years following World War II that Winston Churchill had made a blunder by sending British troops to help defend Greece from a Nazi invasion in the early spring of 1941. Greece was lost and many British troops were killed or captured. It was only later, after the revelation of sensitive intelligence material that had been kept secret for years, that scholars discovered that Churchill had information about the planned German invasion of the Soviet Union that spring. His aid to Greece was not so much to save that country as it was to fatally delay the German invasion of the U.S.S.R., an objective which was accomplished (Stevenson, 1972).

There are many other examples of “established facts” which have been challenged by new evidence. Students need to review and study such examples. Only then can they be encouraged to view contemporary “facts” with a healthy skepticism. Skepticism is often thought of as negative, and often confused with cynicism. But this feeling couldn’t be further from the truth. One could make a strong case for the fact that without skepticism there could be no thought. To be a skeptic is to learn to consider, to think for oneself. Nor is skepticism alienation. Alienation comes when one is separated from the truth and is powerless to discover what is, in fact, true and what is, in fact, untrue. Skepticism is a healthy beginning step to academic rigor.

It is incumbent upon university professors to remember the tenuous nature of knowledge within their disciplines and communicate this tenuousness to their students. The fact that this does not happen often enough is lamented by Metzger (1985) who writes, “I can only surmise that many social scientists, as teachers, lose sight of their own origins as they travel from the library to the classroom” (p. 117).

2. Critical thinking requires the attitude that there is no question which cannot, or should not, be asked.

The proposal that all questions must be allowed may seem radical, yet asking questions about even our basic assumptions is at the very core of critical thinking. Dewey (1916) argued that “an undesirable society, in other words, is one which internally and externally sets up barriers to free intercourse and communication of experience” (p. 99). For Freire (1971) a curriculum that emphasizes process “implies a continuous dynamic questioning of culture. If we do not do this, culture becomes static in the form of myths. We would thus fall into an elitist situation which would be no longer liberating or humanizing” (p. 226). Engle and Ochoa (1988) agree. They believe that “citizens of a democracy must be allowed room for doubt, even of their most cherished beliefs” (p. 11).

At a time when neo-conservatives like E. D. Hirsch (1988) are advocating
the inculcation of cultural norms and even civil religion in schools, it is incumbent upon educators as teachers "to make—and to help others to make—problematic the myth power of the slogans which domesticate us" (Freire, 1971, p. 226). To do this, professors must present materials and explore circumstances which will cause students to examine and raise questions about the fundamental assumptions of our culture. It is important here to emphasize, as do Engle and Ochoa (1988), that this counter socialization does not necessarily imply a rejection of what has been learned earlier in life. Rather, it calls for a thoughtful assessment through which individuals can reach their own conclusions as they face an unknown future where traditional values will undoubtedly warrant reexamination (p. 31).

While the phrase “No pain, no gain” hardly applies, it is important for teachers to know, before they attempt critical thinking, that there are some inherent difficulties. Radical questioning is seldom comfortable for either teacher or students. Rigorous discussion of the fundamental principles of society and culture are often scary, especially to people who hold these principles strongly and witness the discussion. There is always the chance and the fear that a younger generation may reject those principles that are held most passionately by adults. But in order for any fundamental principle to be held strongly, it must be rigorously considered. If there is no chance that it might be considered and then rejected, there can be no academic rigor or true critique in any discussion.

Parents and teachers who fear that the very roots of their belief system might be rejected are right to hold these fears; yet, they are also wrong. Certainly, rejection is possible. But teachers must give their students the chance to grow intellectually. Often teachers forget how they struggled to find the values and principles they hold. They also forget that the strongest steel is subjected to the hottest flame. Anything worth holding is worth considering first.

This fundamental faith in asking questions holds a dilemma for teachers. Teachers must be prepared to have the very structures of their classes questioned. Scariest yet, they must even encourage students to do this. Interestingly, our experience suggests that students are as nervous and anxious about questioning structures as their teachers are having them do it. They are excited by the process, because they often recognize it as necessary to growth. Yet they feel tension. The enterprise strips away the cozy comfort of the natural structure of the school, which is administratively set up so that they can experience no power.

Students both want to extend their responsibilities and want not to. It is sometimes easier to wash your hands of responsibility than it is to make tough decisions and assume responsibility for them. Many students, like other humans, remain in chosen bondage, blaming others for their plight. It’s a cheaper, less authentic way to live; but it is easier. The kind of inner turmoil
that radical and fundamental questioning creates is often the catalyst for
creative thinking, and indeed is the first stage that Dewey (1916) identifies
in that process. The only problem is, it hurts.

3. **Critical thinking requires an awareness of, and an empathy for, alternative world views.**

None of us can escape our backgrounds, nor should we want to. We can
never approach an issue from a truly neutral position, nor should we want
to. Our genetic makeup, combined with all of our past experiences, has given
us a perspective through which we see the world. This perspective is a cause
for celebration, not fear. Without this organization of our experiences, we
would never be able to understand anything that happens to us. We are
ideological humans, and this ideology helps us relate to all that we see. We
are, quite simply, what we have learned.

Although we can never completely escape our perspective, becoming aware
of what it is and how it differs from the perspectives of others is essential
to critical thinking. Our western orientation in social studies has reinforced
the way many of us see the world. We have learned that we, at least most
of us, are at the center of the universe. Every world map that we had in school
has North America at its center. Every history book we read is a history of
the world according to us. We have learned to give an unnatural preeminence
to the white, male, western vision of how things ought to be.

This view has helped us understand history, but at the same time it has
offended and marginalized people with other conceptions of the world. Rex
Nettleford, in his address to the 1989 annual meeting of the Association for
Supervision and Curriculum Development, suggested that Global Education
ought to challenge “mankind [sic] to the acknowledgement of cultural diver-
sity without the encumbrances of value judgements as to whose culture is
better or worse than whose.” Kenneth and Barbara Tye, speaking at the same
conference, refer to the “skill of perspective taking, being able to see
phenomena through the eyes and minds of others whose lives are very dif-
f erent from us.”

Central to critical thinking is understanding that there are conceptions of
the world that differ from our own. Students ought to be brought into signifi-
cant contact with people, text, and art which views the world from a perspec-
tive different from theirs. It is no longer enough to read books about other
parts of the world and other peoples, written by westerners. Students need
to listen to other people speak in their own voices through text, art, or per-
sonal contact. In an increasingly pluralistic society, many different voices
exist within our classrooms. We need to provide opportunities for them to
speak. We need to emphasize the importance of real listening. Real listening
means seeking to understand, not for the sake of building argument or gain-
ing advantage. Barber (1989) writes:

> I will listen means to the strong democrat not that I will scan my adver-
sary’s position for weaknesses and potential trade-offs, nor even that
I will tolerantly permit him to say whatever he chooses. It means, rather, I will put myself in his place, I will try to understand, I will strain to hear what makes us alive. (p. 356)

To embody this principle we, as professors, need to learn to listen to our students, to value what they have to say. Often real listening allows us to discover that we share much with the speaker. We also need to learn to listen in order to learn how to tolerate silence. Silence in classrooms, even at the university, is often misconstrued as wasted time; but, as Barber (1989) goes on to point out, it is an essential aspect to perspective taking: "One measure of healthy political talk is the amount of silence it encourages, for silence is the precious medium in which reflection is nurtured and empathy can grow" (p. 356).

4. Critical thinking requires a tolerance for ambiguity.

Real world problems seldom have neat and tidy final solutions. Dealing with them requires that public citizens will be engaged in deliberations of profound uncertainty, because of the need to accommodate conflicting interests, the lack of conclusive knowledge on most matters, and the fact most public problems are never finally resolved (Newmann, 1989, p. 358).

Schools have traditionally been places that have not tolerated ambiguity. The educational system has been geared to teaching the facts and testing for the "right" answer. Engle and Ochoa (1988) report that the "New Social Studies" reforms of the 1960s and 1970s failed largely because "teachers were unprepared to deal with materials that led to no correct and final answers" (p. 102). But it wasn't just the teachers who reacted badly. Parents and administrators were concerned about a possible break with tradition. No one really liked the tradition, but it was safe. At least the results could be measured in ways that everyone felt more or less comfortable with. It was a case of "the devil that you know is better than the one you don't." When it became obvious that it would be impossible to measure a new curriculum in traditional ways, the answer was easy. Dump it.

The old social studies curriculum had one real advantage. You could find abstract, singular, carved-in-stone answers and solutions there. Critical social studies had one big problem. Reflection and action about real issues rarely produced one, permanent resolution to the problem. If critical social studies was going to work in schools, which it wasn't, everyone involved needed to build up their tolerance for ambiguity.

This was especially true for students. Teachers, parents, and administrators are not the only ones who are uncomfortable when there are no "right" answers. For all their protestations and struggle with authority, students are even more like fish out of water without a concrete structure. Our experience with students suggests that they are, in terms of the traditional system, the ones who are the most uncomfortable with change and the least likely to want it. Many of these students have done well in a system where learning the "right" answer was required. These are the rules they know. When these
rules are changed, they are disoriented. It is hard to face the idea that there
may not be someone somewhere who knows if their answer is the right one.
We believe that sometimes “poorer,” “less academic,” students might
sometimes even fare better. First, they are used to questioning authority. Sec-
ond, they have had the right answer so seldom anyway that they are far more
willing to speculate. Third, they are more comfortable with the possibility
that they might not be right. Fourth, they sometimes find real joy in a system
where their answers are not always criticized.
No matter how “public” our universitites are, they are for the elite students
in our society. This is especially true in Canada. The students who get into
universities are the best from the traditional system. They have been good
at finding THE answer, and once they have found it have little desire to
speculate about why it might be right. They find it; they remember it; and
they write it down. They remind us of the wild boar in the following ancient
tale that illustrates part of the Buddhist Eightfold Path.

ONCE
upon a time
not so very long ago
Little Owl was listening to his mother. He didn’t really feel like listening
to her, because he had other things to do, but he was a reasonably polite
little owl, so he listened.

“Little Owl,” Mother Owl said.
“Yes, mother,” Little Owl said.
“Listen to me.”
“Yes, mother.”
“Little Owl,” Mother Owl asked, “do you know what’s most impor-
tant in life?”

Little Owl thought for a while.
His mother looked very serious, peering at him with her big round eyes.
“Right wisdom,” Little Owl squeaked.
“Yes,” his mother said, lifting a wing and flapping it about.
“RIGHT WISDOM. Very good. We owls are wise, we know great
truths.”

“Yes,” Little Owl said in his most convincing manner.
His mother moved a little closer and bent down so that she could whisper
into Little Owl’s ear.
“We owls,” she whispered, “don’t only learn HOW to do things, we
also find out WHY we do them.”
“Why?” Little Owl squeaked.
“Yes,” Mother Owl said and nodded. “Why!”

Little Owl ran off. He flew a bit as well, and he kept on talking to himself.
“Why,” he said. “We owls find out why we do things. We owls are
wise. We think a lot. We think out real answers. And then we tell all the other animals about the real answers, so that they can become wise, too, just like us owls.”

Little Owl looked down. He saw a wild boar. The wild boar was standing in a clearing in the forest below him. Little Owl flew down and sat on the ground, right in front of the wild boar.

The wild boar looked up. “Go away,” the wild boar said in a deep voice. “What are you doing?” Little Owl asked.

“Looking for grubs,” the wild boar said. “Now go away. You’re bothering me.”

“Do you know how to look for grubs?” Little Owl asked.

“Of course,” the wild boar said. “I’ve been doing it all my life. I must dig about with my snout, like this. But why am I talking to you? Go away.”

“Do you know WHY you are looking for grubs?” Little Owl asked. The wild boar sighed impatiently. “Yes,” he said, “because I am hungry. GO AWAY!”

“No,” said Little Owl. “I must tell you something very important. Something you don’t know about yet. But I do because I am an owl.” “Yes?” the wild boar asked slowly and showed its great yellow fangs. “Yes,” Little Owl said confidently, and he hopped up and down.

“You are looking for grubs because you want to go on living. You see, you want to feed yourself. That’s very good. You will live longer. And the longer you live the more chances you will have to find real answers about your life, you see? About why you are alive and . . .”

But Little Owl could say no more. The boar took a deep breath and charged. And Little Owl was left lying flat on his back. When his mother found him, Little Owl was still on his back. His wing was sore and he was crying. She took him home and put him to bed.

“Mother,” Little Owl said after he had stayed in bed for some time. “Yes, dear?”

“I am bored. Will I have to stay in bed much longer?”

“Another few days, dear.”

“Ah,” Little Owl said in a sad voice.

“Don’t fret, dear. I’ll tell you a story.”

If the wild boar represents our students, then we must be like the little owl. Our role is to keep raising the questions, working to build a tolerance for ambiguity. At times, we are too eager to tell, or too slow to ask. Sometimes our students, like the boar, are satisfied that they have sufficiently answered
the question. They will react badly should we continue to probe. Nevertheless, we need to continue to raise questions, point out inconsistencies, and encourage further reflection. This is the critical way.

5. Critical thinking requires an appreciation for alternative ways of knowing.

"Technological rationality refers to the dominant mind set of our culture" (MacDonald, 1988, p. 165). Our culture has become enamored of rationality, and has downgraded or discounted ways of knowing that are considered to be non-rational. Within social studies in general, and the critical thinking movement in particular, there has been a tendency to emphasize the scientific method as practiced by social scientists. There has seldom been an attempt to critique the critique. But the scientific method, if there ever was such a thing, is reductionistic. It reduces any study of problems or issues to an empirical analytic process, and denies many "non-rational" aspects that are powerful influences on any real issue. As Ted Aoki (1989) points out, the empirical analytic approach is, in itself, inadequate for real thinking about issues, because "multifold indeed are the ways in which people relate to the world" (p. 12).

This empirical analytic approach has also dominated research in education, but Aoki suggests that this is changing and alternative orientations to research, such as phenomenology and critical inquiry, are gaining acceptance and becoming more prevalent. It is time for such a change in classrooms as well. To study any problem with rigorous insight, a wide variety of materials need to be included in that study. In Engle and Ochoa's (1988) seven guidelines for social studies curriculum development, numbers 5 and 7 relate directly:

5. Since questions of what is good and what is bad are involved in most or all of these kinds of questions and since models for thinking about questions of good and bad are more likely to be found in the humanities than in the social sciences, selections from literature, art, music, religion, philosophy, and journalism would be utilized alongside and on a par with selections from the social sciences and history in the thoughtful study of any topic, episode, or problem. For instance, historians have much that is important to say about the institution of slavery but so do authors like Harriet Beecher Stowe, William Lloyd Garrison, and Stephen Crane.

7. The firsthand experience of students and teachers would be respected as one of the important sources of information bearing on any question or problem. (pp. 128–129)

Curriculum and instruction courses in social studies education need to provide prospective teachers with the opportunity to synthesize their experiences with Arts, Science, and other Education courses. They should also allow
students to consider their own backgrounds and consider how the totality of their experiences will shape their teaching. These courses need to value and seek out alternative sources of information. They also need to give students the opportunity to bring to bear the benefit of their own experience in interpreting this information.

6. **Critical thinking requires a skeptical attitude towards text.**

Textbooks can stand in the way of critical inquiry. In schools, they often take on the aura of the sacred. As Metzger (1985) points out, "As students we all quickly learned that the material between two hard covers was sacrosanct" (p. 116). Most people grow up in homes where books are revered. It would be sinful to fold the pages to mark the place, or to bend back the cover too far. Writing notes in books, even books that are owned by the reader, is also strictly forbidden. Even as adults, some people would never make a mark in a book. The tag of "Make This Book Your Friend," which many of us found in our textbooks as school children, always meant that we were to treat this "friend" with an overt gentleness, almost like a friend who is ill. Many of us misinterpreted this metaphor completely, and we still do.

The place and authority of a book is very great. In like fashion, both the text and the books themselves are given high honor by teachers. This is partly because written words have long-lasting formality, and partly because most people, even teachers, do not know how easy it is to write a book. While the printed word is extremely important to education, no text ought to go unquestioned or be regarded as containing the definitive information about any topic. School textbooks are particularly vulnerable to inadequacy. Many are produced to sell, not to be intellectually accurate.

In Canada, Ministries of Education usually vet textbooks—often designing the book’s content as the book is being written. If publishers are to sell books in provinces in Canada, they must understand and consider the “curriculum fit” or books simply will not sell, no matter how good they might be. For example, in Alberta, the grade 12 social studies topic on Political and Economic Systems includes a particularly archaic and wrong-minded understanding of the meaning of ideology. The belief is that an ideology is something that citizens of different countries choose and wear, almost like a pair of pants. Once the ideology has been put on, one acts out the definition of that ideology in one’s political interactions. One is a liberal, or a communist, or an anarchist.

What the social studies topic fails to understand is that ideological positions are also patterns of thought that are generally not consciously known or understood by the people who hold them. Yet, these thought patterns control the interpretation of the world, the understanding of what is or is not a problem, or the limits of good taste or action. If a textbook is to sell in Alberta and be used in the grade 12 topic, it must adopt, or pretend to adopt, the former mythological understanding of ideology—even if it is incorrect.
Textbooks are as much political as they are accurate. The recent rise of public groups with vested interests scrutinizing texts (Engle and Ochoa, 1988), the political and economic agendas of publishing companies (Apple, 1988), and the desire of school personnel to cover a lot of material and avoid controversy have led to the publishing of texts that give an “oversimplified and misleading interpretation of human events” (Engle & Ochoa, 1988, p. 52). These texts, themselves, become wonderful opportunities for students to practice their critical vision.

Textbooks are also political because they reflect the world view of the status quo. The status quo can lead to such things as history being taught “primarily from a military and political perspective” (Metzger, 1985, p. 116) or “overt propaganda [being] passed off as facts” (Engle & Ochoa, 1988, p. 52). Political scientist Marshall Conley (1989) argues that “textbooks, at least in Canada, are incorrigibly hierarchic and deferential in their sympathies” (p. 146).

The exclusive use of textbooks as sources of information has great appeal for teachers and administrators. It makes planning easier, avoids issues that might disturb the community, and emphasizes low-level knowledge which is easy to grade. If higher-level thinking skills are going to be developed, however, textbook versions of “the facts” need to be supplemented and challenged:

We should deliberately help students to experience different versions of a human event and to look for and question the assumptions that underlie a particular version. In short, textbook expositions should be questioned and criticized and students should be helped to develop the skills of criticism. Students should not be punished with failing grades for quarrelling with the text. (Engle and Ochoa, 1988, p. 59)

One of the most profound experiences I (Sears) had as an undergraduate history student was when a professor required our class to read both a Soviet and American eyewitness account of the Soviet invasion of Hungary in 1956. I still remember the sense of revelation I felt when I realized that two observers of the same event could report it so differently. My attitude toward the written word has been different ever since. Students in our classes need to be confronted with alternate views to the views put forth in textbooks. They also need to be encouraged to do the same for their students when they begin to teach.

7. Critical thinking requires a sense of the complexity of human issues.

Closure, that is bringing every lesson and topic to a final, testable conclusion, is often held up as an important part of any social studies lesson plan. Unfortunately, closure does not operate very neatly in the real world. To come to closure too quickly brings with it a human tendency to be hard-headed and intolerant of subsequent information, regardless of how crucial this information might be. Issues have innumerable sides. Each needs to be considered. While some resolution may be achieved, these issues are seldom finally solved.
Critical thinking practiced as a strategy, rather than an ethic, attempts to fit the mold of the school. As a result, Tanner (1988) suggests that critical thinking programs tend to use simulations that are not as complex or persistent as real world problems. These neat and tidy curriculum strategies do not serve the students well. Nor do they serve the long-term interests of a democratic society. Anne Wood (1989) points out: "In fact the curious effect of the conservative implementation of progressive education in Canada, coupled with our national political policy of glossing over controversial issues, resulted in a bland, ineffectual form of citizenship" (p. 24).

The propensity of social studies courses to want to cover scads of material is the major detriment to fully examining issues. Social studies classes should not be places where we are cutting off debate, questions, or research as we work to "cover the course." Rather, courses should be set up to take an in-depth look at a relatively small number of issues and flexible enough to allow digression when a question proves more complex or interesting than anticipated. Students need to be encouraged to seek out alternative courses and solutions for issues.

A further part of this process would be to anticipate the possible consequences of proposed alternative solutions. An interesting format to discuss alternatives might be a public hearing where various groups would be invited to class to give their responses to positions the students have taken on issues. Students might then realize that there is almost never a solution to a real issue that satisfies everyone or does not involve a cost.

Summary

For a long time, there has been a disparity between social studies as it is conceived by theorists at universities and as it is practiced by teachers. The fundamental difference between the two groups is that the theorists focus on developing critical thinking abilities, while teachers have focused on content acquisition as central. Many reasons for this dichotomy have been advanced. These reasons mainly focus on problems with the educational system itself.

This paper proposes an alternative view of the fundamental reason for the lack of consistency between theory and practice. Our view is that, while teachers have been exposed to critical thinking as a teaching strategy, they have not, by and large, adopted it as an ethic. When faced with the difficulties of implementing a critical thinking based program in their classrooms, teachers who have no ethical commitment to the process choose alternative teaching strategies. These strategies are "safer" and usually involve more traditional content. Critical thinking as an ethic is built on several fundamental principles that cannot be learned, but must be experienced. It is incumbent then for university professors to embody the ethic of critical thinking in their own teaching if they hope to influence prospective teachers to adopt and teach a critical social studies.
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Introduction

Japan's economic rise is a phenomenon that, along with the internationalization of the U.S. economy, profoundly affects us. With the exception of the Japanese themselves, Americans are perhaps most cognizant of Japan's new economic power. The United States is the number one world market for Japanese products, is Japan's leading trading partner, and is the recipient of a recent surge of Japanese investment.

Obviously the above events are changing American and Japanese economic and political perceptions of each other. Despite John Naisbitt's suggestion (1982) that the United States and Japan were so economically interdependent there would be an incentive on the part of both sides to work out any serious problems, there is widespread evidence of worsening Japan-U.S. relations, particularly with regard to trade.

Interviews conducted by Harris for Business Week magazine (1989) of random national samples of Americans and Japanese constitute just one example of the rising cacophony on both sides of the Pacific.

On the American side 68% of the 1,250 adults who were interviewed believed that Japanese companies do better selling products in the U.S. than American companies fare in Japan because Japan imposes unfair barriers on U.S. imports. Seventy-nine percent of Americans favored requiring that the Japanese allow a certain amount of U.S. products into their country, while well over 60% of those polled favored imposing higher tariffs on Japanese products and limiting the amount of Japanese goods allowed into the United States. Finally, in a much publicized question from the same poll, 68% of Americans believed that the economic threat from Japan was more serious to the future of this country than the military threat from the Soviet Union.
Rising tensions over U.S.-Japan economic and trade issues, and a belief in the desirability of systematic inclusion of both international economics concepts and Japan-related content in high school economics, were the motivating factors behind this study, in which the attitudes of American high school economics teachers on U.S.-Japan economic issues (and in particular the trade controversy) are compared and contrasted with those of other Americans, and classroom treatment of Japan in high school economics is examined.

Thoughtful reflection on the above topics is enhanced by an examination of the literature on three contextual questions related to this study. What is being taught about international economics and international trade in American high schools? What level of agreement exists among economists and economic educators regarding trade theory, which is particularly important in understanding current Japan-U.S. economic relations? Based on an examination of economics texts and related research, what content related to the Japanese economy and U.S.-Japan economic issues is most frequently taught in U.S. secondary social studies courses?

**International Economics in High School Economics**

Recently, a recommendation appeared in a special issue on economic education of the National Council for the Social Studies journal, *Social Education* (1990), that not only should every high school economics course include a unit on international trade, but that the entire high school economics course be approached from an international perspective. The recommendation, made by two nationally influential economic educators, is only the latest of a large number of exhortations by individuals and groups interested in U.S. social studies curriculum reform in favor of more emphasis on international economics.

Previous research on the relative emphasis placed by teachers on different economic concepts, however, indicates that international concepts receive very little classroom attention in U.S. high school economics courses.

In an examination of concepts taught in high school economics based on a stratified random sample of all schools in the U.S. that offer a high school economics course, Highsmith (1990) found that when asked to reveal which of 14 concepts they spend "a great deal of time on" the smallest percentage of teachers spend time on international economics concepts, with 14% spending "a great deal of time" on comparative advantage and only 5.4% of teachers devoting time to balance of payments.

This research is corroborated by an earlier study in which Figgins and Young (1986) administered a Likert survey composed of the 22 major concepts in the Joint Council on Economic Education 1984 Master Curriculum Guide, and the concept "Consumer Economics" to a randomly selected national sample of teachers (N = 173). Respondents ranked each concept based on the importance they placed upon teaching it in their economics classes.
The five ranking categories ranged from very important (5) and important (4) to unimportant (1). The three international concepts included in the survey, "Absolute, Comparative Advantage, Barriers to Trade"; "International Growth and Stability"; and "Balance of Payments, Exchange Rates" were ranked 20th, 22nd, and 23rd based on the percentages of teachers that considered the concepts "very important" or "important".

In addition to these studies, examinations of American secondary school economics texts indicate that while all include sections on international economics and trade, this material is invariably found at the back of the book. In short, despite the internationalization of the U.S. economy, and the exhortations of leaders in economic education for more emphasis on international economics and trade, relatively little attention seems to be given these concepts by high school economics teachers.

Economists' Views on International Trade: Agreement?

Since international trade theory is a basic component of international economics that students must first learn if they are to understand the economics of the U.S.-Japan trade controversy, this study can be more thoughtfully considered if a mainstream economic position on international trade, and particularly the question of free trade or protectionism, can be identified.

Classic Ricardian trade theory postulates that free international trade is beneficial to both parties while government-imposed tariffs and other forms of protectionism does great harm to national and international economic health. Although economists of varying political persuasions exhibit little consensus on many questions of political economy, there is substantial evidence of a high level of consensus among professional economists in support of the desirability of free trade and the harm of protectionism.

In a study in which university economists and educators who were members of the National Association of Economic Educators were asked to agree, agree with provisions, or disagree with 27 propositions on economic issues, Lang and Leet, (1989) found that 95% of respondents appeared to support free trade by disagreeing with the statement "the U.S. should increase its trade barriers in order to discourage imports." Moreover, when the 27 propositions were rank ordered, this item was ranked number one with regard to the level of shared consensus of respondents.

In an earlier study of American, West German, Swiss, Austrian, and French academic and business economists' attitudes on issues relating to political economy which utilized similar propositions, Frey, Pommerehne, Schneider, and Gilbert (1984) found that of 27 propositions, "Tariffs and import quotas reduce general economic welfare" was the single category in the entire survey with which the largest percentage of American economists agreed (79%), and ranked fourth out of the 27 propositions with regard to level of consensus exhibited by all economists who participated in the study.
Do similar levels of high school economics teachers also support free trade and oppose protectionism? Highsmith (1989) found that 81% of a national sample of 695 U.S. high school economics teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the proposition "Tariffs and import quotas reduce general economic welfare." Despite a seeming lack of attention to international trade in the classroom, high school economics teachers appear to also accept the theoretical arguments for free trade and against protectionism.

Japan in Secondary School Social Studies

Although in recent years a wide range of curriculum materials on Japan and the Japanese economy have been developed in the U.S., there seems to be no new evidence to refute James Shaver’s contention (1979) that the textbook is, in practice, the most important component in the social studies curriculum. In a 1981 review (Becker & Tokuyama) by Japanese educators of 26 U.S. secondary geography, American and World history, and civics texts, (economics texts were not included) Japanese reviewers found that most U.S. text authors gave little attention to Japan’s 19th century economic development, post-World War II economic growth, and contemporary Japanese domestic and international issues.

For the purposes of this study the author examined five U.S. high school economics texts for treatment of Japan. The books reviewed included one text designed for lower level students, three books designed for students at grade level, and one book written for honors students. Japan-related content ranged from omission of any information in the lower level text to approximately five pages in one of the books designed for students at grade level. The average amount of information devoted to Japan in each book was approximately one page.

Japan-related topical coverage varied from book to book with statistics on trade included in two books, case studies of the 1982 voluntary agreements to limit Japanese auto imports to the U.S. included in two books, and a one and one-fourth page description of Japan’s post World War II economic growth included in one book. Passing references to Japan of two sentences or less in descriptions of antitrust laws, productivity, foreign investment, unemployment, and economic growth were included in four books. The Japan-U.S. trade controversy was specifically mentioned in only one book, although there were indirect references to this issue in the two case studies of the auto agreements. What treatment of Japan that existed was accurate, with the exception of a couple of descriptions of comparative U.S. and Japanese wage rates which overemphasized higher U.S. wages.

The extent to which teachers claim to have included Japan in secondary world history classrooms in Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana was addressed by Barker and Christian (1987) in a survey of randomly selected secondary world history teachers (N = 195) from those states. Although teachers ranked Japan as the third most important country (behind the Soviet Union and
China) about which American students should learn, and reported spending an average of seven to seven and one half hours on Japan, the evidence indicates that recent economic developments in Japan and U.S.-Japan economic relations were given short shrift.

Major topics history teachers reported covering in class included Japan’s participation in World War II and ancient history. Other topics mentioned less frequently included the opening of Japan to the West by Commodore Perry and the history of Japan since World War II. The authors of the study were surprised to find very little attention given to Japan’s role as a world economic leader.

Although over 75% of teachers in the same study believed more emphasis should be placed upon teaching about Japan in the schools, less than 20% strongly agreed or agreed with the statement “My college training provided me with a good knowledge base to teach about Japan.”

Summary of Related Research

Although leaders in economic education urge more attention by teachers to trade and other international economics topics in secondary school classrooms, survey research and the positioning of international material in texts suggests that teachers spend little time on these concepts. Despite this lack of attention, high school economics teachers tend to agree with their college counterparts in support of the theoretical arguments in favor of free trade. When the teaching of Japan is considered in social studies, what limited evidence exists suggests that economic topics relating to Japan are not taught. Treatment of Japan in high school economics texts, based on the texts reviewed, is scant with the U.S.-Japan trade issue largely ignored, or at best, addressed in an indirect manner by authors.

Procedures

In order to examine the attitudes of American high school economics teachers toward U.S.-Japan economic issues, particularly questions involving trade, and to assess the nature and extent of coverage of Japan in high school economics classes, a two-part survey encompassing the back and front of a one page form (Tables 1 and 2) was constructed and mailed to a national random sample of 600 high school economics teachers obtained from Market Data Retrieval Incorporated. Responses were obtained from 219 teachers.

The first half of the survey (as reported in Table 1) was designed to obtain data on economics teachers’ attitudes toward U.S.-Japan economic issues with an emphasis on trade-related questions. Permission was obtained from the Harris Company to utilize several questions in this study which had been administered to the national sample of adult Americans cited earlier. The data collected from these questions were then used to assess teacher attitudes toward U.S.-Japan economic and trade issues, and to compare and contrast
those attitudes with attitudes of American adults as reported in the Harris poll.

The null hypothesis that there would be no statistically significant differences between the general public and economics teachers in their responses to the attitudinal questions was employed with regard to the first half of the survey, (Table 1). In order to test the null hypothesis a Chi-square procedure was employed where percentages of responses to each possible answer by the two samples were analyzed.

With regard to attitudes toward Japan-U.S. economic issues and trade the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level for all items indicating that in all cases statistically significant differences as to responses existed between the general public and teachers.

The first three items in the survey assessed the general attitudes of the two groups toward Japan, Japan’s economic success, and the Japanese people. In all three cases, and particularly with regard to Japan and the Japanese people, teachers exhibited markedly higher levels of admiration for Japan than the adult sample. Although 10% fewer teachers (AA = 49, ET = 39), expressed a great deal of admiration for Japan’s economic success than adults, 50% of teachers compared to 29% of adults expressed some admiration for Japan’s economic success, with almost twice (AA = 19, ET = 10) as many adults expressing not much, or no, admiration for Japan’s economic success.

In the next three items, respondents chose explanations for the relatively greater success the Japanese have in exporting to the U.S. when compared with American efforts to export to Japan. Although equal percentages (38) of adults and teachers believed a reason for the disparity were inferior U.S. products, 12% more adults than teachers (AA = 59, ET = 47) did not see

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Attitudes Toward Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Reported as Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How much admiration do you have for (EACH ITEM): a great deal, some, not very much, or none at all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan as a nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adults (AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Teachers (ET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan’s economic success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adults (AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Teachers (ET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Japanese people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adults (AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Teachers (ET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. While Japanese companies do better selling products in the U.S., American companies have had trouble selling their products in Japan. Do you think those troubles are the result of (EACH ITEM), or not?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 cont.:

U.S. products not being as good as Japanese product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Are result of</th>
<th>Are not result of</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. products being too expensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Are result of</th>
<th>Are not result of</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of Japan imposing unfair barriers to imports from the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Are result of</th>
<th>Are not result of</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Here are some measures that the U.S. might take to make the Japanese markets more receptive to this country's products. For each, tell me if you favor or oppose that measure.

Require that a certain amount of U.S. products be allowed into Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impose higher tariffs on Japanese products coming into the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Put a limit on the amount of Japanese goods allowed into U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restrict the outflow of technology from the U.S. to Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If you were considering a major purchase and you had a choice between a product made in Japan or a product of equal quality made in the U.S. by an American company, would you be willing to pay more for the product made in the U.S.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay more for</th>
<th>U.S. product</th>
<th>Would not</th>
<th>much more</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If you had to say, which do you now think is a more serious threat to the future of this country—the military threat from the Soviet Union or the economic threat from Japan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soviet military threat</th>
<th>Japan economic threat</th>
<th>No difference</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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inferior U.S. products as a problem, with a much higher percentage of teachers when compared to the adult sample, (ET = 15, AA = 3) answering that they weren't sure that product quality was or was not an issue. Ten percent more teachers than adults however, (ET = 78, AA = 68) believed the lack of American success in Japan could be attributed to the existence of unfair Japanese trade barriers.

The third set of four items provided data as to whether in the case of Japan, respondents favored or opposed protectionist measures, and were of the most interest to the author of this study. Although based on responses, majorities of adults and teachers would require that a certain amount of U.S. products be allowed into Japan, 15% more adults favored this policy than teachers (AA = 79, ET = 64).

The two proposed policies in this set which are the most directly protectionist, "Impose higher tariffs on Japanese products coming into the U.S." and "Put a limit on the amount of Japanese goods allowed into the U.S." produced the second greatest difference in responses between adults and teachers of any set of items in the survey. Sixty-one percent of adults favored higher tariffs on Japanese products and 35% opposed such a measure, while only 26% of teachers supported higher tariffs with 64% of teachers opposing such a policy. The response pattern was repeated on the proposed policy of import limits on Japanese goods with 69% of adults favoring the policy and 29% opposing it, while the policy was favored by 32% of teachers and opposed by 58% of teacher respondents.

Although differences between adults and teachers on the last proposed policy, "Restrict the outflow of technology from the U.S. to Japan," were less impressive, they were still substantial. Seventeen percent more adults, (AA = 59) than teachers (ET = 42) favored the policy. Similar percentages of adults and teachers (AA = 37, ET = 40) opposed restrictions on technology, with a much higher percent of teachers than adults (ET = 18, AA = 4) reporting they weren't sure of the desirability of the proposed policy.

The survey item resulting in the largest differences among adult and teacher responses was the item where, given a choice between products of equal quality produced by American and Japanese companies, a respondent was asked to indicate whether he or she would be willing to pay more for a product made in the U.S. than for a product made in Japan. While 66% of adults reported they would pay more for the U.S. product, only 14% of teachers gave the same response. Fifty-three percent of teachers, as opposed to only 6% of adults, chose the response "Depends on how much more" to this question.

The last question on the survey asked respondents to identify whether they thought the military threat from the Soviet Union or the economic threat from Japan was a more serious threat to the future of the U.S. On this question almost three times the percentage of adults (AA = 22, ET = 8) com-
pared to teachers thought the Soviet military threat more serious, with 74% of teachers compared to 68% of adults considering the Japanese economic threat to be more serious. Almost twice the percentages of teachers (ET = 18) as adults (AA = 10) responded that there was no difference, or they were unsure, to this question.

The second half of the survey, (Table 2) which was designed by the author, is an assessment of economics teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of Japan-

**Table 2: Japan in High School Economics**

(Data Reported as Percentages)

1. I think it is important to teach about Japan in high school economics courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I devote approximately __________ class periods to teaching about Japan in my economics classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Periods</th>
<th>0-1 hrs.</th>
<th>2-5 hrs.</th>
<th>6-10 hrs.</th>
<th>11-15 hrs.</th>
<th>16+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devoted</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate any topics below which you teach in class.

- [51] Post World War I Japanese economic growth
- [36] Structure of the Japanese economy
- [47] Japanese business-government relations
- [53] Japanese management practices
- [80] The U.S. trade deficit with Japan
- [75] Japanese investment in the U.S.
- [23] Differences between Japanese and American unions
- [51] American efforts to export to Japan
- [71] Free Trade vs Protectionism with Japan-related examples

4. How important are each of the factors listed below in terms of limiting the amount of material on Japan that you cover in your economics classes? (circle one response provided, where N = not at all; M = Minor importance; S = Somewhat important; I = Important and E = Extremely important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Limited coverage in course textbooks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Lack of other Japan-related instructional materials</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The greater importance, given limited class time, of other topics</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My own level of knowledge about Japan</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Others (please specify)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Please list by title and company any print or video curriculum materials you use to teach about Japan in your economics classes (various responses, see narrative).
related material in high school economics courses, the nature and extent of Japan-related topics included in economic courses, curriculum materials used for such instruction, and teacher perceptions of various factors that might limit teaching of Japan in economics courses. Data is organized by the percentages of responses to components items in the survey (Table 2).

A large majority of teachers (91%) strongly agreed or agreed that it was important to teach about Japan in high school economics courses. When the data indicating the number of class periods was organized into five ascending categories of class periods, a majority of teachers (53%) reported spending between two and five class periods on Japan. Almost twice the percentage of teachers (22) spend 0 to one class period on Japan as the percentage of respondents (12) who report spending 16 class periods or more on the topic.

The U.S. trade deficit with Japan constituted the most commonly addressed Japan-related topic in the respondents' classes with 80% of teachers reporting that they included this in economic courses. Large majorities of teachers (75% and 71%) also reported including the topics of Japanese investment in the U.S. and Japan-related examples relating to free trade and protectionism. The topic that teachers reported including the least (23%) in classes were differences in Japanese and American unions.

Although teachers listed a variety of other topics about Japan they taught in economics classes, including the contribution of the Japanese educational system to economic success and the Japanese propensity to save, no topic was identified in the "Others" category by as much as 5% of those who returned the survey.

Five items on the survey were designed to assess teacher perceptions of barriers to teaching about Japan. The largest percentage of teachers identifying an inhibiting factor to covering Japan in economics courses were the 64% of respondents who reported their own lack of knowledge about Japan as "extremely important" or "important." Fifty-seven percent of teachers reported an "extremely important" or "important" factor limiting their teaching of Japan was the greater importance, given limited class time, of other topics.

A majority of respondents (51%) also reported that a lack of Japan-related instructional materials as an "important" or "extremely important" limiting factor in teaching Japan in economic courses.

The perception by economics teachers that there are few Japan-related materials is corroborated by the data from the item on the survey designed to assess what Japan-related print and video curriculum materials is used in economics courses. Although a relatively wide variety of curriculum materials on the Japanese economy and U.S.-Japan economic relations have been developed for the secondary school level, over 60% of respondents left the question completely blank in which teachers were asked to list by title and company any print or video curriculum materials on Japan used in class. No specific materials were listed by as much as 5% of respondents with the
majority of respondents simply writing "news magazine and television news programs."

**Discussion and Recommendations**

Along with Highsmith's work, the findings of this study seem to be yet additional evidence that U.S. high school economics teachers generally support free trade and oppose protectionism. In the case of this study the sample of teachers, although they believed Japan to be engaging in unfair trade practices, still for the most part favored free trade and opposed U.S. protectionist policies toward Japan.

Only one of the four protectionist policy options in the survey (the requirement that a certain amount of U.S. goods be allowed into Japan) received support from a majority of teachers. Substantial majorities of teachers opposed the two most overtly protectionist options in the survey, (limiting Japanese imports and imposing higher tariffs on Japanese products). When studies such as this one and earlier studies of high school and university economics instructors (Frey, Pommerehne, Schneider) are taken into account, there appears to be little doubt that economics teachers in the nation's schools and universities strongly support free trade and oppose protectionism.

In the case of actual treatment of Japan-U.S. trade issues in high school economics classes, the above finding is potentially important. There appears to be a substantial discrepancy between the beliefs of the general public and the beliefs of high school economics teachers on what should be appropriate U.S. trade policy toward Japan. Based on these expressed teacher beliefs, if the question of the desirability of increased U.S. protectionist policies toward Japan arises in economics classes it is quite likely that many American students will receive a free trade perspective from teachers while being exposed to protectionist sentiments at home or possibly from the electronic and print media.

Based on this study it also appears that a large majority of U.S. high school economics teachers think it important to include a variety of Japan-related content in their classes. Also, trade-related issues constituted two or three Japan-related topics that the largest percentage of teachers reported covering in class. Still, 75% of the teachers in the sample spent five hours or less teaching about Japan in economics classes. As is the case with international economics, there seems to be little attention given to Japan in high school economics classes.

There also seem to be powerful factors that prevent in-depth treatment of Japan, including the short shrift given to international economics in secondary school courses, teacher ignorance of Japan, teacher perception of the greater importance of other topics given limited class time, and teacher beliefs that very few or no Japan-related instructional materials exist.

Given the importance of Japan, and prior research that indicates a lack of attention in general by teachers to international economics in high school
courses, the provision of more teacher workshops and courses on international economics and Japan-related topics by the 300 centers for economic education throughout the United States would be a useful outreach activity for those social studies educators, economists, and Japan specialists in higher education who believe Japan deserves more attention in the classroom. Already models for such courses exist (Ellington & Hutchinson, 1990). If more international and Japan-related courses and workshops are provided for economics teachers this would represent a step toward implementation of the recommendation of Morton and Reinke that the entire economics course be approached from an international perspective.

The scant treatment of Japan in high school economics texts could be improved by increasing the amount of content on this important economy. It is particularly recommended that a case study approach, a highly successful business and economic pedagogical strategy, be considered by text authors.

Finally, increased efforts should be made, both in courses and workshops and through such organizations as the U.S.-Japan Foundation-funded teachers programs throughout the nation, to inform teachers of the already existing substantial amounts of print and video curriculum materials on the Japanese economy such as The Japanese Economy: Teaching Strategies (Ellington, Morgan, Rice, and Suglia, 1990); Contemporary Japan: A Teaching Workbook (Martin, Tsunada, and Heinrich, 1988), and Understanding the Japanese Economy (Johnson, 1987). These latter materials, which are all revisions of earlier works that have been available for several years, represent only a small sample of a growing body of accurate and exciting secondary school curriculum materials on Japan that economics teachers do not appear to be aware of at the present time.

Endnotes

1. In a similar poll also conducted by the Harris Company, 1,000 Japanese adults expressed negative attitudes on questions about U.S.-Japan economic issues (1989). Fifty-four percent of Japanese identified low product quality as the major reason American companies had trouble selling products in Japan. Fifty-seven percent of Japanese thought the United States was unfairly pressuring Japan or trade issues, and a plurality (41%) believe that if relations with America worsened, Japan should work harder to improve relations with the Soviet Union.

References


Economics Teachers’ Attitudes About and Treatment of Japan

Lucien Ellington
with James Muntean
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Introduction

Japan's economic rise is a phenomenon that, along with the internationalization of the U.S. economy, profoundly affects us. With the exception of the Japanese themselves, Americans are perhaps most cognizant of Japan's new economic power. The United States is the number one world market for Japanese products, is Japan's leading trading partner, and is the recipient of a recent surge of Japanese investment.

Obviously the above events are changing American and Japanese economic and political perceptions of each other. Despite John Naisbitt's suggestion (1982) that the United States and Japan were so economically interdependent there would be an incentive on the part of both sides to work out any serious problems, there is widespread evidence of worsening Japan-U.S. relations, particularly with regard to trade.

Interviews conducted by Harris for Business Week magazine (1989) of random national samples of Americans and Japanese constitute just one example of the rising cacophony on both sides of the Pacific.

On the American side 68% of the 1,250 adults who were interviewed believed that Japanese companies do better selling products in the U.S. than American companies fare in Japan because Japan imposes unfair barriers on U.S. imports. Seventy-nine percent of Americans favored requiring that the Japanese allow a certain amount of U.S. products into their country, while well over 60% of those polled favored imposing higher tariffs on Japanese products and limiting the amount of Japanese goods allowed into the United States. Finally, in a much publicized question from the same poll, 68% of Americans believed that the economic threat from Japan was more serious to the future of this country than the military threat from the Soviet Union.
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Rising tensions over U.S.-Japan economic and trade issues, and a belief in the desirability of systematic inclusion of both international economics concepts and Japan-related content in high school economics, were the motivating factors behind this study, in which the attitudes of American high school economics teachers on U.S.-Japan economic issues (and in particular the trade controversy) are compared and contrasted with those of other Americans, and classroom treatment of Japan in high school economics is examined.

Thoughtful reflection on the above topics is enhanced by an examination of the literature on three contextual questions related to this study. What is being taught about international economics and international trade in American high schools? What level of agreement exists among economists and economic educators regarding trade theory, which is particularly important in understanding current Japan-U.S. economic relations? Based on an examination of economics texts and related research, what content related to the Japanese economy and U.S.-Japan economic issues is most frequently taught in U.S. secondary social studies courses?

**International Economics in High School Economics**

Recently, a recommendation appeared in a special issue on economic education of the National Council for the Social Studies journal, *Social Education* (1990), that not only should every high school economics course include a unit on international trade, but that the entire high school economics course be approached from an international perspective. The recommendation, made by two nationally influential economic educators, is only the latest of a large number of exhortations by individuals and groups interested in U.S. social studies curriculum reform in favor of more emphasis on international economics.

Previous research on the relative emphasis placed by teachers on different economic concepts, however, indicates that international concepts receive very little classroom attention in U.S. high school economics courses.

In an examination of concepts taught in high school economics based on a stratified random sample of all schools in the U.S. that offer a high school economics course, Highsmith (1990) found that when asked to reveal which of 14 concepts they spend “a great deal of time on” the smallest percentage of teachers spend time on international economics concepts, with 14% spending “a great deal of time” on comparative advantage and only 5.4% of teachers devoting time to balance of payments.

This research is corroborated by an earlier study in which Figgins and Young (1986) administered a Likert survey composed of the 22 major concepts in the Joint Council on Economic Education 1984 Master Curriculum Guide, and the concept “Consumer Economics” to a randomly selected national sample of teachers (N = 173). Respondents ranked each concept based on the importance they placed upon teaching it in their economics classes.
The five ranking categories ranged from very important (5) and important (4) to unimportant (1). The three international concepts included in the survey, "Absolute, Comparative Advantage, Barriers to Trade"; "International Growth and Stability"; and "Balance of Payments, Exchange Rates" were ranked 20th, 22nd, and 23rd based on the percentages of teachers that considered the concepts "very important" or "important".

In addition to these studies, examinations of American secondary school economics texts indicate that while all include sections on international economics and trade, this material is invariably found at the back of the book. In short, despite the internationalization of the U.S. economy, and the exhortations of leaders in economic education for more emphasis on international economics and trade, relatively little attention seems to be given these concepts by high school economics teachers.

**Economists' Views on International Trade: Agreement?**

Since international trade theory is a basic component of international economics that students must first learn if they are to understand the economics of the U.S.-Japan trade controversy, this study can be more thoughtfully considered if a mainstream economic position on international trade, and particularly the question of free trade or protectionism, can be identified.

Classic Ricardian trade theory postulates that free international trade is beneficial to both parties while government-imposed tariffs and other forms of protectionism does great harm to national and international economic health. Although economists of varying political persuasions exhibit little consensus on many questions of political economy, there is substantial evidence of a high level of consensus among professional economists in support of the desirability of free trade and the harm of protectionism.

In a study in which university economists and educators who were members of the National Association of Economic Educators were asked to agree, agree with provisions, or disagree with 27 propositions on economic issues, Lang and Leet, (1989) found that 95% of respondents appeared to support free trade by disagreeing with the statement "the U.S. should increase its trade barriers in order to discourage imports." Moreover, when the 27 propositions were rank ordered, this item was ranked number one with regard to the level of shared consensus of respondents.

In an earlier study of American, West German, Swiss, Austrian, and French academic and business economists' attitudes on issues relating to political economy which utilized similar propositions, Frey, Pommerehne, Schneider, and Gilbert (1984) found that of 27 propositions, "Tariffs and import quotas reduce general economic welfare" was the single category in the entire survey with which the largest percentage of American economists agreed (79%), and ranked fourth out of the 27 propositions with regard to level of consensus exhibited by all economists who participated in the study.
Do similar levels of high school economics teachers also support free trade and oppose protectionism? Highsmith (1989) found that 81% of a national sample of 695 U.S. high school economics teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the proposition "Tariffs and import quotas reduce general economic welfare." Despite a seeming lack of attention to international trade in the classroom, high school economics teachers appear to also accept the theoretical arguments for free trade and against protectionism.

**Japan in Secondary School Social Studies**

Although in recent years a wide range of curriculum materials on Japan and the Japanese economy have been developed in the U.S., there seems to be no new evidence to refute James Shaver's contention (1979) that the textbook is, in practice, the most important component in the social studies curriculum. In a 1981 review (Becker & Tokuyama) by Japanese educators of 26 U.S. secondary geography, American and World history, and civics texts, (economics texts were not included) Japanese reviewers found that most U.S. text authors gave little attention to Japan's 19th century economic development, post-World War II economic growth, and contemporary Japanese domestic and international issues.

For the purposes of this study the author examined five U.S. high school economics texts for treatment of Japan. The books reviewed included one text designed for lower level students, three books designed for students at grade level, and one book written for honors students. Japan-related content ranged from omission of any information in the lower level text to approximately five pages in one of the books designed for students at grade level. The average amount of information devoted to Japan in each book was approximately one page.

Japan-related topical coverage varied from book to book with statistics on trade included in two books, case studies of the 1982 voluntary agreements to limit Japanese auto imports to the U.S. included in two books, and a one and one-fourth page description of Japan's post World War II economic growth included in one book. Passing references to Japan of two sentences or less in descriptions of antitrust laws, productivity, foreign investment, unemployment, and economic growth were included in four books. The Japan-U.S. trade controversy was specifically mentioned in only one book, although there were indirect references to this issue in the two case studies of the auto agreements. What treatment of Japan that existed was accurate, with the exception of a couple of descriptions of comparative U.S. and Japanese wage rates which overemphasized higher U.S. wages.

The extent to which teachers claim to have included Japan in secondary world history classrooms in Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana was addressed by Barker and Christian (1987) in a survey of randomly selected secondary world history teachers (N = 195) from those states. Although teachers ranked Japan as the third most important country (behind the Soviet Union and
China) about which American students should learn, and reported spending an average of seven to seven and one half hours on Japan, the evidence indicates that recent economic developments in Japan and U.S.-Japan economic relations were given short shrift.

Major topics history teachers reported covering in class included Japan's participation in World War II and ancient history. Other topics mentioned less frequently included the opening of Japan to the West by Commodore Perry and the history of Japan since World War II. The authors of the study were surprised to find very little attention given to Japan's role as a world economic leader.

Although over 75% of teachers in the same study believed more emphasis should be placed upon teaching about Japan in the schools, less than 20% strongly agreed or agreed with the statement "My college training provided me with a good knowledge base to teach about Japan."

Summary of Related Research

Although leaders in economic education urge more attention by teachers to trade and other international economics topics in secondary school classrooms, survey research and the positioning of international material in texts suggests that teachers spend little time on these concepts. Despite this lack of attention, high school economics teachers tend to agree with their college counterparts in support of the theoretical arguments in favor of free trade. When the teaching of Japan is considered in social studies, what limited evidence exists suggests that economic topics relating to Japan are not taught. Treatment of Japan in high school economics texts, based on the texts reviewed, is scant with the U.S.-Japan trade issue largely ignored, or at best, addressed in an indirect manner by authors.

Procedures

In order to examine the attitudes of American high school economics teachers toward U.S.-Japan economic issues, particularly questions involving trade, and to assess the nature and extent of coverage of Japan in high school economics classes, a two-part survey encompassing the back and front of a one page form (Tables 1 and 2) was constructed and mailed to a national random sample of 600 high school economics teachers obtained from Market Data Retrieval Incorporated. Responses were obtained from 219 teachers.

The first half of the survey (as reported in Table 1) was designed to obtain data on economics teachers' attitudes toward U.S.-Japan economic issues with an emphasis on trade-related questions. Permission was obtained from the Harris Company to utilize several questions in this study which had been administered to the national sample of adult Americans cited earlier. The data collected from these questions were then used to assess teacher attitudes toward U.S.-Japan economic and trade issues, and to compare and contrast
those attitudes with attitudes of American adults as reported in the Harris poll.

The null hypothesis that there would be no statistically significant differences between the general public and economics teachers in their responses to the attitudinal questions was employed with regard to the first half of the survey, (Table 1). In order to test the null hypothesis a Chi-square procedure was employed where percentages of responses to each possible answer by the two samples were analyzed.

With regard to attitudes toward Japan-U.S. economic issues and trade the null hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level for all items indicating that in all cases statistically significant differences as to responses existed between the general public and teachers.

The first three items in the survey assessed the general attitudes of the two groups toward Japan, Japan's economic success, and the Japanese people. In all three cases, and particularly with regard to Japan and the Japanese people, teachers exhibited markedly higher levels of admiration for Japan than the adult sample. Although 10% fewer teachers (AA = 49, ET = 39), expressed a great deal of admiration for Japan's economic success than adults, 50% of teachers compared to 29% of adults expressed some admiration for Japan's economic success, with almost twice (AA = 19, ET = 10) as many adults expressing not much, or no, admiration for Japan's economic success.

In the next three items, respondents chose explanations for the relatively greater success the Japanese have in exporting to the U.S. when compared with American efforts to export to Japan. Although equal percentages (38) of adults and teachers believed a reason for the disparity were inferior U.S. products, 12% more adults than teachers (AA = 59, ET = 47) did not see

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Attitudes Toward Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Reported as Percentages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How much admiration do you have for (EACH ITEM): a great deal, some, not very much, or none at all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan as a nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adults (AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics Teachers (ET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan's economic success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Adults (AA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Japanese people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. While Japanese companies do better selling products in the U.S., American companies have had trouble selling their products in Japan. Do you think those troubles are the result of (EACH ITEM), or not?
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Table 1 cont.:

U.S. products not being as good as Japanese product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are result of</th>
<th>Are not result of</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. products being too expensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are result of</th>
<th>Are not result of</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of Japan imposing unfair barriers to imports from the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are result of</th>
<th>Are not result of</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Here are some measures that the U.S. might take to make the Japanese markets more receptive to this country’s products. For each, tell me if you favor or oppose that measure.

Require that a certain amount of U.S. products be allowed into Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impose higher tariffs on Japanese products coming into the U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Put a limit on the amount of Japanese goods allowed into U.S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Restrict the outflow of technology from the U.S. to Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If you were considering a major purchase and you had a choice between a product made in Japan or a product of equal quality made in the U.S. by an American company, would you be willing to pay more for the product made in the U.S.?

Pay more for U.S. product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. product</th>
<th>Would not</th>
<th>much more</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If you had to say, which do you now think is a more serious threat to the future of this country—the military threat from the Soviet Union or the economic threat from Japan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soviet military threat</th>
<th>Japan economic threat</th>
<th>No difference</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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inferior U.S. products as a problem, with a much higher percentage of teachers when compared to the adult sample, (ET = 15, AA = 3) answering that they weren't sure that product quality was or was not an issue. Ten percent more teachers than adults however, (ET = 78, AA = 68) believed the lack of American success in Japan could be attributed to the existence of unfair Japanese trade barriers.

The third set of four items provided data as to whether in the case of Japan, respondents favored or opposed protectionist measures, and were of the most interest to the author of this study. Although based on responses, majorities of adults and teachers would require that a certain amount of U.S. products be allowed into Japan, 15% more adults favored this policy than teachers (AA = 79, ET = 64).

The two proposed policies in this set which are the most directly protectionist, “Impose higher tariffs on Japanese products coming into the U.S.” and “Put a limit on the amount of Japanese goods allowed into the U.S.” produced the second greatest difference in responses between adults and teachers of any set of items in the survey. Sixty-one percent of adults favored higher tariffs on Japanese products and 35% opposed such a measure, while only 26% of teachers supported higher tariffs with 64% of teachers opposing such a policy. The response pattern was repeated on the proposed policy of import limits on Japanese goods with 69% of adults favoring the policy and 29% opposing it, while the policy was favored by 32% of teachers and opposed by 58% of teacher respondents.

Although differences between adults and teachers on the last proposed policy, “Restrict the outflow of technology from the U.S. to Japan,” were less impressive, they were still substantial. Seventeen percent more adults, (AA = 59) than teachers (ET = 42) favored the policy. Similar percentages of adults and teachers (AA = 37, ET = 40) opposed restrictions on technology, with a much higher percent of teachers than adults (ET = 18, AA = 4) reporting they weren’t sure of the desirability of the proposed policy.

The survey item resulting in the largest differences among adult and teacher responses was the item where, given a choice between products of equal quality produced by American and Japanese companies, a respondent was asked to indicate whether he or she would be willing to pay more for a product made in the U.S. than for a product made in Japan. While 66% of adults reported they would pay more for the U.S. product, only 14% of teachers gave the same response. Fifty-three percent of teachers, as opposed to only 6% of adults, chose the response “Depends on how much more” to this question.

The last question on the survey asked respondents to identify whether they thought the military threat from the Soviet Union or the economic threat from Japan was a more serious threat to the future of the U.S. On this question almost three times the percentage of adults (AA = 22, ET = 8) com-
pared to teachers thought the Soviet military threat more serious, with 74% of teachers compared to 68% of adults considering the Japanese economic threat to be more serious. Almost twice the percentages of teachers (ET = 18) as adults (AA = 10) responded that there was no difference, or they were unsure, to this question.

The second half of the survey, (Table 2) which was designed by the author, is an assessment of economics teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of Japan-

Table 2: Japan in High School Economics
(Data Reported as Percentages)

1. I think it is important to teach about Japan in high school economics courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. I devote approximately ________ class periods to teaching about Japan in my economics classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-1 hrs.</th>
<th>2-5 hrs.</th>
<th>6-10 hrs.</th>
<th>11-15 hrs.</th>
<th>16+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate any topics below which you teach in class.

- [51] Post World War I Japanese economic growth
- [36] Structure of the Japanese economy
- [47] Japanese business-government relations
- [53] Japanese management practices
- [80] The U.S. trade deficit with Japan
- [75] Japanese investment in the U.S.
- [23] Differences between Japanese and American unions
- [51] American efforts to export to Japan
- [71] Free Trade vs Protectionism with Japan-related examples
- Others (please list)

4. How important are each of the factors listed below in terms of limiting the amount of material on Japan that you cover in your economics classes? (circle one response provided, where N = not at all; M = Minor importance; S = Somewhat important; I = Important and E = Extremely important)

   a. Limited coverage in course textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. Lack of other Japan-related instructional materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c. The greater importance, given limited class time, of other topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   d. My own level of knowledge about Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Please list by title and company any print or video curriculum materials you use to teach about Japan in your economics classes (various responses, see narrative).
related material in high school economics courses, the nature and extent of Japan-related topics included in economic courses, curriculum materials used for such instruction, and teacher perceptions of various factors that might limit teaching of Japan in economics courses. Data is organized by the percentages of responses to components items in the survey (Table 2).

A large majority of teachers (91%) strongly agreed or agreed that it was important to teach about Japan in high school economics courses. When the data indicating the number of class periods was organized into five ascending categories of class periods, a majority of teachers (53%) reported spending between two and five class periods on Japan. Almost twice the percentage of teachers (22) spend 0 to one class period on Japan as the percentage of respondents (12) who report spending 16 class periods or more on the topic.

The U.S. trade deficit with Japan constituted the most commonly addressed Japan-related topic in the respondents' classes with 80% of teachers reporting that they included this in economic courses. Large majorities of teachers (75% and 71%) also reported including the topics of Japanese investment in the U.S. and Japan-related examples relating to free trade and protectionism. The topic that teachers reported including the least (23%) in classes were differences in Japanese and American unions.

Although teachers listed a variety of other topics about Japan they taught in economics classes, including the contribution of the Japanese educational system to economic success and the Japanese propensity to save, no topic was identified in the “Others” category by as much as 5% of those who returned the survey.

Five items on the survey were designed to assess teacher perceptions of barriers to teaching about Japan. The largest percentage of teachers identifying an inhibiting factor to covering Japan in economics courses were the 64% of respondents who reported their own lack of knowledge about Japan as “extremely important” or “important.” Fifty-seven percent of teachers reported an “extremely important” or “important” factor limiting their teaching of Japan was the greater importance, given limited class time, of other topics.

A majority of respondents (51%) also reported that a lack of Japan-related instructional materials as an “important” or “extremely important” limiting factor in teaching Japan in economic courses.

The perception by economics teachers that there are few Japan-related materials is corroborated by the data from the item on the survey designed to assess what Japan-related print and video curriculum materials is used in economics courses. Although a relatively wide variety of curriculum materials on the Japanese economy and U.S.-Japan economic relations have been developed for the secondary school level, over 60% of respondents left the question completely blank in which teachers were asked to list by title and company any print or video curriculum materials on Japan used in class. No specific materials were listed by as much as 5% of respondents with the
majority of respondents simply writing "news magazine and television news programs."

Discussion and Recommendations

Along with Highsmith's work, the findings of this study seem to be yet additional evidence that U.S. high school economics teachers generally support free trade and oppose protectionism. In the case of this study the sample of teachers, although they believed Japan to be engaging in unfair trade practices, still for the most part favored free trade and opposed U.S. protectionist policies toward Japan.

Only one of the four protectionist policy options in the survey (the requirement that a certain amount of U.S. goods be allowed into Japan) received support from a majority of teachers. Substantial majorities of teachers opposed the two most overtly protectionist options in the survey, (limiting Japanese imports and imposing higher tariffs on Japanese products). When studies such as this one and earlier studies of high school and university economics instructors (Frey, Pommerehne, Schneider) are taken into account, there appears to be little doubt that economics teachers in the nation's schools and universities strongly support free trade and oppose protectionism.

In the case of actual treatment of Japan-U.S. trade issues in high school economics classes, the above finding is potentially important. There appears to be a substantial discrepancy between the beliefs of the general public and the beliefs of high school economics teachers on what should be appropriate U.S. trade policy toward Japan. Based on these expressed teacher beliefs, if the question of the desirability of increased U.S. protectionist policies toward Japan arises in economics classes it is quite likely that many American students will receive a free trade perspective from teachers while being exposed to protectionist sentiments at home or possibly from the electronic and print media.

Based on this study it also appears that a large majority of U.S. high school economics teachers think it important to include a variety of Japan-related content in their classes. Also, trade-related issues constituted two or three Japan-related topics that the largest percentage of teachers reported covering in class. Still, 75% of the teachers in the sample spent five hours or less teaching about Japan in economics classes. As is the case with international economics, there seems to be little attention given to Japan in high school economics classes.

There also seem to be powerful factors that prevent in-depth treatment of Japan, including the short shrift given to international economics in secondary school courses, teacher ignorance of Japan, teacher perception of the greater importance of other topics given limited class time, and teacher beliefs that very few or no Japan-related instructional materials exist.

Given the importance of Japan, and prior research that indicates a lack of attention in general by teachers to international economics in high school
courses, the provision of more teacher workshops and courses on international economics and Japan-related topics by the 300 centers for economic education throughout the United States would be a useful outreach activity for those social studies educators, economists, and Japan specialists in higher education who believe Japan deserves more attention in the classroom. Already models for such courses exist (Ellington & Hutchinson, 1990). If more international and Japan-related courses and workshops are provided for economics teachers this would represent a step toward implementation of the recommendation of Morton and Reinke that the entire economics course be approached from an international perspective.

The scant treatment of Japan in high school economics texts could be improved by increasing the amount of content on this important economy. It is particularly recommended that a case study approach, a highly successful business and economic pedagogical strategy, be considered by text authors.

Finally, increased efforts should be made, both in courses and workshops and through such organizations as the U.S.-Japan Foundation-funded teachers programs throughout the nation, to inform teachers of the already existing substantial amounts of print and video curriculum materials on the Japanese economy such as The Japanese Economy: Teaching Strategies (Ellington, Morgan, Rice, and Suglia, 1990); Contemporary Japan: A Teaching Workbook (Martin, Tsunada, and Heinrich, 1988), and Understanding the Japanese Economy (Johnson, 1987). These latter materials, which are all revisions of earlier works that have been available for several years, represent only a small sample of a growing body of accurate and exciting secondary school curriculum materials on Japan that economics teachers do not appear to be aware of at the present time.

Endnotes

1. In a similar poll also conducted by the Harris Company, 1,000 Japanese adults expressed negative attitudes on questions about U.S.-Japan economic issues (1989). Fifty-four percent of Japanese identified low product quality as the major reason American companies had trouble selling products in Japan. Fifty-seven percent of Japanese thought the United States was unfairly pressuring Japan or trade issues, and a plurality (41%) believe that if relations with America worsened, Japan should work harder to improve relations with the Soviet Union.
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Abstract
The characteristics of social inquiry and artistic thought are identified and analyzed in light of their implied curricular relationships. Both social scientific and artistic thought make use of logical and alogical thought patterns. The biological basis for thought makes possible linkages of social studies curriculum to artistic modes such as modern dance. Social studies educator Harold Rugg suggested the need for the curriculum to be as motor focused as it is word focused. A sample lesson drawn from primary grades social studies demonstrates the techniques for linking modern dance movement and choreography with social studies curriculum.

Introduction
This discussion advances the notion that the arts provide an interesting and powerful tool to which social curriculum and instruction may be linked. Art and social inquiry exhibit similarities in their use of logical and alogical forms of thinking and their mutual efforts to shed light on human experience. Their apparently dissimilar purposes, techniques, and methods of verification belie their significant points of congruence which make them ideal curricular cohorts. Modern dance, with its roots embedded in an awareness of movement (Martin, 1965), provides a particularly appropriate art form to link with social studies. Modern dance and the choreographic process fits the dictate of social studies educator Harold Rugg (1963) that the curriculum should be “as motor focused as it is word focused” (p. 312).

The linkage of social studies and the art form of modern dance requires analysis of the manner in which artistic and social scientific thinking parallel each other. Despite different standards of verification, the arts and social inquiry share commonalities of thinking. Both the arts and social scientific
thinking make use of logical and alogical thought processes. Artistic expression and disciplined social inquiry both incorporate the personal experiences of the creator or inquirer in the development of the end product. Both disciplined social inquiry and the arts shed light on the nature of the social world. Art theory and theory about social inquiry will thus inform this discussion. The commonalities between artistic and social scientific thought lead to unforeseen linkages between the social studies curriculum and art forms such as modern dance. Specific points will be advanced at which the content of social studies may be linked to modern dance. Central to the linkage process will be the concept of objective movement conditions which makes possible the identification of movement ideas contained in all forms of social studies content.

Finally, this discussion sets forth the manner in which students may engage in higher order thinking skills through choreographic problem solving using social studies content. A linkage of art and social studies addresses curricular flaws repeatedly articulated by researchers. Social studies theoretically develops a variety of thinking skills beyond that of rote memorization. A variety of higher order thinking skills such as problem solving, divergent thinking, application, and evaluation stake legitimate claims to social studies (Byer, 1985; Engle, 1978; Kurfmann, 1977). Regardless of the taxonomies used to describe higher order thinking, their implementation on a moment-by-moment basis remains a rare occurrence. Goodlad (1984) points out the preponderance of classroom instruction geared to the coverage of content through textbooks and recitation designed to demonstrate correct answers. A mere 1% of classroom instructional time engages students in higher order thinking (Goodlad, p. 229). Not surprisingly, social studies consistently receives poor student reviews despite the overt desire of students to learn about social studies topics (Shaughnessy & Haladyna, 1985). Linking the arts and social studies offers a tool with which to address the issues of student interest and thinking skills.

Social Inquiry

Social inquiry combines a variety of logical and alogical thought processes similar to thought processes in artistic creation. Both social inquiry and the arts involve the totality of thinking processes, require the involvement of the body, and make use of personal experience. Kaplan (1964) defined social inquiry to include thought processes beyond the steps of the reconstructed scientific method with its linear steps of observing, classifying, posing hypotheses, testing hypotheses, and generalizing. The process of social inquiry requires an awareness of the manner in which personal life experiences, the interplay between ideas and data, and the role of imagination and intuition bring about disciplined understanding of society (Mills, 1961,). Avoiding the pitfall of rigid adherence to an artificial set of step-by-step procedures means that social inquiry must combine both logical and alogical dimensions. The
personal experiences of the inquirer, the techniques and the procedures used in an inquiry, logical thinking, and alogical thinking all play a role in the process (Gouldner, 1970; Polanyi, 1958, Polanyi, 1969). Such a process does not always proceed in perfectly linear steps as implied in teaching manuals, curriculum guides, and methods texts (Savage and Armstrong, 1987; Smith and Cox, 1969; West, 1968).

Social inquiry advances with the intimate participation of the personal life of the inquirer. Personal life experience can help inquiry lead to truth as well as to error.

...this means...that you must learn to use your life experience in your intellectual work; continually to examine and interpret it. In this sense craftsmanship is the center of yourself and you are personally involved in every intellectual product upon which you may work. To say that you can “have experience,” means, for one thing, that your past plays into and affects your present, and that it defines your capacity for future experience. (Mills, 1961, p. 196)

Gouldner (1970) points out the manner in which sociological theory developed through the interplay of personal and institutional experiences of Talcott Parsons. During the Depression, Parsons developed sociological structural-functionalism at the most abstract level. Beneath all the apparent abstractions rested a variety of latent values derived from Parsons’ personal life. Parsons’ abstract sociological theory served personal needs and may be viewed “as a conservative manifesto...a response to the crisis of his times...expressing a middle-class conception of, and response to, the crisis” (Gouldner, pp. 195-197). Deep within Parsons’ seemingly abstract theory lie influences drawn from his personal experiences in everyday life.

Alogical thinking such as imagination and intuition also relate to the conduct of social inquiry. Imagination refers to the ability to create new arrangements of ideas which go beyond established theory and fact. Intuition refers to the ability to shuttle back and forth from logical to unconscious thought to discover new relationships between ideas and data (Nisbet, 1963). Basic sociological concepts such as mass society, alienation, anomie, rationalization, community, social class, and disorganization resulted from imaginative leaps based upon personal life experiences of the social scientists who formulated them. Indeed, “not one of these ideas is historically the result of the application of what we are today pleased to call the scientific method” (Nisbet, p. 149). Emile Durkheim combined his personal sense of loneliness while living in Paris with an imaginative leap to produce his theory of alienation in mass society. Durkheim utilized a “profound imaginative grasp” by drawing on personal life in the everyday world through “internal and only partly conscious states of mind” (Nisbet, p. 155).

...it is impossible...to entertain seriously the thought that these major ideas were derived in a manner comparable to what we think of as
scientific methodology. Can you imagine what would have happened had any one of them been subjected, at the moment following its inception, to a rigorous design analysis? Can anyone believe that Weber's vision of rationalization in history, Simmel's vision of metropolis, or Durkheim's vision of anomie, came from logico-empirical analysis as this is understood today. Each was reacting to the world around him, even as does the artist. (Nisbet, p. 156)

Likewise, Bronowski (1966) points out that the "act of discovery in science engages the imagination . . . as truly as does the act of creation in the arts . . . " (p. ix). Imagination and personal experience interplay, that new concepts, new theories, and new explanations may spring into existence.

Social inquiry also includes qualities such as a sense of playfulness, a sense of the comic, as one works to create arrangements of ideas describing the social world (Leslie, 1960, p. 80). The anthropologist Gregory Bateson found that he could apply a variety of concepts to the same cultural events and still generate valuable insights. Bateson found that anthropological concepts such as ethos, structure, and pragmaticism could be applied to every aspect of culture (1965, pp. 257-264). The thought patterns most frequently associated with the arts—imaginative and intuitive skills—in fact characterize social inquiry. Their importance suggest that social studies instruction should incorporate more than the logical skills of the reconstructed logic. Such components are given little heed within the conventional social studies curriculum.

Artistic Thought

Reference to logical thought, alogical thought, and personal experience in social scientific inquiry points to further examination of the artistic process. Like social inquiry, artistic thought requires both logical and alogical thinking skills. The artist, like the social scientist, must develop a crafts-person's mastery of the specific tools and techniques through which the inquiry or creation takes place (Bensman & Lilienfeld, 1973). The sculptor, choreographer, or artist possess mastery of specific techniques for clay, movement, or brush. At the same time, they also have the creative sense of the total work which in turn interacts with their specific technical competencies. Rudolf Arnheim suggests the logical conclusion that "artistic activity is a form of reasoning in which perceiving and thinking are . . . intertwined" (1969, p. vi). The arts and social inquiry ideally make use of both forms of thinking, but as "disciplines stress . . . the study of words and numbers, their kinship with the arts is increasingly obscured . . . " (Arnheim, p. 3). The process of creating and perceiving apply to the arts and to the social studies in their curricular application of logical and alogical thought. Significantly, art involves the personal experience of the artist in ways which strengthen the rationale for linkage of art and social studies within the curriculum.
The personal experience of the artistic process goes beyond individual reactions to the social world or the existence of intuitive and imaginative thought processes. The role of movement in logical and alogical thought points to the biological basis linking social studies to the art form of modern dance. Social studies educator Harold Rugg (1963) pointed out the manner in which movement and thought were intimately connected.

... most recorded acts have verbal concomitants and in the growth of intelligence they are of supreme importance. But, until death, each act is still motor-centered in the nonverbal gesture of the body... The human organism is both motor-focused and word-focused. Throughout its entire life history the organism is tense with incipient movement.

Incipient movement means that even apparently abstract thought carries with it some form of attempted movement by the body. The thought of a tall object causes a muscular reaction in those muscles involved in raising the neck and head (Rugg, pp. 278-279). Although trained by social convention to maintain impassive faces and stationary bodies, the brain sends movement messages to muscles at the same time it engages in thought. Part of the feeling experienced in thought and action stems from the participation of muscles as they attempt or carry out movement. The muscles further participate in thought by retaining a memory of what moves, or attempts movement, during the manipulation of ideas.

Langer developed the biological basis for thought around the concept of feeling. The concept of feeling logically relates to Rugg's notion of movement in thought and action.

Feeling is that sensation, that form of knowledge derived from the biological participation in thought and action by living brain cells and nerves...

Feeling, in the broad sense of whatever is felt in any way, as sensory stimulus or inward tension, pain, emotion, or intent, is the mark of mentality...

... the entire psychological field—including human conception, responsible action, rationality, knowledge—is a vast and branching development of feeling. (Langer, 1967, pp. 4, 23)

Human thought and action thus proceed through mental and physiological processes which cannot be kept separate. The mental and physical cooperation the person experiences includes a vast array of sensations—feeling. The existence of feeling cannot be removed from the realm of thought and experience. Feeling exists as a component of what and when a person knows. Feeling thus makes itself known through biological sensations in the cells and nerves of the brain and coincides with attempted movement of the muscular system (Cynes, 1974; Gelhorn, 1964).
Kinesthesia represents an additional component in the linkage of thought and movement to feeling. Kinesthesia refers to the sense of position and movement in body joints provided by proprioceptors, the receptor organs embedded within the joints themselves (Cohen, 1968; Rose & Mountcastle, 1960). One's entire sense of movement through space and body part placement requires the biological information sent to the brain by the proprioceptors within joints such as the elbows, shoulders, knees, fingers, toes, pelvis, and neck. Every movement and positioning of the human body proceeds with the aid of the kinesthetic sense.

... "motor imagery" appears to be the initiating and indispensable requisite of the flash of meaning. ... Perceptual experience and physiological forms of movement, taken together comprise ... the motor determinants of meaning ... these constitute the primary raw materials ... from which images and concepts are formed. (Rugg, pp. 62, 63)

The anticipatory motor sets and incipient motor acts associated with the kinesthetic sense thus participate substantially in the imaginative, intuitive, and problem identification stages of inquiry. Even Albert Einstein described the manner in which his body became physically involved in creating the theory of relativity.

Feeling, logical and alogical thought, and movement are thus intimately linked. Feeling which stems from movement includes the movement of muscles during actual movement and during incipient motor responses, the movement of impulses through the autonomic and voluntary nervous systems, and the movement of electrochemical charges in the brain as the individual thinks and acts in the world. With the interplay of logical and alogical thought processes comes the sense of feeling derived from the kinesthetic sense and its related efforts of incipient responses. Conversely, movement engenders thought in various forms. Movement may stimulate memories of places and events in which a particular movement pattern took place. Movement may also stimulate thoughts concerning new patterns and relationships derived from the sequence itself. The modern dance choreographer Mary Wigman used the movement of her arms and body to generate the concepts for Pastorale. From the initial movement "the whole dance took form" (Ghiselin, 1952, p. 52).

Modern Dance and Social Studies

Intimate linkages between movement and thought bring attention to dance as a powerful tool for use in the classroom (Dimonstein, 1971). Social studies educator Harold Rugg went so far as to conclude that the full range of thinking and knowing "can be implemented only in a school program that is as motor-focused as it is word-focused" (Rugg, 1963, p. 312). Modern dance in particular offers a focus for integrating movement and thought, art and social inquiry, and logical and alogical forms of thinking. Modern dance ex-
hibits characteristics which highlight the attributes of artistic rationality. Margaret H’Doubler (1966) emphasized the significances of kinesthesia to modern dance. John Martin identified the emphasis of modern dance as movement focused.

This beginning was the discovery of the actual substance of the dance, which it found to be movement . . . With this discovery the dance became for the first time an independent art . . . completely self-contained, related directly to life, subject to infinite variety . . . The body is the mirror of thought. (Martin, 1965, pp. 6–8)

Modern dance, like all art forms, provides insight into social reality as the choreographer uses movement as the opportunity to make one’s perceptions public.

The linkage of social inquiry and artistic forms further points to artificial constraints placed upon social studies curriculum. Within their respective domains, art forms contain specific stimuli capable of being responded to by students of all grade levels. Within the domain of modern dance there exist two primary conceptual tools necessary for creating linkages to social studies curricula, 1) objective movement conditions, and 2) components of movement. Using objective movement conditions drawn from the domain of social studies, students may readily work with the components of movement as choreographers. The resulting choreography links the art form of modern dance to the total scope of student involvement with, and understanding of, the social studies content which they encounter.

Objective movement conditions refer to the movement ideas which may be identified in the content of social studies and in the processes of social studies inquiry. Within social studies content—objects, events, concepts, processes, issues, etc.—there exist objective movement conditions. The process of inquiry itself requires thought and action which contains objective movement conditions which could become the basis for choreography. Objective movement conditions manifest themselves in every context of the social studies curriculum. For example, the movement ideas inherent in urban traffic derive from the grid system of central business districts and older neighborhoods, the dissecting and bypassing of cities by interstate highways, the control of traffic patterns by signs and semaphores, the movement of traffic in non-grid patterns in suburban areas, and the movement and congestion of traffic in commercial and residential districts. Thus specific movement suggested by such conditions might include movement such as: 1) fast and slow parallel and perpendicular movement; 2) stops and starts; 3) parallel lines crossing in front of each other; 4) short stops and starts; 5) weaving in and out; 6) merging or parting; 7) sweeping or tight circular movement; and 8) serpentine movement. Such objective movement conditions exist independently of the individual choreographer but may be manipulated so that the choreographer’s own unique knowledge of urban traffic emerges.
The urban traffic example relates to a wide variety of topics commonly included in elementary social studies. The progression of expanding environments includes neighborhoods, communities, regions, the western hemisphere, and the eastern hemisphere which provides numerous encounters with objective movement conditions dealing with urban traffic. At the secondary level, courses dealing with contemporary problems, the rise of urban life in American history, and the rebuilding of European cities after World War II all provide numerous sources of objective movement conditions. Even world history texts such as *Chronicles of Time: A World History* include "Life in the Cities" at the time of Babylon which would contain objective movement conditions related to urban traffic (Chapin, Felton, Allen & King, 1983, pp. 43-44).

Architecture in urban areas also possesses objective movement conditions. Modern architecture such as the John Hancock Building in Chicago utilizes steel and glass to form a clean, upward sweep. The gradual decrease in width from base to top of the Hancock Building contributes to the upward sweep as well as a solidity, a strength to the beginning of the movement. The objective movement conditions inherent in Gothic architecture appear considerably different. The massive upward sweep of vaulted ceilings supported by flying buttresses and imposing masonry suggest other movement conditions. Upward sweeps less graceful than that of the Hancock Building as well as downward movement flaring out by the support of the buttress indicate two sets of movement conditions in Gothic architecture. The Roman cross, the sculpture, and the window tracery and rose windows all possess shapes which point to movement to capture the shapes and delicate and massive qualities with which the student choreographer might work. A conventional sixth grade textbook with its tour of the eastern hemisphere would find numerous opportunities to deal with such objective movement conditions. Likewise, a secondary world history text such as *The Age of Europe* with chapters titled "Going to Town" replete with photographs of cathedrals and a discussion of the cathedral building process provide objective movement conditions of a similar nature (Burns, 1976, pp. 34-39).

Objective movement conditions also exist in the arrangements of society in which institutions interact with each other and with individuals. Economic systems function by flowing between various sectors of the economy. Money flows from banks to business for expansion, to workers for wages, to businesses for consumer products, and to banks to pay off mortgages on homes as well as to deposit savings. A complex interaction exists in which literal movement takes place. In that movement various groups benefit more or less depending upon their social location. Some sectors of the economy experience rapid growth for individuals and groups while others benefit little or suffer and look on from the outside. Other economic phenomena exhibit objective movement conditions. Transactions between customer and clerk in a department store involve ritual movement in which money or credit
cards move out of wallets and purses, from hand to hand, into cash registers, lateral movement to imprint credit cards on sales slips, movement of cash downward into a register, the upward movement of cash register keys or the right angle emergence of digital numbers and a turning away by the customer from the transaction scene. A first grade *Families* text with a diagram of international trade between the United States, Argentina, and Germany points to objective movement conditions (Senesh, 1973, pp. 68–69). A secondary level economics text such as *Economics: Principles and Practices* with graphs and explanations of flexible exchange rates likewise offers numerous objective movement conditions (Clayton & Brown, 1983, pp. 438–439). Regardless of the factual content, conceptual structure, or grade level, objective movement conditions exist within the K-12 social studies curriculum.

Dealing with objective movement conditions requires that teachers know the components of movement which may be manipulated in the problem solving of choreography. Components of movement consist of four major categories including space awareness, body awareness, quality of bodily movement, and space relationships (Blackmarr, Owens & Rocket, 1974). Space awareness focuses upon the manner in which the body uses personal and general space. General space refers to the total space such as a room or gymnasium in which movement takes place. Personal space refers to the immediate circular space around the individual created by the diameter of outstretched arms. The individual may move through general or personal space making use of directions (forward, backward, etc.), levels (high, medium, low), pathways, and ranges (large, medium, small). Body Awareness stresses body parts, shapes the body can make (round, curled, etc.), basic locomotor movement (walk, run, etc.), manipulative movement (kick, strike etc.), non-locomotor movement (bend, stretch, etc.), and maneuver of weight movement (push, pull, etc.). Quality of Body movement includes how the body moves in time (fast, slow, etc.), in space (direct, flexible), with force (strong-weak, etc.), and with flow (bound, free, etc.). Relationships include that of the body to objects, individuals, and groups stressing near, far, meeting, parting, and related concepts (Akenson, Akenson & Florence, 1978, pp. 6–7). Manipulated in a problem solving context, the four categories of movement become linked to objective movement conditions such that the student choreographer dwells in social studies concepts through an artistic mode.

The linkage of social studies and the artistic mode of modern dance may be illustrated through a simple elementary grade lesson dealing with McDonald’s. Although not typically the focus of social studies curricula, the fast food industry exhibits a variety of concepts and issues ranging from mass production and standardization to corporate social responsibility and the structure of the nuclear middle class family in the late 20th century. Indeed, the complete range of historical, geographic, and social scientific disciplines and interdisciplinary studies could be used in a study of McDon-
Teddy’s and the fast food industry (Akenson, 1977). Global in scope, linked into popular culture, and making use of advanced technology, the fast food industry reveals a great deal about the past and present of contemporary culture. Choreography and problem-solving, based upon a study of McDonald’s, would thus provide an opportunity for art and social studies to be linked. Students would demonstrate and objectify knowledge of facts, concepts, processes, and issues related to, and derived from, their inquiry into McDonald’s. Each choreographic arrangement would generate insights into student understanding and generate additional students insights into the topic.

**Process of McDonald’s Unit**

1. Select specific content derived from the major concepts concerning McDonald’s and identify the objective movement conditions.

**Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Movement Conditions</th>
<th>Movement Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant Design—Basic</td>
<td>Rectangular shapes, rectangular pathways, straight, strong, repetition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rectangular floor plan,</td>
<td>Swinging, irregular, rhythms, variations in tempo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rectangular brick,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rectangular windows.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors which swing in both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers: straight line from</td>
<td>Straight lines, right angles,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrance to counter.</td>
<td>meeting and parting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peeling off, separating,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family unit takes seats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while other member orders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers execute one or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more right angle turns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers: Directly behind the</td>
<td>Quick, back and forth, medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counter, short pathways,</td>
<td>and high level, pivot turns, high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back and forth, quick short</td>
<td>turns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movement, pivoting, reaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into medium and high level,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occasional lateral movement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Create movement problems for children to solve. Samples:
   a. Assign individual children an objective movement condition to manipulate in a creative study.
   b. Assign individual children more than one objective movement condition to manipulate.
   c. Assign small groups of children an objective movement condition to manipulate.
   d. Assign small groups of children more than one objective movement condition to manipulate.

3. As individuals and/or groups work on their movement problems, move about to ask questions designed to help students explore a greater range of possible movement patterns. Base questions on the sub-components of space awareness, body awareness, quality of bodily movement, and space relationships. Questions may logically include:
   a. Can you find a way to use other body parts as you do the (swinging, etc.) movement?
   b. Can you find a way to move through space as you do the movement?
   c. Can you find a way to move at a higher or lower level as you do the movement?
   d. Can you find a way to use bending or stretching movement?
   e. Can you find a way to do the movement faster, slower?

4. Upon completion of the movement analyze the choreography with questions such as:
   a. What ideas about McDonald’s did you have?
   b. How did different persons contribute to the movement?
   c. Are there any other ways they could have dealt with the idea(s) about McDonald’s?
   d. Could some people move faster, slower, lower, higher, remain stationary, move different body parts differently? Would the idea about McDonald’s stay the same? Would it change?
   e. Did you learn anything new about McDonald’s from watching the creative study? Are there any new ideas about McDonald’s that we should study?

Within the problem solving context of choreography, social studies concepts interact with the artistic, motor-focused dimensions of logical and alogical thought. As students solve the choreographic problem with the objective movement conditions, social studies readily functions with a combination of logical and alogical forms. Such involvement generates disciplined understanding of the social world and helps fulfill Harold Rugg’s advice that
the curriculum should be both motor focused and word focused. Students at an elementary school in middle Tennessee clearly demonstrated their abilities to solve the same basic choreographic problem by manipulating McDonald's based objective movement conditions in ways unique to each child or group. At the same time each child and each group stayed faithful to the objective movement conditions and could discuss their choreography after it had been presented to the class. The process of creative problem solving takes students into the realm of higher order thinking, yet requires careful grounding in the content and process of social studies.

**Conclusion**

Linking social studies to artistic modes such as movement readily flows from an orientation of thinking about social studies as examining the linkages between personal experience and the institutional structures which give societies their order. Coming to grips with a vision of social studies curriculum evolves from a focus upon the actual purpose and conduct of social inquiry, the manner in which personal experience and institutional arrangements interact with one another, and the manner in which logical and alogical thought forms interact. A wide variety of topics may be subsequently structured along criteria of personal interest and the external significance of structural phenomena and issues within society.

Social studies curriculum exists within an historical tradition dominated by limited instructional procedures. The role of the arts receives little consideration as a complementary mode for enhancing social studies curriculum. No less a social studies educator than Harold Rugg pointed to the need for linking movement to the existing curriculum. Analysis based upon art theory points to conceptually valid evidence for advocating the linkage of social studies with art forms such as modern dance. Social studies curriculum may be crafted to exhibit characteristics consistent with the conduct of social inquiry and be further invigorated by linkages with artistic modes. Incorrect perceptions of the divisions between artistic thought and social inquiry may be eliminated. Within an orientation geared to developing curriculum linkages there exists the possibility of involving students in a variety of ways to better comprehend the meaning of their lives and the lives of others.
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In his book, *Legacy of Silence*, Israeli psychologist Dan Bar-On explores the impact of Nazi atrocities on the perpetrators' children. After an introductory chapter, Bar-On presents a series of 13 interviews with middle-aged children of men who were active in the Nazi party during World War II. While the children of famous Nazis such as Josef Mengele are not found here, several interviewees are children of the Nazi elite.

The nine men and four women Bar-On interviewed are, in many ways, quite different from each other. Some were infants during World War II and have no memories of their fathers during the war years. Others had close relationships with their fathers and have vivid childhood memories of the experiences and events they shared during the war.

The interviewees also differ in their responses to their fathers. Some report close, loving relationships, while others describe their fathers as aloof and demanding. As adults, some interviewees reject their fathers and want to be free of any association with the past. Several others defend their fathers' actions and continue to be loyal to their memories. Most, however, have an uneasy relationship with their fathers because they are unable to reconcile Nazi activities with their need for fathers who were good men and lived commendable lives.

Though the interviewees' responses to their childhoods are dissimilar and the details of their lives are unique, several themes can be traced through the interviews which apply to all of them. First, Nazi activities during the war are repeatedly referred to as a "taboo subject" which could not be spoken of at the time and which cannot be spoken of to this day. Some interviewees learned about events in general and activities of their fathers in particular only recently from stories in the media. It appears that the silence about current events and the willful ignorance cultivated by Germans during the war persisted after the war and became habitual. This creates a significant problem for the children of Nazis who need to understand their pasts before they can create their futures.

The difficulty of establishing stable adult lives is the second and perhaps the dominant theme found in the interviews. The children of Nazis struggle to lead normal lives in the face of the Nazi activities of their fathers. In early childhood, these fathers were seen as powerful men, actively involved in shaping political events, surrounded by pomp and ceremony, and worshipped as heroes. Suddenly, after the war, they became villains in the eyes of the...
world and were prosecuted as criminals or forced to flee their homes. Several committed suicide; others were executed. Some families moved to remote areas, and became impoverished. The impact of these events on the lives of the children was overwhelming and, as adults, they now experience serious difficulties in establishing families of their own.

Several interviewees suggest a further reason for remaining childless when they speak of their fear of their own potential for evil. They worry that their fathers’ capacity for committing atrocities has been genetically transferred to them and they and any children they might have are tainted. At least one interviewee also worries about his capacity for evil because of his upbringing. After he described his experiences in the Hitler Youth, he expressed relief that Germany lost the war. Because they had been psychologically trained to carry out murderous acts, he believes that, as compared with his father’s generation, his generation “... would have been worse. We could have done it without any doubts whatsoever. We were trained to hate from a very early age” (p. 213).

Finally, a third theme dominates these interviews and haunts the interviewees; the theme of guilt and remorse. Some interviewees defend their fathers’ actions and at least one of them admires Mengele and believes that the Nazis’ activities had merit. Others disown their fathers and express contempt for their father’s beliefs and actions. Most, however, try to maintain some connections with their fathers by understanding and explaining their fathers’ Nazi associations. This task is much easier if the father expressed remorse for his actions. As one interviewee states, “... if he admits his guilt, then it can be lifted from me” (p. 263). If a father can be shown to have carried out some good deed during the war, or to have broken with the Nazis agenda, or to have repented for his Nazi activities, then the child can maintain a connection with him without defending his war record. Consequently, though they are rarely successful, these interviewees search diligently for any indication that their fathers experienced remorse.

Unfortunately, the final chapter of the book is a disappointment. Instead of an analysis to provide a sociological and historical context for the material in the preceding chapters, Bar-On simply summarizes. While this is helpful, it does not satisfy the reader’s need to see the interviewees’ responses in a larger framework, and to appreciate the significance of their remarks beyond the personal.

Throughout the interviews, Bar-On is careful not to intrude on the voices of the interviewees. The opportunity to listen is of value to us, and the opportunity to speak is of value to them. Trapped between an older generation that chose to forget through silence and a younger generation that chooses to ignore through silence, they are isolated in a society that regards their need to speak as unnecessary and unwelcome. This silence must be overcome if the children of Nazi perpetrators are to find a way to be Germans without guilt and bitterness and with hope for the future.

Reviewed by Samuel Totten, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, College of Education, 300 Graduate Education Building, Fayetteville, AR 72701

Since the early 1970s, when Holocaust education became an increasingly "popular" subject to teach in U.S. public schools, the most conscientious educators have been wrestling with how to go about teaching such a complex and horrific subject as the Holocaust in the most pedagogically sound and effective manner. There are no easy answers, but over the years a number of outstanding curricula and methods have been developed.

One educational organization that has been working diligently over the past decade and a half to address these pedagogical concerns is the Facing History and Ourselves National Foundation (25 Kennard Road, Brookline, MA 02146). Facing History and Ourselves was designed in 1976 (with U.S. Department of Education funds) to improve secondary education. It has since evolved into a nonprofit organization whose primary purpose is to assist teachers at various levels to teach about bigotry, prejudice, racism, antisemitism, the Holocaust, genocide, and issues germane to adolescent and adult development. Since 1981, the U.S. Department of Education has cited Facing History and Ourselves as an exemplary model teacher training program. The program is now included in the Department's National Diffusion Network, which disseminates information about innovative and successful curricula to educators across the nation. Over the past decade, over 30,000 educators from 46 states, Canada, and abroad have taken part in Facing History workshops and conferences. Annually, over 450,000 students in public, private, and parochial schools across the United States and Canada have been taught with Facing History materials.

In 1982 Facing History published its widely acclaimed text *Facing History and Ourselves: Holocaust and Human Behavior* by Margot Stern Strom and William S. Parsons. This text was "specifically designed for adolescents, and their school and home community, to promote awareness of the history of the Holocaust and genocide of the Armenian people, an appreciation for justice, a concern for interpersonal understanding, and a memory for the victims of those events" (Strom and Parsons, 1982, p. 13).

More recently, Facing History has written and published a new text, *Facing History and Ourselves: Elements of Time*, a unique resource book on Holocaust testimonies. The main purpose of the volume is to provide educators with a framework for incorporating survivor testimony into the classroom and enhancing their pedagogical efforts to teach about the Holocaust. Indeed, both the development of this volume as well as many of the insights contained herein constitute a unique step in a new direction
in regard to how survivor and other witness testimony can be incorporated into educational settings. It is this volume that is under review.

In the recent past, many teachers who attempted to teach about the Holocaust tried to "catch their students' attention" by immediately introducing them to the horrors of the death camps. They did so primarily by showing films that focused almost exclusively on the mounds of dead bodies, the emaciated survivors, and other gruesome scenes. Oftentimes the result of this "assault" of the senses was exactly the opposite of what the teacher had intended; that is, in many cases, students were so horrified that they did anything they could to shield themselves from the subject. Indeed, many turned away in disgust. These methods were not only pedagogically unsound, but they displayed a callous disregard for the students' psychological well-being.

*Elements of Time*, on the other hand, advocates the use of more appropriate films/videotapes as well as delineating a process of how to use videotapes of survivor testimony in a manner that is not only more pedagogically sound but is sensitive to the psychological make-up of the students who will be viewing the tapes. Each of these elements contributes to the volume's strength.

Speaking of the videotapes in their preface, the authors state that "For the past five years, Facing History and Ourselves researchers have worked with the unique collections at the Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University. We have gathered and edited an exceptional set of materials that can be used in diverse educational settings, middle schools, high schools, community colleges, universities, adult education programs, interfaith meetings, and special events sponsored by church and community organizations" (p. vii). The authors also state that "*Elements of Time* does not attempt to be a comprehensive survey of survivors' experiences in the Holocaust years. Rather, it suggests the types of themes that most engage students' interest and generate worthwhile classroom discussion. It also provides general guidelines for viewing the ever-growing number of video testimonies in cities throughout the United States" (p. xx).

It is important to note that this book specifically "serves as a companion to the Facing History video collection of Holocaust testimonies" (p. xx). Concomitantly, "the manual is keyed specifically to Facing History curriculum materials, and the video excerpts described in the manual have been selected to enhance and elaborate upon themes explored in Facing History classrooms" (p. xxiii). Thus, the volume will undoubtedly be of most value to those teachers who teach the Facing History curriculum. In fact, it seems that where used by teachers who are not teaching the Facing History curriculum and/or do not have a solid grasp of the history of the Holocaust, such video testimony may well end up being used in the most perfunctory of ways. That is true because the information presented in the video testimony demands that the students understand the context in which the information
is being presented by the witnesses. Without such “context-setting,” the information will be less meaningful than it should or could be.

The volume is divided into three main sections: Portraits, Montages, and Essays by scholars about various aspects of Holocaust video testimonies. It also contains informative appendices.

“Portraits”: Are chronological studies of individuals who lived through the years of the Third Reich, capturing their important moments of decision-making as well as the moments when fate helped in their survival. In most cases the portraits cover several years of a survivor’s life so that audiences can get a sense of the accumulation of humiliations, threats, and physical suffering that survivors endured. Each portrait, except the final one, is between 20 and 30 minutes in length so that a class has an opportunity to discuss the tape immediately after viewing it. (p. xx)

“Rachel G.” is an extremely moving portrait of the experiences of a Belgian Jewish child who spent three years (1942-45) among Catholics. The power of Rachel’s testimony is greatly intensified because the viewer listens to her voice and watches her countenance as she relates the story. At the same time, it is painful to watch Rachel as she experiences obvious agony in the telling of her story. It is worth noting that some scholars have raised questions about the sagacity of subjecting survivors to such torment and have broached the issue as to whether the survivors are being “used” or taken advantage of in such situations. These are issues that educators will have to wrestle with themselves while previewing the tapes prior to using them with their students.

A key problem with the “Portraits” (assuming that “Rachel G.” is similar to the other “Portraits”) is that they are lacking in significant and necessary contextual information (e.g., key historical information, the chronology of the larger events, the overall geopolitical situation, etc.) This is needed if the testimonies are going to be used in the most efficacious manner possible. As Lawrence Langer (1989) states in his essay, “Preliminary Reflections on Using Videotaped Interviews in Holocaust Education,” “[a]s the interest grows around the country in disseminating videotaped survivor or witness accounts, we need to recognize the liability of showing them to audiences who are merely curious or well-intentioned or enthusiastic but not informed—or prepared” (p. 296). On the other hand, if the teachers who use the tapes are highly conversant with the history of the Holocaust and can provide the needed information (and it is likely that most teachers who are using the Facing History curriculum can) then this situation is almost automatically ameliorated; provided, of course, that they avail their students of this information in an effective way. That said, it should be noted that the express purpose of Elements of Time is to provide contextual information, and if teachers use the volume and other key curricular materials in conjunction with the videotapes then the use of the videotapes will not only enhance the study but should make it much stronger.
As for the montages, they "...focus on certain themes of Holocaust history using excerpts from several survivors and witnesses who represent different perspectives on the themes under consideration" (p. xx). Among the themes examined are the following: "the moment in which survivors were separated from their families, showing the variety of separation experiences ranging from brief separations in the ghetto to the permanent severing of family ties" to "the period of childhood for Jews and non-Jews growing up during the Third Reich" to themes found in Elie Wiesel's Night and Hans Peter Richter's novel Friedrich (p. xxi).

As to why Facing History developed the aforementioned "montages," Margot Stern Strom, the Executive Director of Facing History and Ourselves, reports in her Foreword that

...we thought it possible that students, with limited factual information about the history of the Holocaust, might react to unedited or lightly edited tapes of individual narratives with stress, confusion, and perhaps even boredom. Without the opportunity to ask questions, without the subtle modifications in presentation made by a witness-bearer interacting with an audience, students' attention might wander or perhaps focus on comparatively irrelevant details. This potential problem led us to the concept of the montage. The montages can partially correct against common misconceptions and the naive assumption that every survivor's experience is like every other survivor's, especially when readings and testimonies on parallel themes are selected for study. (p. xiv)

The key phrase here is "partially correct against common misconceptions and the naive assumption." It is possible, of course, that if a teacher who is not at all or only partially familiar with the history of the Holocaust attempts to use these montages, he or she could come to naive conclusions about what really took place, and use these tapes in a perfunctory and pedagogically unsound manner. That is because the videotapes for the most part do not provide much contextual or background information vis-à-vis what is being addressed in the montage. Again, however, to be fair to the authors, it needs to be reiterated that they clearly state in their Introduction that: "It is important information in using Elements of Time to remember that the manual is keyed specifically to Facing History curriculum materials, and the video excerpts described in the manual have been selected to enhance and elaborate upon themes explored in Facing History classrooms" (p. xxiii). In her forward Strom also wisely points out that "...getting an accurate historical overview of the effect of the Holocaust cannot be achieved by viewing a handful of interviews; the experience needs to be integrated with reading and discussion" (p. xv).

Lawrence Langer (1989) has broached a number of worthwhile issues in regard to the aforementioned concerns, "certainly if we use these tapes with
students, we cannot expect them to be so thoroughly informed. . . . Perhaps videotaped testimony should be annotated; perhaps we should conclude that historical accuracy is not of primary importance for this particular medium. The problem is not insoluble, but it exists, and we need eventually to confront it” (pp. 294-295). This reviewer believes that serious consideration should be given to the need for annotating any and all testimony (not just those on videotape) about the Holocaust. That, of course, would be a herculean job in light of the vast accumulation of such materials, but it is a task that demands to be done.

The reviewer also viewed the montage tape entitled “Childhood Experiences of German Jews.” While the testimony presented by the various speakers is certainly interesting (indeed, some of it is highly engaging and fascinating)—the aforementioned comments/suggestions made by the reviewer vis-à-vis the Portraits are equally applicable to the Montages.

Each of the portraits and montages in the Portraits and the Montages sections of Elements of Time, respectively, are divided into three separate sections: introduction, commentary, and using. The introductions provide a broad overview of the videotapes, and place them in historical context. The commentary sections provide more detailed historical information, the chronology of Nazi occupation, and insights of and information about other survivors and witnesses who lived under fairly similar circumstances and/or had somewhat parallel experiences. The main purpose of the Commentary sections is “to help put the interviewees into context” (p. 2). While both of these sections provide useful and interesting information for teachers, they would have been a great deal more useful, and ultimately valuable, if each had provided more in-depth information. If teachers simply rely on the information provided in these sections, then the study they conduct will be sorely incomplete.

The final component, entitled “Using,” poses questions and raises points that educators can use for discussion purposes. Some of the Using sections also suggest projects that students could design or work on. For the most part, this is a component that many teachers will find extremely useful. A good number of the Using sections are cross-referenced to “relevant written and audiovisual resources available at the Facing History Resource Center” (p. 8). This is particularly valuable in that it assists those teachers who wish to develop a more in-depth study by providing them with the books and other resources that are known to be both accessible and accurate. In addition, it is worth noting that some of the most useful instructional ideas are those that were actually developed by classroom teachers and/or where the authors describe how certain teachers are actually incorporating the videotapes into their classes.

In spite of this, the various Using sections are somewhat uneven. While most of the Using sections raise fascinating questions (both in cognitive
and affective domains) that could very well prod students to dig and probe into the meaning of various issues/concerns, some tend to include numerous low level (simple recall) questions but few, if any, higher level questions. A key problem here is that if teachers end up mainly relying on the lower level questions, it is likely that the level of discussion among the students and the teacher will remain at the most basic level. Some sections also pose questions that will likely result in rather simplistic answers because the students may not have enough information with which to answer the questions in depth.

The Using sections would have been much more valuable if the authors had included a greater number of suggestions about the development of unique and thought-provoking student projects. It takes a good amount of time to develop sound projects, and time is not a commodity that teachers have in excess. This is not to say that teachers will not take the initiative to design their own projects; however, the Facing History staff has the expertise and time to design such projects (and/or time to collect exemplary project designs from classroom teachers), and it would have been helpful if they had done so.

The third section of the book, entitled “Scholars Reflect on Holocaust Video Testimonies,” is composed of nine essays. Many of these are insightful and thought-provoking. The first eight essays, which specifically address various aspects of oral testimony, include: “The Importance of Survivor Testimony” by Nora Levin; “Transforming Oral History: From Tape to Document” by Brana Gurewitsch; “Perspectives on Oral History by the Historian Martin Gilbert” compiled by Mary Johnson; and five essays by Laurence Langer: “Preliminary Reflections on Using Videotaped Interviews in Holocaust Education”; “The Act of Recall: A Variety of Voices”; “Making Distinctions: The Ultimate Challenge”; “The Missing Voices of the Killers: What Could They Tell Us?”; and “Interpreting Oral and Written Holocaust Texts”. This section concludes with an essay entitled “Beyond Judgment” by survivor Primo Levi. It addresses such concerns as Why didn’t the victims escape? Why didn’t they rebel? and Why didn’t they avoid capture beforehand? This section of the volume is valuable in that it encourages educators to consider both the value of such video testimony as well as to what constitutes the most effective manner of using such testimony in their pedagogical efforts. Educators, in fact, should not use the video testimonies until they have read these essays and pondered their insights, concerns, and suggestions, with respect to the value and use of the video testimonies.

Appendix I provides an overview of videotapes of scholars and educators taking part in Facing History workshops on various aspects of genocide, the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust, and other concerns. A sampling of the videos that are outlined and available for use by educators include: “An Overview of Facing History and Ourselves”; “The Rise of Nazism” featuring Henry Friedlander; “Women in the Resistance and in the Holocaust” featuring Vera Laska; “The Armenian Genocide” featuring Richard Hovannisian;
"The Search for the Evidence of the Holocaust" featuring Martin Gilbert; and "The Politics of Remembrance" featuring Raul Hilberg. Appendix II contains the video proceedings of the Facing History annual conferences, which have addressed, for example, such issues as "The Impact of Nuremberg: Today and the Future," Facing History in Perspective: From Theory to the Classroom," and "The Judgment of Adolf Eichmann: Evil, the Media & Society."

When all is said and done, though, Margot Stern Strom could very well be right when she says, "As part of a multi-faceted educational experience, viewing testimonials is likely to be the critical experience that moves viewers and listeners to care" (p. xv). Certainly the immediacy of the medium combined with the personal story of a survivor or other witness makes for a remarkably powerful experience. These videotapes also have the power to assist young people to understand, possibly for the first time, that the fabric of history is composed of individual stories and that historical events can and do have a tremendous impact on individual lives. That is no small feat. The key pedagogical concern here of course, as Strom points out, is that for the study to be as sound as possible, it must be "multi-faceted."

Despite the aforementioned criticism of the volume and videotapes, Facing History should be commended for its efforts to increase the quality of pedagogy and resource materials available for teaching about the Holocaust. While certain material and teaching ideas in Elements of Time are not perfect, they certainly constitute a positive move in the right direction with regard to educating about a very significant subject. And while the current video testimonies are lacking in certain ways, current and future educators and researchers certainly can learn from both the strengths and weaknesses of the Facing History effort, and endeavor to create stronger curricular materials. For making this initial trail-blazing effort, Facing History's staff deserves the thanks of the educational community.
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EcoNet Announcement

All presenters in the CUFA program have been asked to upload, that is, to place their papers on a special EcoNet Computer Conference called ncss.cufa.

To read the papers that will be presented in the 1990 conference, before you get to Anaheim, you can access Econet through a local computer telephone call, select c, conferences, and then type in the NCSS/CUFA computer address: ncss.cufa. You must use lower case. Members in Latin America, Europe, Australia, Canada, and Japan can read and download the presentations of the CUFA meeting in California.

EcoNet is a non profit computer conferencing system devoted to the exchange of information, opinion, and analysis relating to environmental issues, sustainable development, conflict resolution, via electronic mail and conferencing. EcoNet is affiliated with and connected to similar non profit communication networks in Latin America, Canada, Europe, Australia, Southeast Asia including Japan, and Africa. It can be a valuable source of information for social studies education. It can be used by teachers and students both as a source of information and as a means of communications with students and teachers in many parts of the world.

Its cost is nominal. Wherever you are in the world, you or your institution may join this system for $15.00 It costs $10.00 a month to maintain access to the system. It costs $10.00 an hour to use EcoNet from 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. It costs $5.00 and hour to use EcoNet from 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m. and all day Saturday, Sunday and holidays. This system can be accessed with a local telephone call from most cities in the United States, Canada, Japan, Latin America and Europe. EcoNet uses Telenet, a commercial computer telecommunications system. The EcoNet access fee pays for this commercial computer telecommunications system. Outside of the U.S. you may have to make a special arrangement to use Telenet. In Japan, for example, you must establish an account with KDD (the telephone company) to use Telenet. Access to Telenet varies from country to country. Call this toll-free number for information about your local situation: 1-800-835-3638. (As a result of improved capacity, EcoNet expects to reduce its charge to $3.00 an hour in the United States.)

You can subscribe to EcoNet with a phone call or a letter to the following address:

EcoNet
Institute for Global Communications
3228 Sacramento Street
San Francisco, California 94115
(415) 923-0900
You will receive a manual that will explain how to upload manuscripts and how to make comments; the manual will also explain how to download items from the ncss.cufa conference.

EcoNet people, at the above address, will provide additional information about the system and its characteristics. For information about the ncss.cufa conference, you can get in touch with Millard Clements, who will facilitate the conference, at the following EcoNet address: mclements.

Millard Clements
New York University
SEHNAP
200 East Building
New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 998-5495
Bitnet: Clements@nyuacf
Information for Authors

Manuscripts

Manuscripts (five copies) should be addressed to the incoming editor: Jack Fraenkel, TRSE, San Francisco State University, Burk Hall 238, San Francisco, CA 94132. In addition, if you use WordPerfect, please send your article on a floppy disk; the disk will be used in the final editing of your manuscript for publication.

Manuscripts should be typed double-spaced. Authors should take care to follow the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association: Third Edition. Pay careful attention to:

1. The citation of published writings.
2. The use of quotations of various lengths.
3. The use of headings.
4. Matters of punctuation, style, endnotes, bibliography, and abbreviations.

Although these are merely conventions, they do provide a convenient way to edit written material for publication. This manual provides advice on most aspects of the preparation of a manuscript for publication in TRSE.

Each manuscript should include, on a separate page, an abstract of 50–100 words. Ordinarily manuscripts will not be returned. Authors are not expected to send the original copy.

TRSE is a refereed journal. Manuscripts are sent to outside reviewers. This is often a time-consuming process. Reviewers of individual articles usually remain anonymous, although outside reviewers are identified in each issue of the journal.

Book Reviews

Book Reviews (two copies) should be sent to Jane J. White at the address in the front of the journal or to 1820 Tucker Lane, Ashton, MD 20861. The length may vary from 500 to 3500 words. The format for the top of the first page of the review is as follows:

Author (last name first). Title (underlined). City of publication: Publisher, date of publication, total number of pages, list price.

Reviewer's name, followed by your institutional address complete with Zip Code.

The book review, as all manuscripts, should follow the guidelines described above. If you use WordPerfect, please send a floppy disk with your review on it.
An Invitation

I would like to invite all readers of this journal to contribute to *TRSE* and to encourage friends or colleagues who are engaged in important research to do so as well.

It is my hope that during my editorship *TRSE* will publish many different kinds of scholarship concerned with social studies education. Publishing recent doctoral research is quite appropriate for the journal. Scholarship dealing with women’s issues, racial issues, environmental issues, economic issues, peace issues, political issues, historical issues and or philosophical issues of social studies education are all appropriate for this journal. Scholarship concerned with curricular materials and instructional activities have an important place in this journal. My intention is to include rather than exclude different perspectives on research and scholarship.

We all share a common faith that something we think of as research is at least one way we should seek to improve social education. We, as social studies teachers, want our students to come to some understanding of society and history, to be effective citizens, to avoid the aberrations of racial, religious and sexual prejudice. Through social studies education we hope to contribute to the development of a saner, more just, less polluted, less violent world.

Whatever this hope and aspiration, the actual world we live in presents a darker aspect: savage conflicts in Central America, Africa, the Middle East, Sri Lanka, the Philippines, and East Timur. Torture, assassination, arms races, world wide environmental degradation and homelessness, poverty and despair in many United States cities are everyday realities. Often torture and assassination are claimed to be progress, or the defense of democracy or a struggle for social justice. The truths of our planet are infinite and many of them are painful. On our troubled planet what is wisdom in social studies education?

What research is vital to our professional concerns? What should we seek to know that we do not know? About social studies education? About human society? About being human? About the conduct of social inquiry? What research is relevant to our highest aspirations and yet grounded in an awareness of our human condition? What issues should be explored in *TRSE*?

I would like to invite all readers of this journal to join in the exploration and clarification of ways we may seek to make social studies more honest in its treatment of issues, more significant in its intellectual challenge, more important in the lives of students.

Millard Clements

*Editor, TRSE*
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