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FROM THE EDITOR

THROUGH AND RESEARCH IN SOCIAL EDUCATION AT A QUARTER CENTURY

This issue marks the beginning of the 25th volume year of Theory and Research in Social Education—an appropriate opportunity for taking stock of our past endeavors and charting new courses. Each issue of this volume will include essays from social educators to this end.

Volume 1, Number 1 of Theory and Research in Social Education appeared in October 1973. In their first “From The Editors” column, Cleo H. Cherryholmes and Jack Nelson, the founding editor and associate editor of TRSE, observed:

During the last decade we have witnessed the proliferation of materials and ideas related to social studies education. Social studies educators, social scientists, historians, and philosophers have been and are continuing to contribute at what seems an increasing pace to this enterprise of social education. Scores of curriculum development projects and hundreds of educational researchers have bombarded social studies practitioners with competing claims for alternative ends and means... (p. iv)

While the heady days of the New Social Studies and the generous funding for social studies curriculum development associated with it have passed, debate over the nature, purpose and content of the social education continues. Instead of various curriculum projects vying for classroom adoption, today no less than six separate and competing national curriculum standards documents intend to mold social studies teaching and curriculum in various ways. The ideological discourse around national (and state) curriculum standards and frameworks illustrates the continued importance of social studies curriculum and instruction in shaping the conceptions and understandings of our social, political and economic roles as public citizens and the actions we take based on those conceptions (Ross, in press).

TRSE was established with the stated purpose of providing a forum in which ideas and research findings could be focused, debated, refined and developed. The founding editors presented TRSE as an entity that would further the aims of the profession, specifically “the institutionalization of systematic thinking and research in social education” (p. iv).

A healthy and developing profession is characterized by a critical and sustained flow of ideas and research findings upon which an intellectual structure can be built and tested.
repeatedly against reality....The functions of a professional journal, in short, are to increase the rationality of professional activity. (p. iv)

While Cherryholmes and Nelson might apply different criteria for diagnosing the health of the profession today, it seems safe to say that the continued diversity of ideas regarding the ends and means of social education bode well for the profession. I confidently venture that there is widespread agreement that TRSE has succeeded in providing a estimable forum for ideas and research findings of social educators. Whether or not this journal (or any other scholarly publication) has functioned to "increase the rationality of professional activity" is questionable, both as an outcome and as an aim.

The methods of social and educational research have dramatically shifted in the past quarter century. TRSE was founded during a period of epistemological disarray, in which the Cartesian/Newtonian paradigm of social research was subjected to internal (e.g., Cronbach, 1975) and external (e.g., Habermas, 1972) critiques. As a result, the boundaries of "appropriate" methods or stances of social researchers were blurred and the significance of the researcher and the importance of interpretation and understanding (in contrast to causal determinism) in social research grew. In educational research, for example, Schwab (1969) explored the implications of the Aristotelian distinction (revived by Kant) between theoretical knowledge (states of affairs that can be checked, tested and accepted) and practical knowledge (decision making) for curriculum work in schools. Since then it has become increasingly clear to educational researchers that "knowing the truth about the workings of the world is one thing; knowing what to do about it something else" (Hamilton, 1994, p. 63).

It is this "something else" that proves to be problematic for applied social science and social education in particular. Nelson's (1994) appraisal of contemporary social education literature notes that mainstream social studies education (i.e., K-12 social studies curriculum and instruction) has reflected the recent conservative sociopolitical climate of the nation, despite the social studies' liberal-progressive origins. While essentialists have held their own in the social studies classroom, Nelson is guardedly optimistic that shifts toward conservative orientations are largely interruptions in the general long term trend toward progressivism in the social studies. Nelson's review illustrates how in social studies (and in every situation) questions of "what to do" relate not only to what is, but to what ought to be.

As social and educational researchers have embraced interactive processes of inquiry—with a concern for mutual understanding and practical reasoning—both the empirical and moral status of situations that require practical action become increasingly apparent. Deciding
what to do about issues of social studies curriculum and instruction requires social educators to apply moral judgments in the realm of human action.

The grounds for exercising moral judgment—as well as the methods of conducting research—in the social sciences have radically shifted in the quarter century existence of TRSE. The moral authority of positivist social science is (was) grounded in scientific procedures, rules of evidence and impersonal knowledge that posits a world of efficiency and rationality (Popkewitz, 1984). Critical social science pursues democratic forms of communication and social justice by appealing to principles of human freedom and social emancipation. The challenge facing social educators today, however, is not merely making a choice between competing paradigms. The foundational bases for the exercise of moral judgment in both positivist and critical social science are challenged by deconstructive-postmodernism, in which groundlessness is the only constant and values, ethics, and "history" are viewed as arbitrary.

It seems to me that at some level research is a uniquely individual enterprise. But it is also true that individual researchers are guided by values created in particular social, cultural and historical contexts. For our work as social education researchers to be meaningful to others it must be linked to theories of our predecessors and the research of our contemporaries. Confronting the sources of our ideas and their consequences may be the only "method" we can rely on.

E. W. R.
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Mary Ritter Beard and Marion Thompson Wright: Shaping Inclusive Social Education

Margaret Smith Crocco
Teachers College, Columbia University

Abstract
This article examines the contributions of Mary Ritter Beard and Marion Thompson Wright to inclusive curriculum in social education. Beard established the field of women's history through her writing and public addresses. Wright promoted the application of Black history in the schools through her work as a teacher, educator, and scholar with the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History. Wright also was involved in the struggle to end segregation of the nation's schools. Both women's contributions suggest the broad perspective which has characterized social education from its inception, more apparent when the focus moves beyond the organizational establishment of the field and the creation of the National Council for the Social Studies.

Introduction
In recognition of its 75th anniversary, recent months have seen numerous recapitulations of the founding of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) (e.g., Davis, 1996; Parker, 1996; Smith and Palmer, 1995). Such retrospectives are immensely valuable. However, to the degree that these studies have focused on the organizational aspects of social education, they represent only partial explanations for the contemporary character of the field, specifically leaving unanswered its relation to issues of diversity. As earlier work by Hazel Hertzberg (1989), Murry Nelson (1987), Oliver Keels (1980), and others indicates, a broader approach to defining the origins of social studies also exists. This article is situated in that latter tradition, relying on a foundational rather than organizational perspective in explaining the development of social education.

I would like to thank Stephen J. Thornton for his helpful review of an earlier draft of this article; Clement Price for his insights into Marion Thompson Wright; and the anonymous TRSE reviewers for their helpful comments.
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As The Great Speckled Bird (1995) recently underscored, determining whose story gets told in state-sponsored curricula has become highly contested terrain. Knowledge production by academic researchers continues to expand the scope of material with at least potential relevance to social studies education. Even if political demands for multicultural curriculum in the schools abate, the pressures emanating from the trickle-down force of this knowledge explosion will surely continue.

The objective that stimulates this analysis, therefore, has to do with discovering the roots of inclusive curriculum in social studies. Between 1920 and 1950, social studies was, of course, less defined in its contours than it is today. This article will substitute the concept of social education for that of social studies as its focus to allow for consideration of two women, Mary Ritter Beard and Marion Thompson Wright, with only indirect ties to the emerging structures within the field. Their pioneering efforts have proved significant in orienting approaches to social education in recent years.

Linda Levstik (1996) has commented that:

NCSS was the product of two social phenomena. The first was the move toward professionalism among historians and a concomitant interest in how history was taught in the schools. The second was a growing interest among social scientists and social welfare advocates in an integrated field - often called "social studies" - aimed at social improvement and civic responsibility. (p. 22)

The work of Beard and Wright developed within the intellectual milieu of "the new social history" which overlapped significantly with both groups Levstik describes. Their contributions extended this history into a consideration of gender and race. Interdisciplinary in nature, presentist in orientation, and ameliorative in intent, Beard’s and Wright’s research was meant to have a direct impact on the schools. Their status “on the margins,” however, undoubtedly delayed application of their work to the mainstream of the field.

While the term “multiculturalism” has gained widespread currency in the last ten years, the roots of such an approach in social studies can be traced back beyond the 1960s, despite Garcia and Buendia’s (1996) discovery of the almost total absence of articles on diversity in the NCSS journal Social Education prior to this date. Looking beyond the pages of Social Education is necessary, therefore, in identifying the origins of an inclusive approach to curriculum. Between 1910 and 1950, Beard wrote numerous books and articles on women and promoted this history as part of curriculum through speeches, course syllabi, and textbooks written with her husband, Charles Austin Beard. Wright served as scholar, counselor, and teacher educator between 1940 and 1962 at Howard University, helping to bring
African American history into the schools through vehicles such as the Negro History Bulletin and Negro history month.

On the occasion of a recent anniversary of the American Studies Association, the president of that organization, Elaine Tyler May gave a speech which offers a model for the kind of approach I have adopted in this essay. May’s address, “The Radical Roots of American Studies,” suggests that academic creation stories tend to be Oedipal tales, revolving around “killing off the alleged fathers to create a new, oppositional scholarship” (1996, p. 179). The founders of American Studies shared many social reconstructionist traits: political engagement, recognition of the ill effects of industrial capitalism, and profound sensitivity to the class divisions within the United States. Merle Curti, Wright’s dissertation sponsor at Teachers College, Columbia University, was involved in both movements. May’s address invites scholars to a fresh round of myth making concerning the origins of American Studies. “With canon bashing the rage in so many fields of late, it is time that we bash our own canon, too,” she concludes, “to see what’s really in there and to add a few more voices to the canon fodder” (p. 180).

While it is not my intention here to bash the “creation canon” in social studies, I do wish to suggest the partiality of examinations focusing on institutional arrangements. Only by looking beyond the centerpiece of the recent retrospectives, the National Council for the Social Studies and its organ, Social Education, can we gain an understanding of the paths by which other voices contributed to curriculum development for the schools.

The Intellectual Context

In her examination of the origins of social science in the United States, Dorothy Ross (1991) asserts that “Dewey’s pragmatism, like the characteristic doctrines of Progressive social science, emerged directly from the Gilded Age crisis of American exceptionalism and revised the exceptionalist heritage to embody the new liberal and historicist awareness of change” (p. 162). Defining history as the study of social change provoked James Harvey Robinson and Charles A. Beard towards reconsidering whether the promises of democracy had been delivered to all America’s constituent groups. Intimately aware that only by excluding the stories of the disenfranchised and underprivileged could the claim to exceptionalism be sustained, they looked towards education to close the gap between ideal and real.

As Hazel Hertzberg (1981) has shown, “It was the advocates of the social studies, forwarding a vision of history advocated by Robinson, who stepped forward to bridge the gap between the academic study of the past and the modern concern for the production of good citizens” (p. 386). Social studies reformers in the early years of this century found much inspiration in Dewey’s work (1900), especially his advocacy of closer links be-
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tween school and society. Dewey’s orientation to social science made him sympathetic to the “new social history” which Hertzberg (1981) defines as “progressivism manifest in the historical profession” (p. 18). He and his followers were deeply involved in many of the progressive initiatives of the day, such as the settlement house and women’s rights movements, causes to which Mary Beard and Marion Wright also subscribed.

Robinson and Charles Beard were colleagues and close friends of Dewey’s, eating lunch regularly together during their years at Columbia (Soderbergh, 1966, p. 125). With Robinson and Beard, Arthur Schlesinger, Sr. at Harvard University and a number of other historians collaborated with representatives of elementary and secondary schools, normal schools, and teacher education colleges to promote a curriculum designed for social efficiency and good citizenship. In 1920, a group of professors in education and social studies subjects from Teachers College, Columbia University suggested the formation of an organization to deal with issues related to articulation of the nature of the emerging field and its practice in the schools. As Thornton (1996) reports, as a result of this overture, a meeting was held in 1921 in Atlantic City, New Jersey, at which NCSS was founded.

About the same time, Carter G. Woodson, a student of Schlesinger’s at Harvard, developed the foundation laid by W.E.B. DuBois in scholarship on African American history. In 1915, Woodson published The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861 and in 1933, The Mis-education of the Negro. Over the next two decades, Woodson and his colleague, Charles Wesley, created the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History (ASNLH) as a means of directly disseminating their research to the public because mainstream publishers would not consider their materials. Encouraged by White historians such as Albert Bushnell Hart of Harvard (Whelan, 1994), a central figure in the social studies movement, Woodson and Wesley pioneered the production of knowledge about African American history (Banks, 1996; Meier and Rudwick, 1986). These scholars shared a belief that their work would enhance Black self-esteem and improve White attitudes towards African Americans (Quarles, 1988).

The Beards’ shared goal was “to convert the present into a more decent future” (White, 1957, p. 52). Education, broadly conceived, was the means they adopted for promoting social change. The first civics textbook they wrote in 1914 criticized other textbooks for holding the view that civic life was static rather than dynamic and progressive (Soderbergh, 1966, p. 96). This book was written at Mary Beard’s suggestion in order to include women in the idea of citizenship since by this time they constituted the majority of all high school students (Cott, 1991, p. 15). She returned to this idea of women as citizens the following year in Women’s Work in Municipalities (1915).

One of the Beards’ closest friends was Merle Curti. Curti received his Ph.D. at Harvard. He was a student of Frederick Jackson Turner’s and later
worked with Schlesinger after Turner’s retirement. Curti taught briefly at Beloit and Smith Colleges before coming to Teachers College, Columbia University in 1938. After leaving Teachers College in 1942, Curti spent the remainder of his career in the History department at the University of Wisconsin (Davis, 1996, p. 15).

Curti had been associated with George Counts, Charles Beard, and John Dewey in the publication of *The Social Frontier* since its founding by Counts at Teachers College in 1934. This relationship brought him into the Department of History and Social Studies at Teachers College which offered, at that time, degrees in history, educational sociology, geography, and social studies. A pacifist and socialist, Curti’s social concerns paralleled those of Charles Beard: women’s rights, the plight of the average working man, and racial discrimination. During his education at Harvard, he became a friend of Charles A. Wesley, Carter Woodson’s colleague at ASNLH. According to Meier and Rudwick’s history of the development of the Black historical profession, during the thirties and forties, Curti “would journey periodically to Washington to meet with Woodson, and he was the first in the guild to seek seriously to integrate the history of blacks into his monographs on the American past” (1986, p. 105).

While at Teachers College, Curti guided the development of Wright’s powerful work on Negro education in New Jersey, more accurately described as a full history of African Americans in the state. During the 1950s, Wright worked as a research assistant for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), “compiling evidence for the public school desegregation cases” which would be decided in *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954: “The methods of research she used to gather data on New Jersey were applied to a study of the United States as a whole, showing injurious patterns of discrimination throughout the nation” (Burstyn, 1990, p. 437).

In 1932, Charles Beard wrote *A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools*, describing the goal of social studies as “inquiry rather than indoctrination.” This book was part of a series; both Counts (1934) and Curti (1935) contributed volumes (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 45). Curti’s *The Social Ideas of American Educators* (1935) became the basis for several of the courses he offered at Teachers College. A subsequent volume, *The Growth of American Thought* (1943), won the Pulitzer Prize. This work drew heavily on the research of the ASNLH on ante-bellum Black thought and included an entire chapter on Booker T. Washington, an “unprecedented” step, according to Meier and Rudwick (1986, p. 105). Curti also wrote *Control of Social Studies Textbooks* (1941) for NCSS and the National Education Association (NEA), which reflected his concurrence with Charles Beard that social studies ought to be inquiry oriented (Soderbergh, 1966, p. 112; Mullen, 1996).

Curti’s publications helped establish intellectual and cultural history as new emphases within the profession. He used the pages of the *Teachers College Record* to promote the application of these subjects to the secondary
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school curriculum. In one article (1938), he referred to Teachers College as “a pioneer among professional schools of education in trying to acquaint the teacher with the literature of American cultural history” (p. 5). In support of this claim, he cited J. Montgomery Gambrill’s 1914 course on social history (p. 6). Even earlier, Charles Beard had offered extension courses at Teachers College utilizing this new approach.

As social reconstructionists, Beard, Counts, Curti, and Dewey advocated the use of history and social science to promote change. They used *The Social Frontier* to spread their views, hoping to move American society away from unrestrained individualism and toward the ideal of democratic collectivism. Reforms in education could contribute to this end. In an article entitled, “Can Education Share in Social Reconstruction?” in October, 1934, John Dewey wrote, “I do not think...that the schools can in any literal sense be the builders of a new social order. But the schools will surely, as a matter of fact and not of ideal, share in the building of the social order of the future” (p. 12). This remark reflects views propounded earlier by George Counts (1932) in speeches and publications.

In the late thirties, the group made plans for an institute of social research at Teachers College which would advance these objectives. The plan was short circuited when Beard encountered an article in *The New York Times* announcing the intention of the University of Pennsylvania to offer an interdisciplinary program “for students who wish to specialize in the broad field of the development of social and cultural institutions” (Dennis, 1989, p. 142). Sounding too close to their own idea, the group abandoned the project. The Penn program eventually became the first American Studies department in the country.

As program director of the American Historical Association convention in 1940, Curti arranged several sessions on “the common man,” including full panels on women’s, labor, and African American history. DuBois chaired the session on “The Negro in American History” and invited Rayford Logan of Howard University to participate. Curti invited Mary Beard to chair the session on women’s history. While gratified by the introduction of women’s history to the AHA program, she declined the invitation, evidently irked at not being given a role in lining up the other panelists (Cott, 1991, p. 221).

Curti became president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association in 1952, vice-president of the American Studies Association and president of the American Historical Association in 1954. He used his official addresses to these organizations to attack McCarthyism, loyalty oaths, and anti-intellectualism. During the fifties, he also wrote a high school history text with Paul Todd, a revised edition of which is still in print. Like Charles Beard, Curti was “often attacked, especially in the 1950s, for his liberalism, his relativism, and for his defense of unpopular causes” (Davis, 1996, p. 15).
During his brief tenure at Teachers College, Curti’s personal qualities and intellectual stature attracted a wide range of students. Former faculty member, Alice Spieseke (1978), recalled Curti’s pleasure in the contribution made by his teaching at the College to public education; she commented on Curti’s openness to new ideas:

He wasn’t dogmatic; he wasn’t a person who was emphatic in his notions. He was always willing to talk with you about ideas and if you entertained or saw things from a point of view different from his, he would explore it further, never criticize you because you differed from him. Students liked his open-mindedness and that he treated them as equals. (p. 118)

Curti’s reputation as an historian sympathetic to the field of Black history undoubtedly provided a catalyst for Wright’s choice of him as sponsor of her dissertation. During the twenties and thirties, many African Americans attended Teachers College with scholarship assistance made available by the Julius Rosenwald and Rockefeller Foundations. These organizations assisted the preparation of scholars and teachers for Black schools and colleges throughout the South. In 1938, between two hundred and three hundred African Americans enrolled at Teachers College, constituting almost 10% of the student body. These figures represented the college’s interest in the “urgent and needy matter of Negro education” (Russell, 1942). Courses and lectures by speakers such as Dr. Mordecai Johnson, the first Black president of Howard University, were regularly offered. Seven hundred people came to hear Johnson speak on “The Future Outlook for American Negroes” in 1930. A number of well known Black educators took degrees at Teachers College, including Lucy Diggs Slowe, first Dean of Women at Howard, and Charles Thompson, Dean of the School of Education there. Indeed, Paula Giddings asserts that Howard University “followed the lead of such schools as Columbia University in establishing a Teachers College that offered a more professional, comprehensive, and varied program than the two year normal school” (1988, p. 31), ties which are more fully documented in Rayford Logan’s (1969) history of Howard University.

During the summer months, Teachers College offered extension courses in seven states throughout the South and the District of Columbia. Lawrence Cremin (1954) indicates that these courses were largely attended by women teachers seeking course work beyond their normal school preparation. Over two thousand individuals, only 18% of whom had baccalaureate degrees, were registered in extension courses during the years 1927 and 1928. “At first,” Cremin writes, “some felt that the relationship between the two racial groups might be disturbed by a northern university’s intrusion into a southern area. But at the close of the year, all those con-
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connected with the experiment, instructors, students and local administrators alike, praised the work that had been done" (p. 262).

Under the leadership of Professor Mabel Carney of the Department of Rural Education, a student organization for African Americans was established in 1928 (Weneck, 1996, p. 320). A Midwestern woman, Carney received her education at Teachers College and was appointed to the faculty in 1917. A suffrage supporter, she claimed three lifelong interests: rural education, the welfare of African Americans, and world peace. With support from the Rosenwald Fund, Carney brought James Weldon Johnson, W. E. B. DuBois, Booker T. Washington, and Mary McLeod Bethune among others to participate in a lecture series on "race relations."

In her regular report to the president and dean of Teachers College, Carney mentioned professors with a particular interest in "Negro student welfare," including George Counts, Esther Lloyd-Jones and Sarah Sturtevant. Both Professors Lloyd-Jones and Sturtevant worked closely with Slowe in redefining the role of Dean of Women from that of matron to expert in the education of women (James, James, & Boyer, 1971, p. 299). In 1926, Carney visited Capetown, South Africa. Subsequently, she traveled throughout the South, visiting Hampton Institute, Lincoln, Howard, Tuskegee, and Fisk Universities.

Mary Beard and Marion Wright were thus part of an intellectual milieu that included the new social history, social reconstructionism, and the burgeoning social studies movement. Like their male counterparts, they were dedicated to using new forms of knowledge to extend democracy and the benefits of citizenship to women and African Americans. They shared the same progressive faith as the organizational architects of NCSS that social education in the schools could provide the conduit for such change. By pressing the boundaries of this movement towards a more complex consideration of gender and race, they provided models for those who would build on their work in subsequent decades.

Mary Ritter Beard (1876-1958)

In the intellectual history of the 20th century, Mary Beard's contributions have clearly been overshadowed by those of her husband. Newer considerations of her husband's work, however, have made fairer assessments than earlier ones of the depth of their collaboration (Nore 1983; Novick 1988). In the last twenty years, the women's studies movement has given her work a serious reexamination, most recently in a book edited by Nancy Cott (1991) which pulls together a good number of her letters and gives a lengthy analysis of her legacy in the introduction. New editions of a number of her books have been published. An enigmatic figure in many respects, Beard resists easy labeling, even as feminist. An anti-essentialist before the term was invented, she attempted to hold class and gender in balance as she studied the "long history" of women. Because she opposed
many prominent women's leaders of the day, was dubious about the merits of the equal rights movement, and did so "without portfolio," she became something of a pariah in certain circles. Beard remained convinced throughout her life that "sexual equality was a deficient goal for women if it meant measuring up to a male norm" (Cott, 1991, p. 2). A true radical, she often attacked those audiences she was invited to address, chiding the timidity of their goals and outlooks.

Beard wrote eight books of her own and co-authored seven with her husband. Cott (1991) remarks that "like many the accomplished wife of a more famous man, Mary Beard achieved much greater public prominence as her husband's collaborator than she gained on her own as a suffragist, reformer, or author." Upon his death in 1948, "his evaluators read her out of the record, calling The Rise of American Civilization, for example, 'his' masterpiece, 'his' greatest work" (p. 3). Her independent publications include Woman's Work in Municipalities (1915), A Short History of the American Labor Movement (1920), On Understanding Women (1931), and her magnum opus, Woman as Force in History (1946). Beard insisted that the work of citizenship and civilization be redefined to include women's role in sustaining families and communities. She rejected the feminist claim of women's subordination throughout history.

Beard worked for suffrage but opposed Alice Paul's Equal Rights Amendment, a position reflecting her sensitivity to class issues. Along with Florence Kelley and Frances Perkins whose roots were in the labor movement, Beard believed that "equal treatment of unequals is the greatest inequality" (Lane, 1988, p. 27). As Beard saw it, such an amendment primarily served privileged women. In her writing, she contrasted the lives of those women who dealt with the "central problems of life" around survival with those of women who wavered "between the will to create" and "the will merely to enjoy" (Lane, 1988, p. 152). Beard (1912) criticized middle class women for their "pious precepts" which often ignored the poor women's "bitter struggle for the barest necessities of life." For example, the "institutes of Mothercraft" devised by middle class women for poor women assumed that family dysfunction derived chiefly from maternal failure. Beard rejected both diagnosis and solution, arguing instead for changes in a social and economic structure which supported neither mothers nor families.

In this same essay and later work, Beard rejected the distinctions other scholars made between "social" and "political" activity, suggesting that "everything that counts is political." In Woman's Work in Municipalities (1915), she describes the numerous projects undertaken by women's clubs and teachers' associations as political activity. She concluded that narrow definitions of politics had obscured the important contributions women had made as citizens.

Charles and Mary Beard relied on novel approaches to communicate their message to the public. As Nancy Cott (1991) has commented, "both
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remained deeply skeptical that conventional establishments of higher learning furthered the goals of democratic progress and social enlightenment” (p. 15). Among other similar initiatives, they founded the Workers Education Bureau of America for training in the social sciences as preparation for working-class leadership (Bender, 1987, p. 300). This program was affiliated with Brookwood Labor College of Katonah, New York, and resembled the summer school for women in trade unions launched at Bryn Mawr College around the same time (Heller, 1986). In 1920, Mary Beard wrote *A Short History of the American Labor Movement* as a contribution to the “Workers’ Bookshelf” series of the Bureau. Throughout her life, Beard produced numerous speeches, radio addresses, newspaper and magazine articles in an effort to extend the reach of her ideas.

Beard recognized the uneven manner in which social and political change affected women of different classes and races. During her suffrage movement days, she was troubled by the manner in which the increasingly conservative mainstream groups excluded African American women for fear of alienating Southerners. Beard’s early affiliation with Alice Paul’s Congressional Union reflected their shared tutelage under the Pankhursts in England and the more inclusive nature of Paul’s group. In the suffrage parade organized by the Congressional Union on the eve of Wilson’s inaugural, Beard, her husband, and children joined a group of Black marchers in a show of solidarity (Turoff, 1979, p. 23). Such unity became increasingly rare in subsequent years as the National American Woman Suffrage Association appealed to anti-immigrant and racist sentiment to advance its cause.

Beard wrote a good deal of women’s history but found that the natural audience for it, the women’s colleges, often rejected the conclusions she drew from her research. She rankled at “the false dogma of feminism” that women had never done anything of substance in the world (Turoff, 1979, p. 18). She faulted the writers of women’s studies courses for Douglass and Smith Colleges for suggesting that women have chiefly been victims of history. In her work, *On Understanding Women* (1931), she wrote, “in their quest for rights, they have naturally placed emphasis on their wrongs, rather than their achievements and possessions, and have retold history as a story of their long martyrdom.” These views, she concluded, have contributed “to the tradition that history has been made by men alone, that civilization, at least the evils of it, is the fruit of masculine labors or will, and have demanded that those who have hitherto been nothing should become as near like the males as possible to be something” (p. 30).

Not only did Beard find this conclusion inaccurate but believed it detrimental to women’s ability to grasp their future possibilities in society. According to Beard, correctly done, women’s history could create the “female determination of feminine destiny.” In a syllabus she prepared for the American Association of University Women (AAUW), Beard suggested that women professors “are sometimes the most hostile to the suggestion”
that women's story be added to the curriculum. She asserted that "the 'sexless' education upon which they insist is not, after all, abstract to any great degree. It is basically a sex education - masculine in design and spirit" (Lane, 1988, p. 207). Her conclusions are echoed by Adrienne Rich (1975) in "Towards a Woman-Centered University," published originally as a report for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching which cites Beard at the beginning of the essay.

Beard challenged M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr College, for her belief that in shaping a women's education, "what was good enough for men was perfect for women" (Lane, 1988, p. 156). In an address to the AAUW, Beard directly challenged the pursuit of a college education as a means of gaining equality with men. She often stated her fear that establishing women's education on male principles would diminish the force of "enlightened humanism" (Beard, 1933). Each time women demonstrated, for example, that they "could compose just as rigid documents for their doctoral theses as the most sterile man, there was rejoicing by the egalitarians" (Lane, 1988, p. 152).

An early critical theorist of education, she argued that the so-called democratic education of the day socialized women and girls "to satisfy the political and educational needs of a bourgeois, competitive society" (Lane, 1988, p. 158). Feminists unthinkingly accepted the rules of the capitalist game, she argued, when they fought for an equal place in an unjust system. Beard became increasingly disillusioned with higher education for women as she came to the conclusion that it inhibited women's interest in social reform by fostering individualism at the expense of commitment to communal life and social change.

A seeming inconsistency in Mary Beard's approach to women's education lies in the fact that she refused to consider a role for vocational education or home economics in the college curriculum. Given her efforts to untangle what she saw as the conflation of the public and private in traditional historiography, and her insistence on the contributions of women to civilization through their sustenance of families and communities, this opposition needs reconciling. On the one hand, she rejected an education for women based on male values and male standards; nevertheless, she saw home economics as a form of vocational education that had no place in college and a reversion "from full opportunity for women in public life" (Cott, 1991, p. 60). Perhaps the best explanation that can be given about this and other contradictions in her work is that while enhancing her freedom to engage new subject matter, her position outside of conventional academic life may have cost her the critical scrutiny by colleagues that could have ultimately produced greater consistency in her work.

In Woman as Force in History (1946), Beard moved her critique of women's role one step further, reconciling herself to feminist demands for equality but accepting such demands only on her terms. She called female equality not a "woman question" but a "human" one (p. 332). While cham-
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pioning the view that “women’s past history...must be regarded as indis-

pensable to the maintenance and promotion of civilization in the present

age,” she reflected the temper of the post-World War II world, seeing the

necessity of utilizing the power of both men and women in the struggle

“against disruptive forces of barbarism and for the realization of the no-
oblest ideals in the heritage of humanity” (p. 332, italics in original). For

Beard, the future of civilization itself was at stake. She saw equal oppor-
tunity to participate in “the disruptive forces of barbarism” as self-defeating

for feminism and for all human beings. True equality, according to Beard,
moved womanly values center stage within the culture. Like the work of
Peggy McIntosh (1983) and Nel Noddings (1992) today, she claimed that
these values offered the best hope of rescuing Western civilization from its
destructive potential.

Mary Beard made a direct contribution to social education through
her co-authorship with Charles Beard of a number of influential textbooks,
including American Citizenship (1914), A History of the United States (1921),
The Rise of American Civilization (1927), America in Midpassage (1939), The
American Spirit (1942), and A Basic History of the United States (1944). Taken
as a whole, the Beards’ textbooks sought to implement the 1916 NEA re-
port on social studies in the schools. One historian estimated that these
books sold over five million copies between 1912 and 1952 and were used
in elementary, junior, and senior high schools (Ducharme, 1969, p. 12).
However, some historians have also taken the position that since they were
unable to determine firsthand the nature of the collaboration between the
Beards on these books, they have simply chosen to consider them the work
of Charles alone (Cott, 1991, p. 3). Charles Beard took pains during his
lifetime to emphasize the true partnership involved in the production of
these books. In fact, he instructed his Macmillan publishers to avoid quot-
ing reviewers who singled him out as the sole author since this was false
(Cott, 1991, p. 28).

In several respects, Mary Beard pushed her husband towards an even
broader understanding of social history. In a letter, she explained to a friend
that her view of history as the entire story of human life represented a new
way of looking at the past for her husband:

History is in fact the whole story of humankind including lit-
erature, philosophy, and biology and everything else. This is
the way I see it and having thus seen it, I have in my collabora-
tion with CAB, from its beginning widened politics, war and
law and political economy to cover more aspects of human de-
velopment. CAB has accepted my wide interest and done ev-
erything he could to work with me as I have done everything I
could to work with him (Cott, 1991, p. 245).
A perusal of their textbooks indicates that women's history reaches a level scarcely matched by most current social studies texts. Among the topics discussed are women in colonial times, witchcraft, mother’s pensions, women’s clubs, Lowell mills, child labor laws, suffrage, temperance, and tenement house reform. Among others, the textbooks treat Harriet Martineau, Mary Wollstonecraft, Mercy Otis Warren, Abigail Adams, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Julia Ward Howe, Dorothea Dix, Eliza Pinckney, and Susan B. Anthony. At the end of one chapter of History of the United States (1921), students are invited to debate the following statement, “Women now have equal opportunities with men” (p. 569).

Beard’s last decades were spent in an effort to establish a solid foundation for women’s collective memory through establishment of the Women’s Center for World Archives. These archives would contain a variety of materials—diaries, household records, shopping lists, correspondence, manuscripts—whatever revealed patterns of thought and action. As part of this project, Beard wished to establish a “true woman’s college,” a Women’s Research Institute, and an Academy of Women to encourage women to take an interest in their own history. At the same time, she launched several encyclopedia projects, attempting to convince Britannica and Collier's to augment their treatment of women’s history. In the end, her own estrangement from the established institutions of women's education probably best explains her inability to bring these dreams to fruition.

**Marion Thompson Wright (1905-1962)**

Historians of the traditionally Black colleges indicate that male administrators of the early twentieth century typically viewed Black coeds as “wild, untamed” and in need of “constant surveillance” (Hines, 1993, p. 386). As a result, women’s activities in such institutions were extremely restricted. Women were sometimes made to feel unwelcome despite the fact that their presence increased during the 1920s to around 20% of all graduates of coeducational institutions (Giddings, 1988, p. 81). Relations between women students and the administration at Howard University, the preeminent coeducational Black institution, reached a nadir in 1912 when thirty-three women requested that the president appoint a dean to communicate their needs more effectively to the administration. The request was not granted for a decade until Lucy Diggs Slowe was appointed in 1922. During these ten years, the proportion of bachelor of arts degrees awarded to women climbed steeply, rising to slightly over 50% by 1930, reflecting Black women’s response to the articulation of their mission as “racial uplift” through teaching, social work, and voluntarism (Giddings, 1988, p. 145).

Slowe began her tenure at Howard under the last White president of the school, J. Stanley Durkee. From her earliest days on campus, she criticized the restrictive policies that demeaned women. In 1929, when the first
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Black president, Mordecai Johnson, took over, even greater difficulties presented themselves due to his generally autocratic approach to administration and his tendency to call all his female professors and administrators "daughter" (Janken, 1993). One of the consuming battles of Slowe’s life occurred during the years just before her death in the nineteen thirties as she fought Johnson in a public and acrimonious controversy over the role of female students, faculty, and staff on campus.

Slowe charged that Black colleges generally tended to perpetuate a patriarchal outlook captured by their clear message that Black women were expected to serve and not lead. To prove her point, Slowe surveyed forty-four coeducational Black colleges and found that women received little in courses, activities, or role models to prepare them for leadership (Hines, 1993, p. 385). In 1933, Slowe published an article “Higher Education of Negro Women” in the Journal of Negro Education in which she argued for changes in the treatment of Black women by these colleges. Slowe advocated a shift from the old order towards a new approach which would encourage women in “the making and executing of the rules under which they live” (p. 355). In 1936, she invited Mary Beard to Howard to deliver an address on women’s history which, she hoped, would “instill confidence in women students” (Anderson, 1988, p. 294).

From the beginning of her tenure, Slowe demanded a role for women on university councils, the building of dormitories so they could move onto campus, and an expanded counseling service for female students. Wright was one of the first group of female students to spend four years under Slowe’s mantle. She benefited directly from Slowe’s efforts, gaining a position as a resident advisor in the female dormitory during her senior year.

Born in 1905 in Newark, New Jersey, Wright graduated at the top of her class, one of only a handful of African Americans at elite Barringer High School. This accomplishment is even more remarkable when one considers that Wright dropped out of high school to marry at the age of sixteen and had two children in the subsequent two years. Only because of the pressure and insistence of her mother did she return to complete high school. Again with her mother’s encouragement, she applied for college admission and a scholarship. The offer she received from Howard University placed her in a difficult position.

At that time, university policy prohibited married or divorced women from attending Howard. As late as 1913, “Howard’s board of directors would vote that any female teacher who ‘thereafter married while teaching at the university would be considered as having resigned her position”’ (Giddings, 1988, p. 43). Wright chose to accept the scholarship and conceal her marriage and children. Although she later divorced her husband and remarried in the early thirties, she continued to hide the fact of her children even after becoming a Howard faculty member in 1940. She fully understood the position President Mordecai Johnson, a Baptist min-
ister, held concerning divorce and what his judgment undoubtedly would be concerning her earlier deception of the university.

Wright graduated from Howard University in 1927, magna cum laude, and received a fellowship to study for a master’s degree in education. Wright’s thesis examined the segregated public school systems of sixteen states. Charles Thompson, Dean of the School of Education at Howard, later suggested to Wright that she continue her analysis of school segregation with the study that became her doctoral dissertation at Teachers College (Meier and Rudwick, 1986).

Wright returned to New Jersey to do a certificate program in social work at the New York School for Social Work, later a part of Columbia University. The curriculum emphasized teaching and social work for the settlement house movement. Wright used her training as a case worker for the Newark Department of Welfare and the New Jersey Emergency Relief Administration during the Depression years. In 1933, she began a Ph.D. program in history and educational sociology, one of no more than about forty students matriculating for this degree at Teachers College at this time (Cremin, 1954, p. 163). During her years at Columbia, she made lifelong friends from among those Black intellectuals who studied there, including Walter G. Daniel, later a Howard faculty member as well.

By the late 1930s and early 1940s, Woodson and Wesley’s work with the ASNLH had produced results. Meier and Rudwick (1986) report that “there was a quickening of interest in Negro history both among a broader group of black scholars and a small though growing number of whites” (p. 100). Wright’s dissertation, The Education of Negroes in New Jersey (1941a), was an exhaustive and highly original work of scholarship. Wright followed Curti’s model in dealing comprehensively with the social, political, and intellectual forces which had shaped Black education in the state. Her analysis ranged from the earliest colonial days and Quaker influence to the then current condition of segregated schooling in the southern half of New Jersey. Her work can be characterized as both historical and sociological in its thrust, reflecting not only her theoretical background from her formal education but the practical experience she had gained as a social worker. She demonstrated the negative and powerful impact racial segregation had on children in the southern counties while extolling the more favorable circumstances of largely integrated education in the northern counties.

Wright documented in great detail the inadequate education which resulted for Black children from segregation, including shabby facilities, meager resources, and underpaid teachers. She argued that this inferior education produced numerous deleterious consequences such as juvenile delinquency. Above all, she made the point that the promises of democracy must be extended to all citizens regardless of race. This would be the theme of all her subsequent writing: America must apply its democratic ideals to all its citizens.
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Wright clearly owed her greatest intellectual debt to Curti (Meier and Rudwick, 1986, p. 105). One of only a handful of scholars nationwide who considered African American history a legitimate dissertation topic at this time, Curti was quoted at some length towards the end of her study:

Much also depends on the extent to which educators realize that they ... are deeply influenced by a point of view which they have unconsciously absorbed from their social environment, by a frame of reference which constantly limits their work. Only by recognizing this source of error in their work, only by analyzing the influences which have determined this frame of reference can they hope to rise above the limitations of their class and personal backgrounds and the more or less obsolete ideas and emotional attitudes related to these. Only by so doing can they become whole-hearted pioneers in the building of a better social order. (p. 202)

This passage from The Social Ideas of American Educators (1935) suggests the importance both Curti and Wright attached to the influence of cultural context in shaping attitudes. In Curti’s writing, the potential for using education to change attitudes towards various social groups like women, the working class, and African Americans is stated quite explicitly. Wright’s published material over the next two decades repeatedly utilizes similar constructs, carefully and deliberately placing her subject matter in its cultural context. Her writing also exhibits a pronounced moral flavor, yet her condemnation of segregation is tempered by a recognition of the cultural support for racism. She repeatedly appeals to her readers’ commitment to democratic values in trying to shift these old and damaging patterns.

Wright was also dearly influenced by Dewey’s instrumentalism. In her dissertation, she cites Schools of To-morrow, written with her daughter, Evelyn, in 1915. This work became the basis for his subsequent treatise, Democracy and Education, published in 1916. In the former work, the authors describe a number of experimental schools which were effectively carrying democracy into the new system of mass public education. Among these is a Black school in Indianapolis run by William J. Valentine. Valentine later came to New Jersey to head a highly regarded vocational school for African Americans in Bordentown. Wright noted this fact in the bibliography of her dissertation. Dewey characterized the Indianapolis school as a “social settlement” and offered it as a possible model for “solving the race question” (Boydston, 1979, p. 340).

Wright’s faith that the democratic process would eventually bring racial equality has been criticized as “naive” by later Black historians (Price, 1996). However, contemporary historians also recognize the contributions her work made in demonstrating the persistence of a dynamic Black cul-
ture that had managed to survive the tragedy of slavery and the challenge of Jim Crow. Her “thorough scholarship and faith in the potential of a democratic society ... exemplified the perspective of those engaged in the finest work being done in Afro-American history at the time,” according to one source (Meier and Rudwick, 1986, p. 105).

In the 1940s, Wright’s work “helped spread dissatisfaction” with “the total educational program for Negroes in the state.” As a result of her research and the efforts of the NAACP, New Jersey passed a new constitution in 1947, the first in the country to forbid segregation in both the public schools and the state militia (1953, p. 101). The example of this successful desegregation in New Jersey became a catalyst for the Truman initiative to desegregate the armed forces (G. Wright, 1988, p. 70).

Wright’s dissertation brought her to the attention of the national NAACP which was assembling social science data to prove the widespread and devastating effects of segregation. Wright worked with the team assembled by Dr. Kenneth Clark to gather and interpret materials in support of the NAACP challenge to “separate but equal” (Price, 1996). Subsequently, Wright used the *Journal of Negro Education* to develop her own ideas on the effects of segregation further. This journal was established by Charles Thompson in 1932 to open the field of policy research to African Americans who had been “generally ignored by the predominantly white academic journals of their day.” Thompson published articles that were “strictly speaking outside the discipline of education and provided an outlet for Logan, DuBois, Bunche, Sterling Brown, and many others” (Janken, 1993, p. 203).

In New Jersey, some African Americans expressed concern over integration due to the success of many Black schools in incorporating Black history into the curriculum and in hiring African Americans as teachers. In fact, Wright herself had demonstrated the superior education offered by a 19th century Black school in Newark in her article, “Mr. Baxter’s School” (1941b). In 1953, she wrote another article, “Extending Civil Rights in New Jersey,” which can be interpreted as an effort to put these concerns to rest. She provided data indicating that in the six years since passage of the new state constitution, African American teachers had gained an additional 166 teaching positions in New Jersey (p. 102). She concluded this article with a statement that “New Jersey has blazed trails in the improvement of human relations that merit serious reflection... Let us be vigilant in our efforts to eliminate still further the gaps between democratic ideals and practices” (p. 107). She described the “significant precedent” of the New Jersey Constitution of 1947 in outlawing racial segregation as “an achievement which the NAACP hopes to extend to other states through cases now pending before the United States Supreme Court” (p. 108).

As a faculty member at Howard, Wright found herself in illustrious company. In a study which examines the career of Rayford Logan, an Amherst and Harvard educated historian and Howard faculty member,
Keith Janken (1993) comments that “the core of Howard’s faculty in the 1930s and 1940s not only was the best of any African-American college, it also rivaled some of the best white universities” (p. 203). This elite group included Alain Locke in philosophy, Ralph Bunche in political science, E. Franklin Frazier in sociology, Sterling Brown in English, and Charles Wesley and John Hope Franklin in history. Also during this period, Howard’s law school trained a cadre of civil rights lawyers who would figure prominently in the legal challenges to segregation in the 1950s.

By comparison with the generation of Black historians who came later, Wright’s criticism of the White establishment was muted. Her patriotism, optimism about America’s future, and faith in the power of education sometimes placed her in a paradoxical position. For example, despite being a pacifist, she encouraged Black involvement in the armed services during World War Two because she found a strong correlation between race and rejection by these groups. She explained this in terms of the inferior education given African Americans, thus suggesting another reason to end school segregation.

During her years at Howard University, Wright served as an assistant editor and regular contributor to *The Journal of Negro Education* (e.g., 1944b). She published a number of articles in *The Journal of Negro History*, winning two awards from this journal, including one for best article in 1943. She worked at the center of highly visible academic efforts to extend the true meaning of democracy to African Americans. Nevertheless, as a woman in this environment, she struggled for recognition, often commenting to friends that her pay and promotions were negatively affected by her gender. During these years, the pressures of this unfair treatment and an estranged relationship with her children produced tremendous psychological difficulties for Wright.

Her writings, speeches, and organizational commitments reflected a measure of agreement with the theme of “racial uplift.” Nevertheless, Wright increasingly came to criticize the lack of recognition educated Black women received from the community for this work. After the death of Slowe, Wright suggested that a full-fledged guidance and counseling program be launched for undergraduates at Howard. Wright became its acting director in 1946, taking on this task along with her responsibilities in coordinating the student teaching program. In 1954, she pursued a postdoctoral program in guidance, counseling, and personnel management at Teachers College, Columbia University and traveled widely to review practices at other institutions (Daniel, 1963, p. 310).

She also published in the *Friends Historical Association Bulletin* (1941c), *School and Society* (1942), and *New Jersey History* (1941). Though not a Quaker herself, she valued their historical contributions to race relations in New Jersey: “by themselves respecting the personalities of the Negroes they attempted to stimulate similar behavior in the members of other groups. By teaching the Negroes to respect themselves they sought to ameliorate the
conditions of those who still chafed under the bondsman's yoke" (1941c, p. 87).

Wright served as a contributing editor to the *Aframerican Woman's Journal* (e.g. 1944a), the organ of Mary McLeod Bethune's National Council of Negro Women. During the fifties, like Bethune, she worked in the Women's International League for Peace. She also chaired committees for Delta Sigma Theta, her college sorority and an activist Black women's organization, on rural education and the expansion of libraries throughout the South. Oral histories done by friends after her death suggest that she saw the position of minorities and women in education in a parallel light. As Walter Daniel put it in a tribute published after her death in the *Journal of Negro Education*, "she felt she had to fight the cause for women" (1963, p. 305).

While never a classroom teacher herself, Wright's role as a teacher educator brought many involvements with teachers. She was a member of the NEA and the American Teachers Association (ATA), an organization for Black teachers, as well as the Association of Social Science Teachers in Negro Colleges. She promoted African American history through the ATA and the ASNLH. During the forties and fifties, the NEA made an effort at outreach through a joint committee with the ATA to distribute to its members "instructional materials on Negroes." Segregation remained a problem, however, in a number of chapters throughout the country. In 1955, the NEA agreed to work for desegregation as a result of the *Brown* case. However, only in 1966 did the two organizations fully merge (Hines, 1990, p. 27).

In 1961, Wright received a grant to sustain her in the writing of a Slowe biography. She submitted a sketch to Radcliffe College for inclusion in *Notable American Women 1607-1950* but took her life in October of 1962 before this project was completed. Her friends concluded that she had finally succumbed to the depression that had plagued her since her young adult years. As one colleague and friend put it, "There was something in her life she couldn't handle" (Daniel 1982).

John Hope Franklin has called the world of the Negro scholar "indescribably lonely" (Ducharme, 1993, p. 207). For Wright, loneliness and depression took their toll in her life.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, several points can be made concerning the social education developed by Beard and Wright. Like the founders of the social studies movement, both scholars saw social betterment as the aim of historical and sociological knowledge. Beard's belief that women's history could contribute to a new era for women's citizenship motivated her quest to establish the field. Similarly, Wright held the conviction that education could provide the solution to the complex problem of racism in this society.
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The interdisciplinary breadth of Beard’s and Wright’s approach to knowledge production paralleled that advocated by the new field of social studies, incorporating sociology, economics, vocational guidance, and civics (Thornton, 1996). In their efforts to reconstruct the histories of groups whose records were sparse, scattered, and different from those of more conventional subjects, Beard and Wright stretched historical methodology to include evidence and topics which today figure prominently in many scholars’ more interdisciplinary research repertoire. In a similar vein, both women saw the role of educators as multi-dimensional. Well aware that the demands of educating women and African Americans presented new challenges to schools, Beard and Wright counseled creativity and flexibility in educational means and ends.

Their lives offer examples of the role of public intellectual, a construction Thomas Bender used to explain Charles Beard but which applies equally to these two women: “the responsibility of intellect in a democratic society was to enrich politics and culture by proposing in public powerful ideas that invited, even demanded, response” (1987, p. 308). However, as outsiders, they recognized the necessity of being opportunistic in the methods they used to fulfill this function. Beard’s recognition of the masculinist quality of virtually all higher education and Wright’s acknowledgement of the racist nature of schools mandated new modes of dissemination of their research.

Furthermore, they worked at a time of specialization and professionalization in universities; these trends made popularization of academic research suspect and contributed to their marginalization. It is not surprising, therefore, that their work engendered resistance. Beard provoked resistance from feminists and academics. Wright encountered the sexism of her own institution and the racism of society.

Beard and Wright sought an inclusive understanding of the nature of legitimate knowledge in schools and universities. As empiricists, they could not have failed to notice the limitations of past representations of the world, explaining such deficiencies in terms of the biased norms governing selection of material for curricula. Like academic feminists today, they critiqued the partiality and skewed nature of the “truths” presented by the historical canon. They challenged “the meta-narratives,” rejecting the idea “that stories about a single group could be generalized to all humans” (Banks, 1996, p. 49).

Beard avoided the essentialism of much of women’s history by bringing sensitivity to social class from her background in labor history. She steadfastly refused to attach a sense of victimization to women’s “long history,” as she called it. As feminist theoreticians today attempt to shore up female agency, Beard’s work has tremendous resonance. Her work invites favorable comparison with that of scholars like Gerda Lerner (1989, 1991) and Elizabeth Minnich (1993).
Wright’s research stands as a foundation stone for contemporary multiculturalism. She struggled with an American exceptionalism “forged around the Black man as an outsider” (Quarles, 1988, p. 9). Her legacy inspired a new generation of Black historians, including Spencer Crew, Clement Price, Giles Wright, and others who still hold an annual conference during Black history month in honor of her memory.

A recently published book of readings in social studies begins with the assertion that those authors selected “foresaw the need to amend our notions of knowledge, understanding, curriculum, and education to more fully embrace the diversity of this nation.” Beard and Wright also recognized that “diversity and mutuality” form “the bedrocks of democratic living” (Parker, 1996, p. 1). Their models of transformative scholarship suggest the multiple perspectives which have characterized social education from the start.
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Abstract
Charles A. McMurry exerted a great deal of influence on elementary education and particularly in the field of elementary social studies. McMurry developed the concept of Type Study as part of his comprehensive view of elementary education, yet applied it most fully to elementary social studies. The Type Study evolved as McMurry attempted to apply Herbartian concepts to the unique educational environment of the United States. The Type Study incorporated components related to apperception, concentration, and correlation in an effort to provide organization and structure. The characteristics of Type Studies published by McMurry and his methods of advocacy through teacher training provide insight into the myriad of influences on the development of elementary social studies.

Introduction
Charles Alexander McMurry (1857-1929) spent over fifty of his seventy-two years as a professional educator. McMurry influenced all of elementary education through his teaching, lecturing, writing, and work in professional organizations. His leadership and influence included contributions to the development of the expanding environments organizational framework dominant in elementary social studies (Akenson, 1987; LeRiche, 1975). McMurry's career gradually focused on the Type Study, a variant of instructional unit, as the basis through which elementary curriculum should be organized and taught. Despite his interest in all of the curriculum, McMurry primarily fo-
cused his Type Study instructional units on social studies content for the intermediate grades.

McMurry viewed the Type Study as an in-depth case study about a topic useful to understanding society as a whole as well as events in the lives of students. Type Study units reflected McMurry's Herbartian based concern for the organization of knowledge and inductive teaching strategies. McMurry's career addressed educational needs derived from the transformation of the United States into an increasingly urbanized, industrialized, bureaucratized, and diverse society during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The development of school systems and a formal curriculum with many subjects created problems. Numerous separate subjects created tension over limited instructional time and the apparent lack of relationship between subjects. The Type Study, with its emphasis upon the organization of knowledge, selection of a limited number of examples, and relation of disparate content addressed the issue of content proliferation. The primary focus of this discussion will be on the role of the Type Study as the vehicle through which Charles A. McMurry addressed the organization of knowledge and the delivery of instruction. Discussion will also suggest the probable impact of the Type Study and suggest issues in contemporary elementary social studies similar to those addressed by McMurry.

Early Roots

In 1878, following two years of undergraduate study at the University of Michigan, Charles A. McMurry began his teaching career with four years in Illinois and Colorado classrooms. The realities of classroom life remained with McMurry and he never lost sight of the need for workable teaching strategies and curriculum materials. McMurry spent 1882-84 in Germany at the University of Halle before returning to teach in Pueblo, Colorado. His early involvement in cutting edge educational thought manifested itself in the mid 1880s during summers "...at Cook County Normal, when it was at the height of its onslaught on antiquated methods under that redoubtable old war horse Col. Parker" (McMurry Papers. Vanderbilt University. Papers Honoring Dr. McMurry. Box 1. E.A. Bass to H.L. Donovan. 14 February 1927). From 1886-1888 McMurry did graduate work in Germany at Halle and Jena universities. He assimilated Herbartian principles at William Rein's Pedagogical Seminar at Jena while completing his doctorate.

Immediately after his August, 1886 arrival in Germany, McMurry began to assimilate the Herbartian principles which would be the intellectual mainstay of his career. In September 1886, McMurry wrote to his fiancé that he "found an idea in one of the German pedagogical books yesterday...in Herbart's Pedagogy that all instruction must be
based on the previous knowledge, mental and moral requirement, in short, on the previous status of the child” (McMurry Papers, Northern Illinois University, Box 2, Folder 2). In the same letter McMurry stressed the need to take existing knowledge as a beginning point from which order could be created and elaborated. McMurry believed that school should not just introduce the child to a new world, but “...bring into order and system the world of ideas which he brings with him...” He saw the child’s conceptual world as ill organized and in need of instruction “to bring into order and system the world of ideas which he brings with him.” McMurry expounded that associations “must be adapted to the previous assignment, each new topic or subject that is taught must be based upon, compared with, and brought into organic connexion with what precedes.” McMurry admitted the “great difficulty” but desirability of organizing instruction for children and viewed it as one of the “greatest problems and necessities in education.” In other letters McMurry stressed the close relationship between instruction, curriculum, student interest, and the need to “...unite and consolidate all of these from their earliest years...” (NIU. Box 2, Folder 9). This focus on the organization of knowledge related to curriculum and instruction constituted a major focus which Dr. Charles A. McMurry took back with him to the United States.2

In 1889, at Winona State Normal School (Minnesota), McMurry began his normal school career in which he became a prolific writer and teacher.3 McMurry’s focus on the organization of knowledge rested on the fundamental Herbartian principles of apperception, concentration, and correlation. In 1892 McMurry helped introduce these Herbartian principles to the United States in The Elements of General Method Based on the Principles of Herbart. Each edition also contained a chapter on induction and the “concept bearing process.” McMurry stressed the need for positive examples to develop concepts as classes of similar objects or ideas which “are used to interpret new objects.” (1924, p. 219). Concepts provided the basis through which knowledge could be organized. Apperception dealt with the ability of teachers to structure lessons so that the new concepts and facts were related to existing structures in the student’s mind. McMurry advocated apperceptive teaching methods “by which a new idea...is assimilated there because old ideas...are related to the newcomer to welcome it” (McMurry, D., 1946, p. 35). Lesson plans followed a five step process of preparation, presentation, association and comparison, generalization, and practical application in which personal interest and experience helped orient the child to the topic as well as provide a link to new information. For McMurry, the five step teaching process implied the determination of the main ideas in proper sequence, the grouping of details, facts, and descriptions, the reflective study of causal and logical relations, and comparisons based on likeness and differences
Concentration and correlation proved consistent with McMurry's emphasis upon building conceptual frameworks through the five step apperceptive teaching process. Concentration stressed focus on a limited number of key concepts within rather than excessive proliferation of separate subjects and topics. Correlation pointed to the building of relationships between seemingly unrelated subject matter as "the Herbartians define... correlation to mean the natural relationships or connections between subjects" (McMurry, D., 1946, p. 55). Both concentration and correlation functioned to limit the proliferation of separate and seemingly unrelated subject matter. The five steps of inductive teaching provided the instructional vehicle through which to deliver the Type Study.

The Type Study Developed

As a variant of the instructional unit approach, the Type Study offered a concept consistent with many perceptions and practices in schools throughout the country. The unit method of instruction suggests a series of logically sequenced lessons designed to teach important facts, concepts, and skills about a selected topic. McMurry advocated the Type Study unit variant as a reasonable extension of his Herbartian commitment to specific teaching methodologies and curricular organization. The Method of the Recitation, an 1898 collaboration with brother Frank McMurry, introduced the type concept, but stopped short of using the term Type Study. The term type was used, but not defined, in a series of sample lessons drawn from math, social studies, science, and literature. Type was used to describe the social studies topic "Trade Center in the Northwest-Minneapolis as a Type" (pp. 21-26). The Minneapolis Type Study provided subsequent geographical study with "a standard of comparison in measuring the commercial importance of other large trade centers" (p. 26). A specific definition and elaboration of the meaning of types were set forth in a separate chapter. Types provided "a center around which to collect the materials for induction..." (p.279) and:

...general truths clothe themselves to a large degree, in striking types. Pedagogically considered, these types should stand at the entrance to the important avenues of truth in nearly every study. This fact will be of great service to us when compelled to face the problem of selecting those topics in which study can contain the best lesson unities. (p. 269)

In combination with the five steps of inductive apperceptive teaching, the type provided a "short-cut" in moving from the particular to the general (p. 269) and stood "deeply rooted in...a central, controlling
idea...it proclaims the characteristics belong to a large class" (p. 272). The McMurrays stressed that instruction "...should consist of large lesson units or groups of facts in each of which groups some single idea dominates" (p. 286). Types thus held the promise of cutting down on the proliferation of content through correlating and concentrating content. McMurry refined this set of core notions regarding types as he elaborated the type concept until his death in 1929.

In subsequent writings McMurry formally presented the Type Study as a way to deal with the proliferation of separate courses which crowded the curriculum. He argued that a ... "definite plan must be devised for simplifying this course of study without losing its rich content. The full treatment of a few large type studies in each school subject will give us this simple plan" (NIU. Draft of "Introduction." p. 1. Box 6, Folder 2, nd). For McMurry, more was less and less was more. The apparent answer rested in the use of a limited number of Type Studies focused upon key concepts and examples through which one would organize "...essential facts into a larger unit of thought" (p. 2). McMurry metaphorically described the Type Studies as constituting the "main highways of thought" and reflected his Herbartian roots arguing that "they provide for a vigorous and active correlation of all studies with one another" (p. 3). Indeed, McMurry further articulated his belief in correlation as being a "sound basis for effective thinking" which provides "proper connection and unity in the whole body of knowledge, the entire range of experience" (p. 3). The in-depth Type Study based upon a "fundamental idea is the first of a series of connected units developing through the entire course" in a manner exerting "simplifying and organizing power" stretching "from the beginning to the end of the course" (pp. 2-3). McMurry also emphasized citizenship education concluding that Type Studies would "reproduce in each child the typical experiences that men have had" and would allow children to meet their "own present and future problems as a citizen" (p. 3).

Specific examples of the Type Study may be seen throughout McMurry's earlier and later work. Mitchell (1926) suggested that the 1904 Type Studies from the Geography of the United States represented McMurry's first systematic public effort to set forth the Type Study concept (p. 35). The twenty-five Type Studies offered in Type Studies From the Geography of the United States ranged from "The Hudson River," "The Hoosac Tunnel," and "The Hard-wood Forest Region of the Ohio Valley" to "Irrigation and the Big Ditch at Denver" and "A Gold Mine in California" (1924). The Hudson River Type Study provided clear insight into the Type Study structure. The fourteen page narrative detailed the source of the Hudson River in the Adirondacks to its mouth "just below the end of Manhattan Island" (p.1). Geologic description included the "trough-like valley about 150 miles long," "rock ridges
rising two hundred feet above the Hudson" (p. 2), and "the steep black rocks of the Palisades" (p. 4). Social uses detailed include steamer trips during the fall season from New York to Albany which "gives a nine hours' trip well filled with beautiful scenery" (p. 3), the "villas and country homes of wealthy New York families" (p. 4) near Yonkers with its wooded slopes and hilltops as well as West Point, Fort Putnam, the summer resorts of the nearby Catskills, and Vassar College. Economic impact dealt with passenger steamers and "a great amount of heavy freighting on canal-boats and barges and freight steamers" (p. 6) and the "double-track railroads...which do a very heavy freight and passenger traffic" (p. 7) including the transporting of block ice and farm produce to New York City. Historical evidence focused upon the role of the Hudson in the military campaigns of the Revolutionary War and the literature of Washington Irving and James Fenimore Cooper.

McMurry's theoretical posture stressed the significance of relating evidence into broader contexts. The Hudson River Type Study narrative did indeed place the Hudson River into a broader context stating the "...importance...of the valley of the Hudson is seen in...a broader survey of the connections of this valley with western New York and the Great Lakes, and with Lake Champlain" (pp. 7-8). McMurry supported the broader context with a map of the New York state canal system and further narrative detail which illustrated that agricultural and other products made their way from the Great Lakes "down the Mohawk Valley and the Hudson to New York" (p. 9). Data comparing the Hudson with the Susquehanna, Potomac, and James Rivers placed its impact into a broader context. The concluding statements suggested further contextual development pointing to Type Studies in which the "Hudson may be compared with the Ohio, Mississippi, and other American rivers" (p. 14) and suggested comparisons with European rivers such as the Thames and the Rhine.

McMurry did indeed stress organization and relationships throughout Type Studies From United States Geography. Despite the clear intent at building relationships, McMurry neglected two significant dimensions in his twenty-five Type Studies. First, McMurry, a consummate advocate of method, failed to provide detailed teaching strategies or teaching materials for use in presenting the dense information in the Type Studies. The twenty-five Type Studies presented information at an adult reading level accompanied by maps, diagrams, and photographs. McMurry's Herbartian based teaching methods based upon preparation, presentation, association and comparison, generalization, and practical application cannot be found. The James River Type Study, for example, merely concluded with an admonition to teachers that a "...comparison of the James River with the Hudson...will prove instructive and interesting" followed by suggestions such as comparing "cities and railroad centers at the mouth, harbors, and
bays” (p. 62). Second, McMurry also failed to systematically weave the comparative thread through the Type Studies themselves. The Hudson River did not enter into other Type Studies as a comparative element. Comparative statements found in “The Ohio River Valley” Type Study indicated:

As compared with the Upper Mississippi, the Ohio is used much more for commerce, although the floods and drought along the Ohio are more extreme. Pittsburgh and Allegheny, at the head of the Ohio, correspond well with St. Paul and Minneapolis as centers of trade, though one is a level country and the other in the edge of the mountains. The coal, iron, and petroleum of the Upper Ohio are as important as the wheat and lumber of the Twin Cities. (p.149)

The Hudson River would have fit neatly into the Ohio River Valley comparison. Thus, the appropriate comparative theme did not consistently manifest itself between all of the type studies.

The Peabody Type Studies

The Type Study continued to develop in McMurry’s work to where it became a major focus. In 1915, McMurry left Northern Illinois State Normal University in Dekalb to assume a position at George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tennessee. Type Studies clearly occupied a major focus for McMurry as evidenced in a letter of 20 August 1915 to his wife Emily. McMurry indicated that:

...my course of study class is organized to arrange for the printing of Type Studies and use during the year. I to act as general editor. They are prepared to take them in full sets of our classes for try-out with the children. It looks as if I should get quite a number of them at the practical work. They are disposed to take up the scheme with vigor and try out lessons and build up the course of study. (NIU Box 2, Folder 11)

In addition, at Peabody McMurry continued his long tradition of appearing at teacher institutes (inservices) which helped him to further spread the Type Study concept. A typical institute may be seen in the August 26-30, 1918 program of the Fifty-Second Annual Institute Morrow County Teachers held in the high school auditorium in Mt. Gilead, Ohio. Under the subjects and instructors headings Dr. McMurry came first, listed over Florence A. McNeal and Miss Kreiter. McMurry focused upon six “Type Study Lessons” including “The First Steamboat
The Type Study and Charles A. McMurry on the Mississippi” and “The Salt River Project.” In 1923 McMurry wrote from an institute in Memphis, Tennessee requesting that his daughter Dorothy “send his type studies to Huntsville, Texas” as well as an additional fifteen Type Studies in geography and history to Germantown, Tennessee (NIU, Box 2, Folder 11).

The Type Studies produced under McMurry’s editorship for use in his Peabody College teaching reflected links to his past work and provided the groundwork for more extensive Type Studies which followed. The Type Studies consisted of four volumes published from 1915 through 1922. Elementary social studies provided the overwhelming content focus for The George Peabody College for Teachers Type Studies and Lesson Plans. The series included topics such as “Cotton and Corn”, “City Sanitation”, “Benjamin Franklin and Social Service”, “A School Course in Geography and History Based On Large Units”, “A Wheat Farm in North Dakota”, and “New Orleans The Gulf Port” (NIU, Microfilm, Roll 2, Frame 1347). The Peabody Type Studies reflected the continued focus and refinement in McMurry’s work. The preface to Volume I, Number I, published in October, 1915 stated that the Type Studies “are simple enough to be placed in the hands of children for reading and study” (p. 4). McMurry indicated that the Type Studies “furnish a much fuller and richer treatment...than is usual in our texts” (p. 4). The organization of knowledge received mention as the basis “to re-enforce strongly the important topics of our text-books in history and geography.” The first Peabody volume included three detailed Type Studies dealing with the “First Steamboat on the Ohio and Mississippi,” “The Louisiana Purchase,” and “The Erie Canal.” However, the section “Suggestions as to Method” contained little detail as to the exact instructional procedures. Typically, the suggestions included vague directions to “Study a large map of the Mississippi River with its tributary streams. Compare with the coastal rivers” (p. 5) and “Good pictures of the canal, canal boats and locks, as at Lockport, are needed” (p. 35).

The development of McMurry’s Type Study thoughts further evolved in the 1922 Peabody Type Study titled Method in Handling Types as Large Units of Study. McMurry articulated his concern for organizing knowledge to avoid trivialization and proliferation within the curriculum. Benefits for Type Studies even flowed to students as McMurry claimed that a “large simple unit of study, developing on the basis of a constructive idea, demonstrates to children how they should collect and organize their knowledge” (p. 4). He argued that Type Studies provide “practical thought-centers around which important and extensive groups of knowledge can take place (p.5). Discussions of “The Overland Trip to California in ’49” and “The Great Migration” illustrated the content which brought about the cohesion of knowledge. McMurry detailed the “Main Features” of a Type Study as having: (1)”...
A center for the grouping of facts. (2) A developing process of thought which is its principle of growth. (3) A concrete idea embodied in some object, or person or process... (4) an idea gathers to itself...a valuable body of knowledge which it organizes into its own structure... centers in some important practical project like the building of a railroad... (6)...the key and interpretation to a large number of similar undertakings...a clear type and demonstration of an entire class of important projects, (7) expansion... steadily to the interpretation of larger and yet larger wholes and (8)... it organizes his knowledge into a growing habit of thought...which becomes his own method of thinking and of interpreting the world” (pp.14-16). McMurry elaborated on the eight points in terms of two major stages. In the first stage, teaching makes the idea concrete. In the second stage, the idea becomes connected wherein “comparison with other similar objects or experiences the main idea gradually takes a broader scope and a far reaching application” (p. 24).

The Final Type Studies

The most refined examples of the Type Study may be found in McMurry’s later work published as *Practical Teaching. Book One: Large Projects in Geography* (1925) which focused upon New Orleans, A Project, the Salt River Project, the Muscle Shoals Project, and the Panama Canal Project. In this context McMurry used the term project to indicate undertakings in which human effort brought technology to bear in modifying the environment for the development of a modern society. The emphasis upon depth and the organization of knowledge came through clearly as McMurry stated that the books sought “... to give teachers an introduction to the art of instruction through specific illustrations of organization and of detailed method.” He viewed the four projects as “...demonstrations of large, organized topics [which] serve as standards of carefully-planned instruction. They also suggest a similar treatment of other large topics” (p.1). McMurry discussed the Type Study as a case study which applies to a large number of settings. Viewed as a two staged, two pronged process, McMurry indicated that in the first stage a Type Study provides a “dramatic setting for an idea and, in its second stage, it affords a constructive principle of broad application” (p. 6). Harbor improvement dealt with in the New Orleans Type Study helped organize information studied in the Panama Canal Type Study. The key concept presented in the New Orleans Type Study grows soon into an interpretation of many; ocean and inland commerce respond to a simple constructive idea” (p.6). McMurry further stressed his concern for conceptually oriented, in-depth Type Study which serves as a “demonstration of a principle discovered to be op-
McMurry admitted to a lack of specific teaching strategies and materials in earlier Type Studies (p. 9). Examination of content and teaching strategies in the New Orleans Type Study provides insight into McMurry's fully matured vision. McMurry divided "New Orleans, A Project" into two major sections titled "The Method" and "The Project." "The Method" provided a mix of background information, questions for the teacher to ask students, comments about activities in which students might be engaged, and a series of specific lesson plans. "The Project" provided the specific textual information, photographs, and diagrams which the students would encounter. "The Method" proves of greatest interest as it attempts to remedy the flaw in earlier Type Studies by being more specific in terms of the mechanics of teaching. McMurry peppered the historical background information with a variety of suggested questions and activities such as "...study a map of the Mississippi River and its branches, observing the extent of navigable waters (about 12,000 miles) thus opened up" and "make a diagram showing the mud bars, five miles across, which lay in front of the passes" (p. 25). In keeping with his conceptual focus McMurry made reference to the Panama Canal as well as to waterway enhancement at "Chicago along the Illinois River, one to Pittsburgh along the upper Ohio, one to St. Paul on the upper Mississippi, and one along the Missouri (p. 33). "The Second Stage" of Part I (no separate identification of "The First Stage" existed) expanded the harbor improvement concept from New Orleans to several other examples. New York, San Francisco, Galveston (Texas), Mobile (Alabama), Pensacola (Florida), as well as Liverpool, Hamburg, Calcutta and Rio de Janeiro provided comparisons to help develop the concepts related to harbors and their improvements. McMurry included suggestions in "The Second Stage" to "let the children collect local maps and pictures of San Francisco harbor and other Western ports" and provided questions such as "Why have Gulf ports been slow in developing as compared with those on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts?" (p. 36).

The section on "The Method" concluded with "Daily Lesson Plans" designed to be used with the text content of Part II, "The Project." McMurry designed the first lesson to go with the first two pages of the text which provided information as to the historical importance in context of steamboat traffic and early control by the French. The structure of the first lesson included its aim, outline of topics, suggestions as to method of treatment, and assignment of second lessons. The Aim sought "To show the importance in the early history of America of New Orleans as an outlet for the Mississippi River. (p. 37). Suggested teaching strategies included admonitions to "use a map of the United States"
when "showing the advantages of New Orleans as a gateway to the Mississippi Valley" and to "to use blackboard sketches of maps and diagrams and with the steady development of the outline of leading topics in one combined process of instruction...." (pp. 37-38).

The lesson structure reveals little more than a series of vague suggestions. The exact manner in which the text should be introduced, vocabulary introduced, involvement with the text developed, and specific steps for making comparisons, or analyzing pictures could not be determined from the lesson structure. His emphasis on the main idea, depth of content, and generalizing to other examples clearly comes through in the Type Study text and in the background material for teachers. The detail of the teaching methods remained incomplete and limited the guidance for the very teachers he sought to help.

Discussion

Determining the exact impact which the Type Study exerted in elementary social studies education proves difficult at best. One might hypothesize that, at the very least, McMurry influenced thousands of teachers through inservice institutes, college level instruction, and numerous writings to deliver instructional units with carefully prepared lessons. The Type Study served as a cohesive focus through which McMurry applied Herbartian concepts to avoid the proliferation of content in the curriculum. Type Studies held the promise of cutting down on the proliferation of content through correlating and concentrating content. Such thinking proved consistent with the popular 1920s unification concept which addressed the problem of subject proliferation and which manifested itself in the interdisciplinary conceptualization of elementary social studies (Akenson, p.162). At the very least, McMurry helped propagate a line of thought which made possible the development of the expanding environments framework with its interdisciplinary focus.

Prewett (1950) analyzed the historical development of the unit method of instruction noting that "Herbart and the Herbartian movement had great influence on methodology in education in the United States from about 1890 to 1920; furthermore, that influence has continued to the present time" (p. 153). Prewett further suggested that "McMurry's definitely proposed arrangements of subject-matter which undoubtedly had much in common with modern unit teaching" (p. 159). Prewett's discussion pinpointed the role of Charles and Frank McMurry for generating the characteristics of the unit method. Prewett's discussion of the widely influential Morrison Plan began with a twelve page (pp.151-163) exposition of the Herbartians and the McMurrays. Prewett's analysis of curriculum theorists identified the manner in which modifications to McMurry's thinking took place. Prewett's final
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The chapter devoted seven single spaced pages (pp. 217-223) reproducing verbatim the McMurrays' unit titled "The Irrigation of Arid Lands". Additional impact may be seen in curriculum guides such as those from Kentucky (Cruikshank, 1993, p. 853) or from Oregon which incorporated the term Type Study in its elementary social studies curriculum for fifth grade (McLean, 1957, p. 200).

McMurry's influence may be further inferred from his niche in the normal school setting of higher education and its impact on sales of his Type Study related works. McMurry labored not in the high status of major universities, but in the second class status associated with normal schools and state teachers colleges. Normal schools and state teachers colleges actually trained the greatest number of elementary school teachers. Their constituencies proved very receptive to Charles McMurry's sustained laboring in the realistic vineyard of teacher preparation. The impact of McMurry's labors become evident in light of printing eight editions of The Elements of General Method in nine years. The 1903 revised edition continued in the marketplace until 1924 with total sales exceeding 115,000 (Dunkel, 1970). LeRiche (1974, 1987, 1988) pointed out McMurry's significant impact on elementary social studies curriculum and cited evidence of national and worldwide sales of his many writings. LeRiche documented the use of McMurry's books at the "two major primary school Teacher Training Institutions" of Claremont and Sydney in Australia (1988, pp. 48-49). Westfall (1980) further enforced LeRiche's observation in finding that the McMurry's texts on methods "became standard texts used by the normal schools and education departments of the universities" (p. 79).

The Peabody College Type Studies pamphlets clearly made their way into the hands of a large number of teachers. McMurry and Peabody College entered into negotiations with the Johnson Publishing Company of Roanoke, Virginia to publish and distribute the pamphlet series in the 1920s. In a letter of 16 July 1923 to Johnson Publishing Company chief Frank Perry, McMurry indicated that "...we have sold 72,000 of the pamphlets and there are about 45,000 in stock" (NIU, Microfilm. Roll 2, Frame 1367). Royalty statements from 1926 to 1930 indicate 7,425 sales of the bound pamphlets (NIU, Microfilm. Roll 2, Frames 1382-1390). Johnson sales data indicate that Large Projects In Geography sold 2,749 copies during the five year period ending in 1930. Data gleaned from the 1904-1929 "Annual Statement of Royalty Account" furnished to McMurry by Macmillan provide insight into the sales other works which focused on the Type Study. First published in 1904, Type Studies From The Geography of the United States sold 15,109 copies. Larger Types of American Geography, first published in 1907, sold 9,630 copies. Teaching By Projects, first published in 1920, sold 10,086 copies. How To Organize the Curriculum, which reported royalties for the first time in the 1924 royalty statement, sold 3,094 copies (NIU,
Nor does such data reflect sales of numerous elementary social studies titles which predated the overt articulation of the Type Study, yet which contained elements of the Type Study concept.

In the spring of 1927 George Peabody College for Teachers held a four day celebration in honor of McMurry's fifty years in education. International in scope, the celebration reflected the prestige of Peabody and Charles McMurry. Dr. Erich Hylla of the Prussian Ministry of Education presented four lectures on German education and teacher training (VU, Box 1. Program For Celebration Honoring Dr. McMurry, 1927). Dean William F. Russell of Teachers College, President Charles McKenny of Michigan State Normal College, and President David Felmley of Illinois State Normal University all gave speeches. John Dewey did not attend but regretted with the comment that there "... is no one whom it could give me more pleasure to honor that [sic] my old friend Charles McMurry..." Likewise, Teachers College professor William C. Bagley regretted with similar effusiveness (VU, Box 1). Over 600 letters, cards, and telegrams from school teachers, school system administrators, state departments of education administrators, teacher education faculty and administrators, and even business persons and diplomats acknowledged the invitation to attend the McMurry festivities.

Specific comments in letters went beyond perfunctory laudatory statements and even mentioned specific concepts which greatly impressed the writers. President Joe Cook of the State Teachers College in Hattiesburg, Mississippi wrote that "Dr. McMurry has made many contributions to this generation, among which his idea of developing "The Big Idea" ranks well" (VU, Box 1). Other letters also mentioned the Type Study concept. Tulsa, Oklahoma Superintendent of Schools P.P. Claxton wrote:

I have for many years recommended your books on education as the very best I have known for classroom teachers. Few other books have been so valuable to me, and I remember as distinctly as if it were yesterday the first time I heard you—at the summer school at the University of North Carolina when for a week you gave the Hudson River as a type study. I had, of course, previously read your "Minneapolis as a Commercial and Manufacturing Center." If you had never done more than to set forth the importance of such use of large units in teaching, it would have been a great service, a service which seems to me more and more needed in these later years when there is so much inclination toward disintegration in the common school subjects. (VU. Box 1)
Many a specific memory focused upon McMurry’s teaching and the Type Study concept. C.H. McClure wrote of McMurry’s inspiration when McClure encountered McMurry books as a normal school student. In turn, McClure “...as a superintendent...saw to it that my teachers became acquainted with...his books...and type studies...” McClure credited “…what little success I had as a superintendent...” to McMurry as did other superintendent in settings similar to McClure (VU, Box 1). Upon his death in 1929 a similar outpouring of sentiment suggested that McMurry stood far taller in the eyes of rank and file educators than those who became renowned in more prestigious institutions.

The Type Study and related concepts sprang from Charles A. McMurry’s years in Germany in which he encountered Herbartian concepts. Dunkel (1970) viewed Herbartianism as an ephemeral passing theoretical fancy of American educators. Cruikshank (1993) as well as Westfall (1980) pointed out the underlying staying power of the Herbartians. McMurry’s thoughts may have been eclipsed in terms of formal language, but many of his thoughts continue to exert influence.

As the normal schools, colleges, and universities developed common educational practices during the early twentieth century, the writings of these men took on even broader significance. But later, as the Progressive Movement came into full fruition, many of the ideas first suggested by the these Herbartian advocates were adapted, modified, and preserved in current educational theory and practice. As often occurs, the originator of an idea is forced into a subordinate role once a later leader moves his ideas toward more sophisticated and workable outcomes. Thus, the role of the Herbartians as pragmatic educational innovators who left important practical as well as theoretical contributions for American schools is often overlooked. (Westfall, p. 85)

Contemporary social studies education still grapples with similar issues through approaches such as the structure of the disciplines, concept teaching and learning, depth versus breadth of coverage, integration and thematic units, and schema theory (Banks & Clegg, 1973; Haas, 1991; Hoffman & Ryan, 1973; Taba, Durkin, Fraenkel, & McNaughton, 1971; Torney-Purta, 1991; White, 1988). Jane White searched for substantial knowledge in her analysis of elementary social studies textbooks. White advocated that social studies educators should look for conceptualization of big ideas, coherence and integration, and elaboration of detail (p.122). Hilda Taba dealt with main ideas, organizing ideas, key concepts, and specific facts in the spiral
curriculum framework. Taba sought to resolve the “conflict between the need to cover many areas of knowledge and the demands for greater understanding, for autonomous inquiry, and for application of knowledge” (p.19). Addressing the manner in which elementary social studies curriculum should be organized remains a basic question which continues to occupy social studies educators. The intervening years indicate that Charles McMurry focused upon crucial dimensions of elementary social studies curriculum which continue to manifest themselves unto this day. Conceptual frameworks may well be more refined and sophisticated, but Charles A. McMurry clearly addressed underlying problems and gave his all to bring about their resolution.

Conclusion

Charles Alexander McMurry reflected on his career in preparation for the celebration at Peabody honoring his fifty years as an educator. McMurry spoke of the two loves which dominated his life.

In the summer of 1888 I was married...to Miss Emily Le Crone, whom I had known years before in Illinois. I was selected as principal of a Grammar school at South Evanston just north of Chicago and we spent our first year there together. I began again teaching and supervising in the grades and applying Herbart’s principles to American schools. This was the beginning of a definite line of work which I have followed now rather closely for more than 38 years. (McMurry Papers. VU. Box 1)

McMurry's “definite line of work” included a concentrated focus on the Type Study for “...approximately a quarter of a century of almost undivided effort...” (Mitchell, p. 3). He worked to provide methods and curriculum materials which met the needs of the emerging public education system in the United States. His work in promoting the Type Study primarily focused upon elementary social studies for the intermediate grades. Carefully crafted classroom instruction and curriculum units in the form of Type Studies stressed the organization of knowledge such that it could be integrated into the child's mind. The Type Study rested in a context which also focused upon conceptual teaching as opposed to the mere coverage of material. McMurry thus helped develop and reinforce basic concepts which continue into the late twentieth century. Teaching for concept development and emphasizing the organization of knowledge, the role of the social disciplines, problem solving and inquiry, as well as unit teaching itself constitute major interests, concerns, and practices in the field of elementary social studies. While not privy to the language and theo-
retical constructs of the late twentieth century, McMurry’s thoughts appear surprisingly supple, flexible, and cognizant of dimensions crucial to effective instruction. McMurry established himself as a figure of national prominence who touched the professional lives of thousands of teachers. Through his Type Study efforts McMurry addressed the needs of his time and helped establish, elaborate, and reinforce notions concerning social studies curriculum similar to problems of the late twentieth century.

Notes

1 VU will be used to designate McMurry’s Vanderbilt University Special Collections papers after the first Vanderbilt citation. McMurry’s papers at Northern Illinois University are now available to researchers on microfilm. In cases which the researcher found data using the microfilm version, the reel and frame number are cited. NIU will be used to indicate McMurry’s papers from Northern Illinois University following the first Northern Illinois University citation.

2 McMurry viewed himself as an Herbartian disciple. However, he was well read in contemporary and historical educational thinkers. He integrated concepts from other educators into his works. Upon his return to the United States in 1888, he used his relationship with Dr. E. J. James of the University of Pennsylvania to receive letters of introduction to visit G. Stanley Hall, Nicholas Murray Butler, Woodrow Wilson and others. Herbartian thought is often viewed in terms of a Locke-Herbert-Thorndike axis. Bayles and Hood (1966) provide a fine synopsis of McMurry and Thorndike as well as Dewey and others. Thorndike took scientific pedagogy much further than the Herbartians and Charles McMurry. Thorndike rose to prominence after McMurry’s career was well under way.

3 McMurry worked at Illinois State Normal University at Normal from 1892 to 1899. While at Normal, McMurry spent one year on leave at the University of Chicago. He moved to Northern Illinois State Normal School (DeKalb) in 1899 remaining until his move to Peabody in 1915. At Northern Illinois, McMurry took a five year leave of absence which he used to write. In addition, McMurry taught summer school at numerous colleges and universities including Arkansas, Cornell, Chicago, Columbia, Illinois, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Carolina, Peabody, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

4 Frank McMurry accompanied Charles to Germany, imbibed Herbartian concepts, earned his doctorate, and remained a year longer before returning to the United States.

5 The words type studies were used in summarizing the value of types (p.279). However, it does not appear that they intended to introduce the term Type Studies in the sense used in this discussion. The
adoption of the term Type Study emerges systematically in subsequent works of Charles McMurry.

6 Any discussion of curriculum and instruction raises questions of the relationship of the figure under study to John Dewey. The Type Study definition seems similar to Dewey’s concept of surrounding occupations. McMurry used such terms in some of his early works dealing with third and fourth grade geography. Type Studies such as the Panama Canal did not have the obvious, direct physical immediacy to children. However, McMurry used type studies in the intermediate grades as opposed to primary grades. McMurry and Dewey knew each other from their extensive involvement in the National Herbart Society (later named The National Society for the Scientific Study of Education) and at annual meetings of the National Education Association. McMurry quoted Dewey in the 1924 revised edition The Elements of General Method. McMurry dealt with issues related to the Herbartian concept of interest and Dewey’s concept of interest (pp. 118-119). He also dealt with Dewey’s thoughts of “Interest as related to Will” (pp.307-309, 313-314). Like other Herbartians, McMurry dropped he culture epochs component of Herbartian theory once discredited by Dewey. However, McMurry maintained a consistent focus throughout his career based upon the Herbartian principles which he espoused. The ultimate determinants in McMurry’s conceptual landscape were shaped during his doctoral studies in Germany.

7 Frank McMurry enjoyed the higher status of positions at the University of Illinois and Teachers College of Columbia University. He was more savvy than his older brother and served as a sounding board for Charles in important career decisions. Frank McMurry’s played a crucial role as intermediary in Charles McMurry’s move to Peabody in 1915. Frank’s role in Charles’ move to Peabody will be detailed in a future discussion of the 1927 50th anniversary celebration. Peabody offered a substantially higher income and higher status from Northern Illinois State Normal University. Peabody was nationally known and considered the premier teacher training institution of the South.

8 Philander P. Claxton was also the former United States Commissioner of Education. Claxton held the position of Commissioner during the issuance of the 1916 NEA Report on the Social Studies in Secondary Education.

9 Hilda Taba (1904-1967) occupies a significant place in the history of elementary social studies through her substantial work in the realm of teaching critical thinking, inquiry, and the application of the spiral concept to curriculum scope and sequence. Isham (1982) suggested that Taba received “...too little credit and too little recognition from her colleagues...” (p.108). He briefly traced Taba’s career including the Eight Year Study, The Ohio State University, the University of Chicago, and San Francisco State College. Her involvement with The
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Project in Intergroup Education in Cooperating Schools, the Center for the Study of Intergroup Relations, and her work with the Contra Costa (California) County Schools which resulted in the Taba Social Science Program.
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Abstract

By its very nature the social studies curriculum has as a major emphasis the task of preparing students for citizenship. In order to successfully prepare students for this task, teachers must be adequately prepared to provide a learning environment that encourages inquiry and that deals with the most pressing problems facing each group. As a result of dealing with controversial issues, teachers must also be prepared to deal with possible challenges to the curriculum content. To what degree should social studies preservice teachers be prepared to deal with the issue of academic freedom? A recent survey of social studies methods professors indicated general agreement that preservice teachers should be required to investigate academic freedom issues and most reported that they provided the experience in their methods courses. Social studies methods professors were less certain, however, as to whether preservice teachers were aware of academic freedom issues that occurred within their field placements.

Academic freedom, the right of a teacher to teach and a learner to learn without interference from political authorities or countervailing public opinion, has a long and somewhat turbulent history. Although there is no reason to believe that the denial of academic freedom to Socrates in the fifth century B.C. was a unique instance, his trial and
death still serve as a reminder that teaching youth to think critically and reflectively has been and continues to be viewed by many as a challenge both to the existing order and to prevailing traditional beliefs. The importance of this democratic value of providing students free inquiry to access information and acquire knowledge was emphasized by Lawrence Metcalf (1963) in his analysis of A. F. Griffin's work on the influence of reflective theory on the preparation of high school history teachers. Metcalf stated, "Democracies cannot justify the suppression of knowledge, and if they consider doubt to be the beginning of all knowledge, they must encourage doubt" (1963, p. 934).

The democratic value of providing students free inquiry to access information and acquire knowledge is the basis of our democratic system of government. In 1936 Dewey reminded us of the consequences associated with restricting academic freedom. He pointed out that "Since freedom of mind and freedom of expression are the root of all freedom, to deny freedom in education is a crime against democracy" (p. 165). Since the task of preparing students for citizenship is the major emphasis of the social studies curriculum, social studies teachers must be especially mindful that they can only perform their duty when they and their students are free to question and think critically. The purpose of this study was to determine teacher educators' perceptions of the extent to which preservice teachers of social studies were being prepared to identify the issues of academic freedom and prepared for possible challenges in their classrooms.

Review of the Literature

Reports from early meetings of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) indicate that the concern of social studies teachers in terms of academic freedom seems to have changed little over time. Jack Nelson and William Stanley (1985) revisited reports from what was described as the liveliest session of the 1935 NCSS meeting, a session that dealt with teacher freedom and the freedom of teaching. Nelson and Stanley (1985) reviewed the work of Beale who, writing in 1936, examined a list of forces that restrict academic freedom. These forces were primarily the same economic, social, and political forces that are evident today. Beale pointed out that ... "No understanding of the problem of freedom can be attained without thorough knowledge of the forces that dominate the schools" (Beale, 1936, p. x).

Nelson and Stanley used Beale's list to discuss academic restrictions that still exist for teachers. They indicated that "It would be difficult to argue that there has been improvement in the status of academic freedom for social studies teachers over the past half-century" (1985, p. 663). However, on the positive side they pointed out that NCSS had adopted a strong statement supporting the freedom to teach and
the freedom to learn and had established an academic freedom fund, and that other groups including The American Civil Liberties Union and the American Association of University Professors had been active in academic freedom cases of teachers (p. 664). Nelson and Stanley concluded that:

...for many social studies teachers, these attempts at protection are insufficient or unknown. The profession has not evolved a sense of the necessity for academic freedom and the actions required to attain it. It is a subject seldom covered in the professional textbooks used in teacher education courses; it is almost never covered in courses taken in history and the social sciences; most social studies teachers do not belong to NCSS or ACLU; and the long U.S. tradition of teachers as second-class citizens who are expected to be passive, docile, and apolitical acts against the vigilance needed to assure that teachers have freedoms. (1985, p. 664)

In a doctoral study on the patterns and perceptions of censorship among secondary educators, Daly (1986) found that teachers were unwilling to exercise academic freedom because they anticipated being penalized. They identified both local and national sources ready and able to respond quickly to restrict the teachers who choose to exercise this freedom. Teachers reported that they had no confidence that anyone, within the school or the larger community, would come to their defense if they were challenged. They instead chose self-censorship as a way to avoid controversy and possible penalties in an environment that they perceived as hostile to the exercise of academic freedom.

The expectation by teachers of limited support from administrators appears to be legitimate (Daly, 1991). In a study of the influence of administrators on the teaching of social studies, Daly (1991) reported that teachers may in fact recognize that support from administrators may not materialize if they get in trouble with the community. Daly's study of New Jersey chief school administrators found that administrative support for social studies objectives may not offer much protection for teachers in classrooms. He reported that "While indicating support for [social studies] objectives, well over one-half of the administrators also indicated that teachers should avoid any discussion or materials presenting an unbalanced point of view" (p. 276). The attempt to avoid one-sided materials seemed to preclude dealing with controversy by reading from several alternate sources. Rather than balancing the program by exposing students to materials strongly expressive of various points of view, the presumption appeared to be that a summary of "both" sides be presented. Daly pointed out that
such materials "are likely to be neutral in tone, expressing two points of view, without the passion and conviction often associated with controversy" (p. 276).

Katz (1987) pointed out that academic freedom at the elementary and secondary level is a complex issue and difficult to define. She quoted Albert Shanker's response to a report on Academic Freedom in Pre-College Education issued by AAUP. Shanker said:

There is a tension between a teacher's academic freedom and a community's right to prescribe an appropriate curriculum for its students;...between the school board's right to set a curriculum and a parent's right to determine what is appropriate for his child. (cited in Katz, 1987, p. 433)

The classroom teacher is always caught in the dilemma of assuring that education in a democracy is open to conflicting ideas and controversial issues, but also trying to assure that the individual rights of students and parents are also respected. Since most teachers are aware of the existing political realities in the communities in which they teach, the perceived realities exert a great deal of influence on the academic freedom practiced by teachers in most social studies classrooms. The realities of the classroom have been highlighted in a recent Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) publication, Who's in Charge? Teachers' Views on Control Over School Policy and Classroom Practices. According to the findings reported in the OERI publication, only "24 percent of teachers in large cities believed they had much influence over curriculum—compared to 40 percent in both small towns and rural areas" (cited in Feistritzer Publications, 1994, p. 3).

In a four-state survey of secondary teachers of social studies (Evans et al., 1994), 79.8 percent reported a perception of support from their communities for the freedom to teach what they believe to be important. While this perception of support appears to be high, there are reasons for concern. This support was perceived to be strong by only 19.7 percent and as moderately supportive by slightly more than 58 percent. Strong support from administrators was anticipated by less than 40 percent and from other teachers by a little over 47 percent. Most teachers perceived that there was "indifference" and "apathy" to academic freedom issues within their own communities. "Indifference" and "apathy" were words repeatedly cited in the written comments from all four states. Comments from all of the states suggested that subtle warnings from the community indicated that support was dependent on what topics and issues were addressed rather than a philosophical belief in and support for the academic freedom of teachers and students.
There is little evidence in the literature that teacher educators have responded to the issue of academic freedom in the preservice preparation of new social studies teachers and teachers in general. In a study reported by Richard Gross (1984), academic freedom was not included in the list of topics most commonly mentioned. Likewise, the term "academic freedom" does not appear in a review of research studies concerning the education of social studies teachers in Handbook of Research on Social Studies Teaching and Learning (Adler, 1991). In a study completed by Evans, Mitchell, Daly, and Roach (1996) that investigated the inclusion of academic freedom issues within the curriculum of teacher education programs, only 30.2 percent of the preservice students responding to the questionnaire indicated that the concept of academic freedom was addressed in their professional education courses. Furthermore, only 19.2 percent of the respondents felt that the concept was a formal part of a course and when presented, the concept appeared most often in an educational foundations course. Students participating in the study were completing their student teaching experience and represented a broad spectrum of disciplines.

Although the concept "academic freedom" appears to be missing from the literature pertinent to the preparation of social studies teachers and does not appear in the Standards for the Preparation of Social Studies Teachers (National Council for the Social Studies, 1992), academic freedom is implied in the following statements within the Standards, "Candidates...should have gained substantial understanding...of differing value perspectives, including global and multicultural perspectives...Problem solving, critical thinking, and application skills should be stressed" (p. 272). Dealing with these topics and issues requires that candidates be aware of potential challenges to their use in real classrooms. An understanding of the concept of academic freedom is essential when reflecting on this reality.

Rationale for the Current Study

At the present time, there appears to be an increased number of attacks on classroom teachers in terms of their academic freedom. Although it may be true that teachers have more rights than in the past, there appears to be a groundswell of opposition to many actions by school districts and/or teachers.

The latest and most comprehensive study of the attacks on the freedom to learn, Attacks on the Freedom to Learn 1992-1993 Report (People for the American Way, 1993), indicated that the challengers to academic freedom were more active in 1992-93 than at any time during the 11-year history of the report. According to the report findings, 395 incidents were reported in 44 states in all regions of the country. Three hundred forty-five of these were cases of attempted censorship, where
Academic Freedom and the Preparation of Teachers
demands were made to remove or to restrict curricula or library mate-
rials for all students. Unfortunately, the censors succeeded at a high
rate; 41 percent of the challenged materials were removed or restricted
in some fashion (p. 5-6).

The range of materials challenged and the reason for objection to
the materials were fairly broad. The most frequent target was self-es-
teem programs; however, also challenged were classic novels, sex edu-
cation and drug abuse prevention programs, plays, films, student newspa-
papers, and school reform initiatives. Those who were making the chal-
lenges were most often described as right-wing political organizations
often assisting local groups who describe their efforts as a defense of
"parents' rights." Usually, their objections to materials centered on
religious issues. However, the treatment of human sexuality and off-
censive language were also important objections (People for the Ameri-
can Way, 1993, p. 6).

Many classroom teachers who have been challenged in terms of
their materials or teaching strategies have been unprepared for the
challenge. An actual classroom experience that illustrates the degree
of unpreparedness was described by Marzano (1994) in which he felt
he was being viewed by parents and the community as a conspirator.
Although the challenge itself comes as a surprise to many teachers, the
way in which challenges occur is equally a surprise. In the past, a com-
munity group consisting of a few people might oppose the curriculum
or practices; however, the groups that are currently curtailing academic
freedom are well organized and well funded and in many cases serve
a national constituency. It is happening in large school districts in states
that have traditionally been considered leaders of educational change
as well as in small conservative, traditional school districts.

As our preservice students prepare to go into their own class-
rooms as social studies teachers, they need to be aware of the dangers
they will face in terms of their own academic freedom. Furthermore,
they need to be reminded of their obligations to the nation, the com-
munity in which they choose to teach, their students, and to their pro-
fession as they become teachers. In addition, they need to understand
how to protect themselves and their students from undue criticism and
control. This understanding will not just happen, it must be empha-
sized in preservice as well as in inservice education programs. Whitson
(1994) reminds us that most preservice, in addition to most experienced
teachers, believe censorship is not a problem.

Methods

In order to ascertain teacher educators' perceptions of the extent
to which preservice teachers of social studies were being prepared to
deal with issues of academic freedom, a questionnaire was distributed
to 200 social studies methods professors throughout the United States. The questionnaire consisted of four parts with the first requesting demographic information related to gender, age, years of teaching experience, highest degree held, and whether the subject worked in a private or public institution. Two components consisted of forced choice questions related to whether the college/university methods professor addresses academic freedom issues and if not why. The fourth component included forced choice and open-ended questions which were to be responded to by college/university methods professors who addressed issues of academic freedom. Participants in the study were encouraged to provide comments relevant to each question in the fourth component.

The questionnaire was distributed during the spring of 1993 to 200 members of the College and University Faculty Association of the National Council for the Social Studies. Names were taken from the 1993 membership list, and questionnaires were sent to all members except those whose title indicated they were probably not involved in teaching social studies methods courses. A follow-up post card was sent to all recipients of the questionnaire encouraging those who had not responded to do so. By the end of May 1993, 122 questionnaires were received and all were entered into the data analysis. When interpreting the data the reader must be mindful of the 61 percent return rate. A higher return rate could have altered the results of the study if the nonrespondents had returned the questionnaires with markedly different responses (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Data Source

The analysis of the demographic data consisted of a frequency count and percentages, with the percentages being based upon the number of individuals who responded to the specific question. A majority of the respondents, 54 percent, had taught more than 15 years, Table 1; and 79 percent taught both elementary and secondary social

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+ years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
studies methods courses or just secondary social studies methods, Table 2.

Table 2
Type of Methods Course Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/Middle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/Secondary</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-seven respondents were not teaching social studies methods at the time the questionnaire was administered. Seventy-one percent of the respondents were male, and 91 percent of the respondents were over 40 years of age. Ninety-four percent had earned the EdD/PhD and 84 percent worked in public institutions. Thirty-nine states were represented.

Seventy-eight percent of the respondents, Table 3, dealt with issues related to academic freedom. Of those who did not deal with the issue: (a) 25 percent did not consider the issues to be a major concern to the schools; (b) 61 percent considered them an important priority but found it difficult to focus on them considering everything else they had to cover; and (c) 14 percent provided other reasons. Of the 14 percent providing other reasons, the most frequent response was that the issues were covered in other courses: e.g., foundation, curriculum, and political science.

Table 3
Extent Academic Freedom Issues are Addressed by Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not specifically address academic freedom</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does specifically address academic freedom</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the faculty members who addressed the issue of academic freedom, Table 4, 48 percent addressed the issue on a systematic basis; 38 percent addressed the issue as it arose; and 15 percent addressed the issue both systematically and as the issue arose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Extent Academic Freedom Issues are Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematically</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As circumstances arise</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The varied issues related to academic freedom were addressed in a variety of contexts including class discussions, simulations, guest speakers, and incidents from field experiences. Faculty members who included academic freedom related issues in their courses included such issues as values teaching, right to dissent, censorship, handling controversial issues, selection of materials and methods, and religious indoctrination. Whether addressed by the methods professor or not, 84 percent of the respondents felt that preservice teachers should be required to investigate issues related to academic freedom.

While there was strong support for requiring students to investigate issues related to academic freedom, students must be able to connect theory with practice and identify academic freedom issues in the classroom setting. When asked whether students were aware of academic freedom issues in their field placements, only 57 percent of those responding to the questions indicated yes, Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Are Students Aware of Academic Freedom Issues in the Field?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to determine if there was a relationship between any of the demographic variables and whether issues of academic freedom were addressed by social studies methods professors. The results of the analysis indicated that institutional setting was the only demographic variable that was significantly related to whether issues of academic freedom were addressed by social studies methods professors (p < .0386). The direction of the relationship was negative with social studies methods professors in private institutions more likely to address the issues than those in public institutions. The results of an additional analysis showed that all the professors from private institutions, 20, specifically addressed issues related to academic freedom.

### Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Institution and Addressing Issues of Academic Freedom</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.691</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 4.420  p < .05  Sig F = .0386

**Conclusions And Implications**

It seems understandable that 84 percent of the teacher educators surveyed would report that academic freedom ought to be studied by the preservice teachers. The students are being educated both in university classrooms and through field experiences to join a professional culture that cannot avoid the issue. However, in a field that focuses on issues that by their very nature have the potential to be controversial, it is disconcerting that 22 percent of social studies methods professors who responded to the questionnaire did not address academic freedom issues in their methods course. While concerns can be raised about an absence of experiences related to academic freedom issues in social studies methods courses, this absence appears to be wide spread in teacher education programs (Evans et al., 1996).

The question concerning the percentage of social studies methods professors not addressing academic freedom issues is compounded by the fact that all these professors were from public institutions. This finding raises the following question: Are there fundamental differences in the structure of social studies methods courses or the pedagogy component of teacher education programs at private and public institutions and/or values held by the professors as they relate to the
issues? This question needs to be investigated as 17 of the professors from public institutions considered the issues important but found it difficult to focus on them considering everything else they had to cover.

In addition to the number of social studies methods professors who were not addressing the issue of academic freedom in their courses, another concern is the low number of professors, 57 percent, who reported that their students were aware of academic freedom issues in their field placements. Such a response compounds the fact that issues of academic freedom are not addressed in some methods courses and raises a question regarding the level of involvement of methods professors in the field placements of their students. Furthermore, this low response of awareness adds credence to the perception of a gulf between schools and universities (Leming, 1989) with universities being considered the "ivory tower," all theory and nothing practical (Smith & Auger, 1985-1986).

How can we prepare students to use materials and methods that have been or are likely to continue to be challenged by individuals and organizations if academic freedom concerns are not more strongly a part of the preservice culture? The absence of such study would surely make problematic the contention by Aronowitz and Giroux (1994) that teachers be involved in a systematic and analytical examination of how the nation can promote democratic ideals and principles in a multicultural and multiracial society.

In a field that by its nature deals with controversy, preservice teacher education that does not prepare students for addressing that controversy presents a problematic situation for future teachers. "The foremost aim of instruction in high-school social studies is to help students reflectively examine issues in the problematic areas of American culture" (Hunt & Metcalf, 1996, pp. 110-111), and the ability to achieve this aim is impacted by students' exposure to conflicting propositions. Therefore, it is essential that the content and experiences of social studies methods courses include specific strategies, materials, and procedures for planning, teaching, and assessing those issues commonly associated with the social studies.

People for the American Way (1994) reported that two thousand censorious organizations exist and these organizations are actively engaged in challenging much of what is promoted for social studies classrooms: collaborative learning, critical thinking, simulation games, and role playing. In such an arena preservice candidates would be well served to be familiar with the rationale and concept of academic freedom. Indeed, Nelson (1990) suggested that academic freedom is the most significant concept for teachers to understand and value. Preservice teachers in the field need to deal with the concept as it influences learning, teaching, and expressing ideas in a setting rich in controversy. That so many members of the preeminent social studies orga-
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Organization for teacher educators do not address the issue seems to deprive students of needed and valuable knowledge. It suggests the need to find out how extensively the issue is dealt with by other social studies teacher educators who are not members of the NCSS affiliated unit the College and University Faculty Association (CUFA).

Preservice candidates need more than instructional skills and content knowledge. They must be able to recognize and resist the influences and pressures that can combine to deny important knowledge to their students. As Leming (1989) demonstrated, socialization needs are cited by many in the field as dominant. It is only by exploring the implications of maintaining the status quo, and or analyzing the pressures from the political left and right, at the local, state, or nation level, that preservice candidates can develop compelling rationales for designing, teaching, and assessing in ways that satisfy the needs and interests of the students with whom they will work.
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A RESPONSE TO BLUM'S "DIVERSE" PLOT OF HISTORY

Lynda Stone
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Introduction

The philosopher, Sir Karl Popper (1969/1994) in answer to a persistent question about the nature of history asserts that "there is a plot". Named "historicism," he explains:

[The plot]...in keeping with the whole structure of European thought...is fundamentally theological in origin...despite anti-religious movements, despite the French Revolution, despite the rise of science. For the naturalistic revolution replaced the name 'God' with the name 'Nature', but left almost everything else unchanged. Later Hegel and Marx replaced the goddess Nature, in her turn, by goddess History. So we get laws of History—powers, forces, tendencies, designs, and plans of History. (p. 131)

Historicism, for Popper, incorporates a nineteenth century hegemony of determinism, but as well, more general "spirits" of ages. These spirits, of the age of space, of mass communication to name recent appellations, are themselves "theories of intrinsic historical progress or regress....that explain at least partly...the actions and the sayings of the men living in that age" (pp. 131-132). Ages are segments of what Popper identifies overall as the historicist plot of the growth of knowledge.¹

There is a plot of history too in the eloquent and elegantly-crafted essay from historian Mark Blum, "Continuity and Discontinuity, Change and Duration: Hobbes' Riddle of the Theseus and the Diversity of Historical Logic" (TRSE, 24(4), Fall 1996). Part and parcel of the larger vision that Popper critiques, it is one of a 'unitary' narrative called history substantiated by a sub-plot of an isomorphic structure between history and human psychology. In this response, elements of the plot are themselves made problematic: the suggestion is that Blum's diversity is itself a unity, and moreover that one must call this unity, this totality, into question. To do so moves theory of history in a postmodern direction; to present a contemporary theory—one that is indeed theories (read plots)—is the responsibility of history educators today. Pertinently, to raise these issues is not to say that there is not much to admire in Blum's account. To his credit, he seeks
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to diversify conceptual and pedagogical understandings of the narrative
of history. The purpose is succinctly summed:

[T]he pluralistic challenge of the present finds in the variety of
historical logics a means of integrating differences into a comple-
mentary, common whole...[Furthermore] a recognition of the
coexistence of differing historical logics will help create through
its metacognitive clarification of historical order a greater un-
derstanding of the day to day conflicts with...[one's] fellows.
(Blum, 1996, p. 384)

These are sections that follow: (1) Blum’s Plot, (2) Critique, (3) New His-
toricism, and (4) Conclusion.

Blum’s Plot

Blum posits a plot of history, one he envisions as pendulum swings
across different time periods about the temporal meaning of events that
correspond to what “the majority in the culture recognize as the most ef-
efective perspective for its immediate needs” (p. 366). Furthermore, he of-
er that present times have something tacitly in common with those of the
seventeenth century philosopher, Thomas Hobbes. As then, these are times
of conflict; then as now “people’s judgments of the same events were mark-
edly different” (Ibid.).

The plot is sophisticated and substantiated. Here is its logic: (1) His-
tory is a narrative, a tracking from A to B (p. 360). (2) Within this narrative,
temporal ordering privileges either continuity and discontinuity, each con-
taining either duration or change as an ordering principle (pp. 366-367). (3)
Both logics exist at the same time whether individuals know this or not
(p. 367). (4) Furthermore, persons of an age (and their historians) favor
“what is objective...[and] common to all...[or] what is subjective...[and]
particular to each individual” (p. 362). (5) This follows from the influence
of the social and cultural milieu and also from highly personalized styles
within the same milieu (p. 363). (6) “The present cultural atmosphere with
its poststructural and feminist critiques of historical truth...are evidence of
a pendulum shift towards...[the subjective pole,] the recognition and in-
creasing interest in the role of personal judgment in the construction of
historical reality” (pp. 362-363). (7) Each person’s logically reasoned in-
sight into an event contributes to a complementary larger and more com-
plete picture (pp. 367-368).

Thus, as I take it, Blum’s historical plot is a totalizing unity, a com-
plete picture that he substantiates even as he suggests a diversity of logics.
Here is elaboration:
Each historical logic sheds a differing, valuable light upon an issue; each augments one's understanding of the issue that is common to all. This singularity can in its complementing potential help build a better world in common with others, because without each particular judgment the world would lack something. (p. 384)

Terms such as “common whole,” “singularity” and “a world with lack” begin to substantiate a unitary claim. Contributing sources include the cognitive and linguistic, universally-developmental structuralisms of Piaget and Chomsky (pp. 369, 370).

Even more pertinent to Blum’s plot are a particular reading of the linguistic turn and, as well, a reliance on the philosopher, Edmund Husserl’s phenomenological notion of “time stretch.” Blum asserts, “Contemporary historical practice has begun to acknowledge the centrality of an individual’s meaning systems in the construction of what that person deems an ‘objective’ event”(p. 361). From historian John Toews (1987), this acknowledgement is named “the linguistic turn,” “a catchword for a renewed attention to the problematic role of personal judgment in the formulation of historical facts as well as in the interpretation of these facts” (pp. 361-362). For Blum, this is evidence of a cultural swing to “the subjective pole,” as it relates to a diversity of logics. Here he is again: “Historical logic...[is] the ordering of events by criteria that demonstrate degrees of continuing identity or constant diversity...[i.e. non-identity]. A historical narrative is an ordering of events with a recurrent preference...[for one or the other]” (p. 364). As indicated also, each pole contains not only “its own distinct value” (p. 362), but most significantly for this critique, “[a] common objectivity...[either objective or subjective that] seeks to unify diversity” (Ibid.).

Moreover, historical logic is temporal ordering, since from Husserl, “logic is at its most fundamental level the relationships of parts and wholes to each other” (p. 365). Such a whole is the temporal-spatial flux. The point continues: “Considering a moment of interaction of persons in history as connected in an enduring manner to similar institutional purposes and values can be viewed as identifying these persons as ‘part’ of a greater ‘whole’”(Ibid.). This whole, this unity, is history—its narrative, its plot.

Critique

Blum’s plot of narrative history, a unity out of diversity, is based on interpretations of the linguistic turn and Husserl’s phenomenology of a temporal-spatial whole. Questions arise when these two substantive bases are further explored. A way to frame critique is to suggest that Blum presumes a kind of structuralist or formalist history rather than one poststructuralist (as he implies, p. 362). First there is the unifying purpose
as tied to the cognitive structuralism of Husserl. The latter's position is instructive of Blum's own stance since what is posited is a universal processing structure of the mind that organizes time and space into a continuous totality. But three further points are important: one is that, for Husserl, persons are not cognizant of this ordering since it is an abstraction and can only be got at by "bracketing" experience and meaning. Two is that this ordering is not history although persons live in and through history. Rather than "horizons" of individual cognition, history is one of culturally-organized "regional ontologies"; both are part of a "life-world". Three is that given cognitive structures as primary, Husserl cannot be said precisely to take part in the linguistic turn, although his idealistic transcendentalism might place him at Blum's subjective pole.

More on the linguistic turn is especially helpful. Blum's source, Toews begins his own explication with a definition of history from William Bowsma as one of "all efforts to discover or to impose meaning on our experience" (Bowsma, 1981, p. 283). At first glance, this resonates with aspects of Blum's stance: history is the personal narratives of intellectuals just as "man...[(sic) is] a creator of meanings" (p. 288). However, Toews continues that after the linguistic turn, this creation takes language, not psychology, as logically primary: "Language can no longer be construed as simply a medium, relative or potentially transparent, for the representation or expression of a reality outside of itself" (Toews, 1987, pp. 881-882). As the philosopher, Ian Hacking (1975) puts it, language no longer is "merely a tool by which experiences are shared, no longer even the interface between the knower and the known, but...[is] that which constitutes human knowledge (p. 187)." History, in the current parlance, becomes discourse.

Furthermore, as Toews too describes, discourse itself changes within the linguistic turn. One characterization poses two turn-phases. A first phase, apparently adopted by Blum, is positivist/structuralist in which foundations of language issues and forms are sought and language is 'privileged'. While not easily recognized in his "subjective pole," nonetheless privilege occurs in the universal psychology that underlies individual, historical logics combined as history. A second phase is postpositivist/poststructuralist in which language is antifoundational and "deprivileged". Today, in a stance taken by many intellectual/cultural historians, language is ambiguous and tentative and thus meaning of experience is always, at the least, partially unknowable. Both in a technical and non-technical way, language is 'deconstructed'.

New Historicism

Popper's plot, from the introduction, is by him critiqued as not discovered in history but instead chosen by humans responsible for their actions. His point is to emphasize "the improbablity and fragility of these (progressive) developments" (1969, 1994, p. 136) that could well have been
otherwise. One notes this is still a laudable plot, one with "the motif of emancipation through knowledge...[that seems] worth choosing" (Ibid.).

Blum appears to agree with Popper, first that historical logic is a human choice, and furthermore with him that there is more than one choice. To emphasize, on the one hand, for Blum this choice is diverse within a unitary, psychologically-based structure of history. There is an equation of historical narrative with human consciousness. On the other hand, for Popper this choice is "pluralist", from a philosophy that poses a logical 'similarity' between science and social science and places history within this logic.

To these two traditions in the twentieth century, a third is now added. It is not only anti-foundational but also rhetorical and anti-representational, according to literary historian and cultural critic, Hayden White (1975, 1978). Herein history is a literary artifact, a creation of the ambiguous nature of language itself. For explanation, White turns first to Levi-Strauss, for whom a base is a human impulse to mythologize that is founded in language. Here is White:

[Levi-Strauss] locates the impulse to mythologize in...the manifestly figurative nature of that form of discourse which is called "poetry" by "civilized" man....[and which is] as readily realistic as such forms of prose discourse as historiography. (p. 104)

In a rhetorical view, concepts of poetry and prose are conflated in a general theory of language in which content and form are intertwined. White elaborates, "the extent to which what...[historians] say about their subjects is inextricably bound up, if not identical, with how they say it" (p. 105). History becomes a "sign-system" with two simultaneous directions, one toward a set of events to be described and the other toward a "generic story form to which it tacitly likens the set in order to disclose its formal coherence" (p. 106). White's position is to posit that all historians employ such a sign-system even if they do not recognize it. For him, a set of basic figurative tropes identify various historical consciousnesses (see p. 107).

In this rhetorical move, discursive function turns from validation to signification (Hutcheon, 1988, p. 96). White's reading of the linguistic turn differs from that of Blum as the former begins to suggest the 'deprivileging phase' referred to above. Language is basically figurative rather than literal. This results, I believe, in two different "plots" of history. Blum's is unitary, although with diverse elements. In a significant way, White also recognizes unities, since specific tropes have characterized specific past ages. But here, a distinction in the nature of language is vital. For White, all tropes are rhetorical and ambiguous: this is not an isomorphic vision of cognitive structure and logic. A movement toward poststructuralism and postmodernism is suggested as signification it itself "deconstructed."
According to literary theorist, Linda Hutcheon (1988),

the postmodern challenges our beliefs in origins and ends, unity, and totalization, logic and reason, consciousness and human nature, progress and fate, representation and truth, not to mention notions of causality and temporal homogeneity, and linearity, and continuity. (p. 87)

For Hutcheon, the inquiries of French philosophical historian, Michel Foucault exemplify much of the postmodern direction. She writes, “Michel Foucault has asked us to look at things differently... [Within discourses the] study of anonymous forces of dissipation replaces that of individual ‘signed’ events and accomplishments made coherent by retrospective narrative” (p. 97). From Foucault, difference is a beginning, as he puts it in “[conceiving] the Other in the time of our own thought” (Foucault, 1969, 1972, p. 12). Throughout his work, difference/otherness plays out in three methods and in a general vision of history; basic to all is deprivileged language.

Foucault’s project is to breakup the totality of history through processes of difference, displacement and dispersion. Indeed, there is historical documentation that mutation has broken up any plot of teleology, evolution or progress. Overturned is the idea of history as a continuous unity since any historical event can be other-interpreted. To do this, Foucault “uncovers the underlayers of what is kept suppressed and unconscious in and throughout history—the codes and assumptions of order, the structures of exclusion that legitimate...[specific forms of power/knowledge/subjectivity], by which societies achieve their identities” (Appignanesi and Garrett, 1995, p. 83). Across more than twenty years and many particular inquiries, the late Foucault decenters the unitary, monologic of western thought, first through diverse methods and then through studies of marginality. Topics of inquiry include madness, criminality, governmentality, and sexuality.

A bit more on Foucault is useful for comparison to Blum as well as to Popper. To do this, his project must be located within the tradition of French structuralism-poststructuralism, within neo-Freudianism, and in response to post-Marxism. Discourse is primary as it transgresses in typically ambiguous fashion documentation (utterances and inscriptions) of the past. Various kinds and levels of relations are revealed: knowledge regulations, power strategies, and self interiorizations of the first two exteriorizations. The three methods are archaeology, genealogy, and ethics. Overall transgression, the function of difference, undercut any totalizing process of human thought: implied is different logic, neither an isomorphic logic from Blum nor one dialectic. Undercut is any form of totalizing diversity or plurality. Multiple “narratives”, paradoxical and even contradictory, live ironically side by side.
Conclusion

This response to Mark Blum’s essay on the diversity of historical logic applauds his explication as a first step. But it suggests that pedagogical responsibility rests in presenting still other alternatives to a modern theory of unitary history. A first alternative is posited in the modern, largely nineteenth century, historicist frame critiqued by Popper that has its roots in “postpostivist” philosophy of science. A second alternative, one postmodern and poststructuralist, is advanced via White, Hutcheon, and Foucault. This arises from a rhetorical, literary tradition.

A concluding query asks the “so what,” and concerns the “need” for such a postmodern move and its understanding and at least suggestive presentation by history educators. Here the response becomes personal and ethical. First, I believe that educators are responsible for keeping their students “up-to-date,” especially (and arguably) since they already live in a postmodern world. Second, what is contemporary is to recognize that past theories of totalizing history have posited hierarchical unities. In these some persons’ experiences and meanings have been excluded—in the need itself for unity. Third, this totalizing has extended far beyond history to the very “logic” by which persons make sense of the world. Foucault’s insight is that difference and otherness have always “existed” and are always possible.

Finally this is not to ask that all teacher educators and teachers become philosophers who study history theory or historians who study the theoretical bases of their work. But it is to hope that we all desire a world wherein multiple experiences, meanings, and worldviews count. This is a hope not easily nor naively realized. We know this, as does Blum in his thoughtful and informative essay. The aim of this response has been to “historically” extend his contribution. In my view, the summary value of contemporary theorizings by Foucault and others is that a unifying-diversity of history is itself a problem for inquiry. The “plot” of history becomes potential “plots”.

Notes

1 The term historicism comes from nineteenth century German idealism and is often associated with Hegelian roots. With ties to evolutionary theory, characteristics variously employed are determinism, teleology, development, progress, and evolution itself. Popper’s reading is atypical for a “new historicism” (a term he does not employ) even as he supports indeterminancy. See Popper (1960), (1952, 1982), and as well Popper (1936, 1983).
Although not developed as part of this response, one notes Blum's binaries to which a critique of "cultural hierarchy" can be advanced. Again they form wholes but with privileged parts. Moreover, the "poles" put forward next are part of the same modernist schema. This is returned to in the conclusion.

Below I offer a different reading of the linguistic turn that suggests that the second phase of the linguistic turn (at the very least) alters the modern objective-subjective configuration. See Martin Jay (1982) for still another interpretation.

This use is confusing but the poles together form their own "objective" unity. While an idea of movement toward consonance or dissonance might also be posited, the key is whether a unity is basic. See Stone (1994) for an earlier discussion.

A brief statement about the life-world from Husserl is found in The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology (Husserl, 1954, 1970), originally written in the late thirties. See also David Carr's (1974) excellent explication of Husserl's conception of history.

Toews's own warning is that the textualists may have gone too far away from experience and meaning, but he does not retain a phenomenological account as does Blum.

Deconstruction is often employed as a kind of humanist analysis but is best understood as the project of Jacques Derrida. A key essay responding to structuralist linguistics is Differance (Derrida, 1972, 1991), also Jonathan Culler (1982).

See also a general and significant essay on the rhetorical nature of history from Dominick LaCapra (1985).

Blum notes White's contribution of "dialectical thought without a telic direction" but states his own preference for a teleological whole (p. 381). For additional essays see White (1987).


One notes important influences from Heidegger as well as Nietzsche.


I want to thank Carol Mavor and Marlene Szymona for references, Tom Popkewitz and Barry Franklin for conversation, Wayne Ross for the invitation to respond, and Mark Blum for his challenging essay.
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REJOINDER TO LYNDIA STONE
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The pre-Socratic word in Greece that was the ancestor of the term history was "historia", a concept that meant "inquiry", "research", or "empirical investigation" (Jaeger, 1945, pp. 155, 179). Herodotus introduces his account of the background and conduct of the Persian Wars with this word. Thucydides, in the same century in the first book of his Peloponnesian War offered close to a dozen inquiry methods to help establish empirically historical states of affairs. Among the methods was a form of linguistic analysis that enabled him to determine the differing Greek perspectives of their own cultural identity over time. Thucydides's empirical methodologies helped to establish an objective world by identifying similar and diverse patterns of existence distributed throughout the Greek populations. In the spirit of Heraclitus, he "held fast to what is common to all as a city holds fast to its law (Burnet, 1945, p. 75)." My linguistic-structuralist approach to multiple historical objectivities contributes to this historiographical vision: I argue that one can identify patterns of diverse historical logic in the language of individuals that are distributed throughout a population. Yet, Heraclitus who spoke for the "common" is also the renowned father of contingency "you cannot step twice into the same rivers; for fresh waters are ever flowing in upon you" (Burnet, 1945, p. 136). Lynda Stone is a genuine inquirer who with others (some not so gifted) probe Heraclitus' alternative view. Her synthesis of my historical standpoint in its basic assumptions is a truer abstract than I could have managed myself. Her succinct, yet thorough presentation of my argument and her own philosophy of history reminds me of Ernst Cassirer's review of Martin Heidegger's Kantbuch (1931). Cassirer writes in this review that one must always think through the position of one's philosophical adversary, drawing the other's premises and arguments to their ultimate conclusions. Moreover, one must respect the genuine conflict of positions as legitimate philosophical polarities to be studied in their persistent soundness, rather than seeking to be victorious in a contest of minds.

Stone's own "historia" builds from the premise of contingency. Her recent article on contingency and teaching (Stone, 1993) is proof of the value of her assumptions and their outcomes. The classroom becomes a person-centered experience where the teacher must make occasion for and comprehend the emotional, spiritual, and physical realities of students as well as their minds. Learning is a dialogue. Here Socrates and Diotima give the measure: what is truth is of the moment in its fullness. Stone offers empirical measures for this otherwise existential moment: one can reflect upon the contingencies of the immediate situation, of the socio-economic position of the participants, and of the dialogical relations among participants.
(1993, pp. 823ff.) As she points out in her response to my article, a "plot" unfolds among persons (Stone, 1997). Statistical studies will not be generated with these categories, but informative case histories will be. With Stone’s guidance the future classroom will approach the peripatetic depth of Socratic learning with a contemporary warrant. Unfortunately, the length allowed this response does not permit me to go on with how valuable I hold Stone’s contingent premise to be in teaching. She has shown me a positive side of postmodern thought, beyond its critical acumen. I must now speak for the value of what Stone has perceptively designated as my structuralist vision.

I treat language as primary evidence of thought in the spirit of the phenomenological pioneers who wrote in a time Stone calls "the first phase of the linguistic turn in the first part of this century (Stone, 1997)." Franz Brentano began this Austrian reemergence of phenomenology by probing the judgments that underlay the semantics of sentences (1904/1966). His students Sigmund Freud and Edmund Husserl in their separate paths created even finer tools for discerning the complex intentions embedded in the seemingly straightforward literal claims of the spoken and written sentence. Unlike Stone, I do not see this approach as surpassed by a second, postmodern phase that so relativizes language as to make a search for pattern impossible. The study of a person’s predications of reality in a thorough probing of how that predication can reveal time constructs not immediately apparent seems at a beginning. Husserl’s “time stretch” is the undergirding structure of temporal perception. Yes, it requires either a reflective “bracketing” or the kind of analysis of the written word I urge us all to conduct to expose what otherwise is not self-evident in the natural attitudes of life. As Stone correctly asserts, Husserl’s mature philosophy did not locate a person’s historical world in the “time stretch”, but only because he chose not to take up this rich insight of his earlier, part-whole logic. Rather, he turned to the generalized dynamics of how a “time stretch” progresses in mental imaging and memory in his later The Phenomenology of Internal Time Consciousness (1928/1966). The world was not yet ready for the extreme individuation implied by the singular “time stretch.” Only today is that receptiveness present, a receptiveness Stone articulates through the idea of radical contingency.

I have found through study of the career of thought of prominent persons, as well as in my longitudinal studies of adolescent youth, evidence in each person of a recurring pattern of historical logic. I am sure that each teacher who focuses upon the proto-philosophical time conceptions of their students, probing their actual predications in the manner I suggest, will begin to recognize such recurrences. While contingency prevails in the changing emotional, spiritual, and physical situations, positions, and relations of each person, daily if you will, a historical understanding that carries that person’s world view does not change. Identifying the student’s historical logic, comprehending it and teaching towards
it, can be as humane a step towards a better world as concerning oneself with the person's changing inner and outer life which Stone's pedagogy will cultivate. As Stone recognizes, both of us want "a world wherein multiple experiences, meanings, and worldviews count."
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I have been involved in research in social education for only about 10 years, not enough time to allow me to speak from personal experience about how the field has developed. However, I can offer a few thought-provoking comments by adopting an outsider's perspective—speaking as a person who worked in several other subfields of education before entering social studies. My personal research activities have encompassed applied developmental psychology, the social psychology of education, and generic aspects of effective teaching. Furthermore, my work as a co-director of research centers brought me into contact with scholarly communities concerned with the teaching and learning of language arts, mathematics, science, and the arts. This has given me some perspective on ways in which the scholarly community concerned with social education is similar to and different from these other scholarly communities. As I became involved in the social education community, much of what I encountered was familiar. However, there have been some noteworthy surprises.

One of the first things that I noticed was that scholarship in social studies was quite limited. The field was served by only a few small journals. Most scholarly writings were theoretical analyses or position pieces, not reports of empirical research. A few status reports on the field and collections of research reviews were available, but there was no comprehensive handbook or other embodiment of a coherent social studies education knowledge base.

I have since come to understand that the major reason for the relative paucity of research in the field has been limitations in human resources. The professoriate in social studies is simply much smaller than it is in language arts, mathematics, and science education. Leading universities that have three or four or more professors whose full-time interests lie in these subject areas are likely to have only one or two comparable people in social studies. Many social studies education courses are taught by professors with generic curriculum and instruction or teacher education backgrounds, often with little or no special knowledge about or interest in social education. I don't know the historical reasons for this discrepancy, but I do know that as a field we ought to be working to change it.

Another problem is the lack of perceived importance of social education that would translate into support for research in the field. Far more support is available for research on topics relating to mathematics or science education than social studies education. I am hopeful that some of the current concern about curriculum standards and stu-
dent achievement in social studies subjects and about deterioration in social and civic responsibility among the citizenry will enhance the perceived importance of social studies and lead to improvements in research funding opportunities. However, I also fear that these trends may lead to less desirable outcomes in addition or instead (overly detailed coverage of subject matter without focus on big ideas and their implications; imposition of ill-conceived character education programs).

One noteworthy deterrent to progress in improving the perception of social studies is the seemingly constant and often vituperative squabbling among factions within the social studies community. Allegiances often appear to be primarily to particular academic disciplines, special interest areas, or models of social education, and only secondarily to social studies education in general. This need not be the case. Science educators, for example, seem more united through primary allegiances to science education, even though their individual interests may focus on physics, biology, chemistry, environmental education, science/technology/society, or other subfields.

As I learned about social education, I was struck by the degree to which social studies educators insist on distinguishing between academic disciplines and school subjects. Leaders such as Shirley Engle have pointed out that an academic discipline is a community of inquiry that focuses on some particular content domain and generates increasingly differentiated and elaborated knowledge about it. The discipline focuses on expanding this specialized knowledge base, not on exploring its applications to everyday life or its connections with other forms of knowledge. In contrast, school subjects are collections of knowledge (including related skills, values, and dispositions) organized for instruction to K-12 students as preparation for everyday living and performance of adult roles in society. Although informed by the academic disciplines, school subjects are mechanisms for accomplishing citizen education, not generating disciplinary knowledge. Therefore, decisions about what ought to be included in the K-12 curriculum should be informed by deliberations about what constitutes basic knowledge that all citizens need to possess and be able to use. This knowledge should be consistent with disciplinary knowledge, but it should be selected, organized, and taught as citizen education, not as induction to an academic discipline.

If it were brought to their attention directly, most educators probably would agree with the analysis outlined in the previous paragraph. However, my experience has been that social studies educators are uniquely aware of the distinction between academic disciplines and school subjects, and uniquely insistent on maintaining this distinction in developing school programs. University-based educators concerned with the teaching and learning of other school subjects tend to be less aware of the distinction and more prone to try to finesse curricular issues by equating the K-12
teaching of their subjects with induction into their academic disciplines. Usually they do this only implicitly, although a few have done it explicitly and defended their choice. I believe that this choice leads to problematic curricular decisions that divert precious K-12 “air time” from content and activities that have general education value to overly detailed treatments or explorations of arcane knowledge likely to be of value only to future specialists in the discipline.

A related difference between social studies and other fields concerns the relative attention given to the three traditionally emphasized sources for the curriculum: discipline-based knowledge, the learner’s readiness, and society’s needs. My experience suggests that there are imbalances in attention to these three sources in different subfields of education. In educational psychology and in most of the subject-matter areas (mathematics education, science education, etc.), attention focuses on the first two sources. Most of the scholarly arguments are between those who advocate discipline-based knowledge and socializing students into the dispositions and processes of disciplined inquiry and those who believe that limitations in children’s cognitive development, prior knowledge, appreciation potential, and other readiness factors make the disciplinary approach unsuitable until at least the secondary grades. Much of the conflict in these fields focuses on issues relating to the relative feasibility and effectiveness of systematic instruction in codified knowledge versus discovering knowledge through inquiry or constructing it through discourse. There is little attention to issues of whether and how citizens of the society might use this knowledge. In contrast, social studies tends to focus on the first and third sources of the curriculum. Much of the conflict in the field pits those who believe that we can best prepare students for citizenship by providing them with a thorough grounding in history and the social science disciplines against those who believe that such preparation is better accomplished through a focus on social and civic inquiry, critical thinking, and decision making skills and dispositions. Neither faction pays much attention to student readiness issues (i.e., by conceding that their model might not be suitable for students below a certain grade level, suggesting that it might need to be phased in gradually, or explaining how the specifics of its implementation might evolve as student knowledge and expertise develop).

These imbalances need to be redressed. In addressing curricular issues, other educational subfields would benefit from more awareness of the distinction between disciplines and school subjects and more attention to what society will require from its citizens. Meanwhile, social studies would benefit from more attention to learner development and readiness issues.

As someone with a background in developmental psychology and a lot of experience in elementary classrooms, it is difficult for me to take seriously an advocated social edu-
cation model (e.g., social science, social issues, disciplined inquiry, etc.) if it is presented as the only model to be used in K-12 social studies. It would be more realistic to present models as components of the total social studies program, intended to be used mostly in certain teaching situations (i.e., when certain goals are appropriate given the ages of the students, the content base for the lesson, and what has been accomplished so far in the lesson, unit, or social studies program generally).

Social studies also would benefit from more comprehensive program models that feature multidimensional rather than dualistic thinking, call for reasonable content and process blends, and feature appropriate evolution in the nature of instruction and learning activities as students progress through lessons, units, courses, and grade levels. An analogy might help to convey what I have in mind here. Issues in beginning reading instruction are often misrepresented as a conflict between a whole language versus a phonics approach. There are two major problems with this formulation. First, it implies that there are only two choices, when in fact a comprehensive beginning reading program includes many elements besides those encompassed under the terms "whole language" and "phonics." Second, it implies a forced choice between two incompatible opposites, when in fact a complete and balanced beginning reading program includes both whole language and phonics components. Thus, rather than restrict our thinking about beginning reading instruction by asking whether the evidence favors a whole language or a phonics approach, we should be asking how effective comprehensive beginning reading programs are constructed and how these programs evolve as students progress through the grades. Parallel questions will lead to better theory, research, and program development in social studies, compared to questions that merely draw contrasts between content approaches and skills approaches, disciplinary knowledge approaches and critical issues approaches, etc.

Until I came into social studies, I had never addressed curricular issues (i.e., What is worth teaching to students at a given grade level, and why?). I recognize that these issues cannot be resolved through empirical methods because they involve value questions. However, curricular arguments always contain implied assumptions that can be tested empirically. In particular, they contain readiness assumptions (that students at a given grade level are ready to understand and appreciate particular content) and application assumptions (that mastery of such content will enable the students to use it to handle certain life situations effectively). Social studies could use much more empirical research designed to ascertain first, whether particular programs are feasible for use at a given grade level, and second, if implemented effectively, whether they produce the intended student outcomes, especially life application outcomes.

I also think that we need to expand our views of what constitutes
research, or at least curriculum evaluation, if we want to bring systematic observations to bear on curriculum issues. For example, some of the work that I have done with Jan Alleman has involved critical analysis of published instructional materials in which we sought to determine what made good lessons or activities good and what were the problems with other lessons or activities that made them less useful as tools for accomplishing social education goals. This was not research as typically defined, but it was systematic inquiry that led to some useful generalizations and a collection of illustrative examples. I believe that related inductive methods might be used to tap existing "wisdom of practice" by probing social studies professors' and teachers' perceptions of which lessons, concepts, examples, analogies, questions, or activities are especially useful for developing particular social studies content at particular grade levels; analyzing why these seem to be so effective; and identifying implications for curriculum and instruction.

Finally, I would reemphasize the importance of thinking multi-dimensionally in conceptualizing the purpose and nature of social studies and drawing implications for curriculum and instruction. Disciplinary knowledge is important, but certainly not the whole picture. Cultural literacy is important, but it focuses on what was and is without addressing what might or should be and without confronting questions about which elements of the current culture are of durable importance and deserve to be preserved, and which are not. Dispositions toward thinking critically and making reasoned decisions about social issues are also important, but require sufficient background knowledge to be activated effectively. These and other elements that might have been mentioned are all components of a comprehensive social studies program, not the whole of it. Therefore, it will be helpful if we use the language of the Essentials Statement and the more recent comprehensive position statements issued by the National Council for the Social Studies, rather than more narrow and exclusive definitions, in talking about the nature and purposes of social education. This will help us to avoid some of the imbalances mentioned earlier and will promote a more unified identification with social studies in general rather than just with one of its components.
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The public interest may be presumed to be what people would choose if they saw clearly, thought rationally, acted disinterestedly, and benevolently.

Walter Lippman, 1955

There seems to be a law of nature and, perhaps, a principle in all cultures suggesting that we should become all that we are capable of being. Given the good (ethical), not the easy, environment, this seems to be the case with individuals. On the other hand, there is no innate capacity nor single organic impulse to improve the quality of a group. Thus, communities, even professional communities, need something more. That is, the group seems to need an energy that transcends the individual, while, at the same time, enhancing the individual and his or her levels of achievement. It is the engagement of this energy tied to high purpose that defines the group and its ability to enhance individuals within it. Even athletic teams with great individual talent will not be great teams without something more. That something more was once defined by Vince Lombardi, the legendary football coach of the Green Bay Packers, as love. His players, he said, had a deep love for each other and for their craft. And, because of this love, this something more, they were a great team even without the best individual talent in the league.

When observing the behaviors of those of us engaged in education, and even when you note the high quality of much of our work, it often seems that we behave like the children of a lesser culture or lesser group, not because of a lack of individual talent, but because of a lack of shared energy, purpose, and love - this something more. The idea of a lesser culture represents an interesting metaphor for education in the sense that there seems to be an inherent inferiority complex running through the community. It is as if our field of inquiry is not quite as good as law or medicine and to compound this, schools of education within the university have all the status of a newly minted lieutenant in a combat zone or fire fight. What is curious about this situation is that education has the rationale and content to be the centerpiece of our republic. But, this will never happen as long as we see ourselves as simple brokers of information who are unable or unwilling to transcend the student or ourselves as individuals and move to a higher priority through the engagement of the wisdom needed to control and use ethically the power that comes with knowledge. This is the case because our sense of professional purpose and personal meaning is directly related to a content of wisdom, not our ability to process information. Further, our sense of worth to ourselves
and to others is directly related to the attention we give to the principles of our common culture.

Without doubt, and with our help, our students have access to more knowledge today and through that knowledge, more power than at any time in history. However, this power is raw and almost overwhelming. In fact, many parents and teachers indicate that they are afraid of their children. They call their children more precocious, more aggressive, and even more knowledgeable than previous generations. But, they would also say that their children or students are not as civil, respectful, or reflective. Admittedly, this complaint has been made of children across the ages, but today the eternal contract between the generations is in suspense, and the adult world seems without the courage, prudence, or justice to restore and enhance the generational relationships. It seems that on a larger scale, this lack of courage and sense of who we are as moral beings has resulted in adults abdicating the position of mentor, ethical model, and judge. Because of this fear and its attending intellectual paralysis, we now have school programs built upon the needs and wants of children, and on the fallacious notion that students are "customers" with the wisdom or capacity to buy an education. What is clear to most teachers is that the first thing that students usually want to buy is an easy way through school in order to prepare themselves for an easy way through life. What greater joke can we play on our children than to give them what they want?

The use of such concepts as need and consumer in the construction of educational programs, while putting aside such concepts as server, co-creator, and producer, is a simple and clear manifestation of our fear of confronting our children, our culture, our inner selves, and the natural chaos of learning and life. And, we will remain children of a lesser culture until we get beyond this fear and engage our values and the moral principles that define who we are and what is expected of us. As long as we fail to link our craft to the most powerful narratives of our heritage, we will be marginalized as a profession. Until we can develop a public voice that is both professional and civic, and until we understand civic work as a responsibility to the group that leads to personal rights, then whatever we do will have less meaning for our students, for ourselves, and for the citizen at large, because it will not transcend the individual and lead us to that state of something more.

As one cannot be ethical alone, neither can one be truly human alone. There is no self outside of community. We do not relate to others as the individuals we are. We are the person we are as we relate to others. It is this notion of others that provides the context for culture, and without a healthy conception of community, and in our case, the democratic community, we remain creatures of a lesser culture. We need a more complete understanding of community, one that would include the powerful values of our heritage as they relate to our profession. We will add value to our craft when we
understand that a community is both a geographic region (natural space) as well as an idea or mental construct which we call the public realm (cultural place). We seem to miss the point that a community is, above all, a value or idea(l) that goes far beyond the notion of a contiguous geographic region. What is New York City? What is the state of Wisconsin? What is the United States of America? Or, what is the global market? A community is defined only superficially by natural landscapes. It is much more dependent upon the landscape of the collective intellect used to construct a cultural place. It is place that we construct not only through our buildings and roads, but through our politics. That is, our values about landscape, the ethics and information we share with each other, even through the Internet, and our aesthetic sense of place define the public realm. Meaning is awakened through this construction of place. And, it should be the public voice of education that makes explicit the common concerns for landscape, ethics, and aesthetics, and the attending and defining attributes of love, learning, craft(work), and citizen that are necessary in the construction of place and meaning. Again, this common concern is absolutely necessary in the development and sustainment of the democratic community. Education's public voice and its value to the republic (the cultural wisdom of the educator) will come only through its role in democratic community building. We might begin this work by engaging each other in a set of common questions. Let's consider a few examples.

* Who is a citizen of the United States of America?
* What does it mean to be a citizen?
* As a people, in what do we believe?
* What is the common wealth? How is it related to private wealth?
* What is the common good?
* What is the common school? How is it related to the common good?
* What is a community?
* What is the relationship between community and family/individual in terms of well-being?
* What is the good person? society? citizen?
* What source of value can we use to ground education's public voice? That is, what value reference do we need?

It might be useful to look at some other professions and the nature of their public voices as we try to develop and articulate one public voice for education. If the public schools, and schools in general, are to survive, improve, and fulfill their cultural purpose, this may be the most important work for the education profession at this time in our history.

Within our society, the Law, for example, references the Constitution and the legal system, suggesting that all social dilemmas and attending policies will be defined by the courts. From questions about the essence of life and death, to concerns about who should receive special treatment in the workplace, the courts define the limits of policy. And we, of course, not only let it
happen, we encourage it. This is the case because of the value reference to our Constitution and to the established public voice of the law, made clear through law schools, the media, members of Congress, and even the jokes about lawyers. Like it or not, the profession of law is planted deep in our cultural soil because its public voice has a clear value reference and the citizen understands the connection, if only dimly, to what is important or valuable in his or her life.

Medicine references science and the attending narratives about health, disease, and death. The hospital is like the courthouse or the church in that it is a sacred place where our most significant mythic constructs are affirmed and our cultural stories are played out. The fundamental stories and mythic constructs of the medical/health culture (the stories of life and death) provide a spiritual unity for our common humanity and a shared imaginative sense of thought and consequent behavior. Our common mortality, when viewed within mythic thought, is strongly intertwined with the incredible human drive to symbolize. And, we find in myth, rite, and ritual our base of explication and our most satisfying mode of extension to others and to God. Again, the public voice for medicine is clear because of the reference to fundamental values of the culture.

These constructions of public voice within professions make it possible to carry on discussions at two different levels. At one level, the language is technical and limited to those within the profession who have learned the syntax and vocabulary of the field. At the second level, the discussion is with all citizens, but in a way that enhances the profession in the eyes of those citizens. In the media and within our own lives, the public voice of law or medicine, for example, is clear because the reference to fundamental cultural values is clear. Life, death, justice, and well-being are baseline values. We may not know what happens inside the institution, but we understand that it is important. We may also know that we should take more responsibility for our own health and legal status, but this would take more effort on our part, and so we let the public voice of the professions become more ubiquitous and more imbedded in the fabric of our daily life. We may someday come to understand that to be enlightened will mean the linkage of professional practice with personal practice. But, this enlightenment will only be a function of the quality of the public realm, and the quality of the public realm will depend on the quality of education. This education will then define the quality of our hospitals, our courts, our infrastructure, and so forth. For example, this enlightenment will cause me to care about the general quality of medicine even though I am not sick, because I understand that health is a community or cultural value that if attended to will someday benefit my personal health. The reverse argument is not true. Simply taking care of personal or even family health problems does not enhance research, build hospitals, train doctors, protect air and water, inspect food, or in any mean-
ingful way help to move the field of health to higher levels of quality.

The same can be said about the law. Being concerned with only my rights and not those of my neighbor will soon place me in jeopardy under the law regardless of how law-abiding I think I am. My quality of life under the law will always be a function of the general quality of life. And, the general quality of life will be a function of the quality of the common school. This does not mean the quality common school for just my child, but the quality common school for my neighbor’s child as well. It is not enough for the few to think only of getting their child educated, for the few or the one will always live within the context of the many. And, the quality of that context will depend on how well we educate all of our children. This is the meaning of: the common school for the common good. As Thomas Jefferson said to P. S. Dupont de Nemours in April of 1816, “Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day.” It must be clear to all of us that the practice of responsibility toward the group or society will result in greater personal freedom, even for those citizens with great wealth. In a time such as ours, when so many of our children are leaving our schools without a firm grasp on even basic literacy and common characteristics of rightful behavior, it is no longer enough for my child to get “hers” from the school system and get out; for in truth, my child, as will we all, pay dearly for the lack of common education, and sooner than we may think. We can build all the walled suburbs we can. We can build more prisons, and hire more police. We can even try to grow our economy and compete in the global markets. None of this will make any difference, however, if we don’t, first of all, address the education of the citizen. None of it will thrive if we don’t first understand that the purpose of our schools is to transmit the cultural DNA, defined here as the intellectual, spiritual, and moral essence and possibilities of the American Republic, from one generation to the next.

Because of these realities of contemporary life, education must be something more fundamental to our culture than any other professional practice. This is the case because our conception of the public realm, and the probability of our survival as a people with the attending enhancement of our liberties is directly related to the quality of our schools. Preparing citizens who are loving critics of the republic is our fundamental value, because it becomes the base of our dynamic culture. The creative tension between love of learning and community on the one hand, and criticism (loving critic) on the other, provides the context for growth, and the ethical and aesthetic growth of citizens is the cultural reference of our democratic republic. This assumes that we pay careful attention to the innate love of learning, of wonder, and of meaning upon which scholarship is constructed and in turn is nourished. Within this context, scholarship is in service to the republic. However,
this is not what teachers experience today. The world of the classroom is often characterized by the task of trying to engage reluctant learners who see school as a problem to deal with, rather than as an exciting opportunity. How will students change from saying: “Do I have to know this?” to “Do I get to know this?”

First, and foremost, we must develop a public voice worthy of our work. As law and medicine present a clear rationale, our public voice should be even more clear about our ethical practices and the fundamental value to which we make reference. That fundamental value is rooted in the Preamble to our Constitution and is stated as, WE THE PEOPLE, the fourth branch of government. The history of our republic is the history of the struggle to enlarge the set known as WE THE PEOPLE from a small group of white men, over 21, who owned property in the several states, to the inclusive set that defines the republic today. This history, this value, this voice is grounded in the Bill of Rights and the Amendments to our Constitution that kept expanding the set so more citizens might embrace the American dream. Add to this the struggles and grace of the individuals and groups that gave of themselves to educate all of us. They would include such people as civil rights workers, labor organizers, statesmen, business leaders, soldiers, salespeople, and so forth, all educated by teachers. Rooted in this history, our voice is defined by civic virtue, civic work, and the passing on of the cultural narrative, so as to provide the ethical context whereby people can improve the quality of their lives and the life of the republic at the same time. In fact, this value helps us come to know that the improvement of one’s life is only possible with the improvement of the lives of the many.

Our personal well-being is a measure of the well-being of the community (public realm). This is a truism. In essence, this is the proper meaning of e pluribus unum. Thus, we will become children of a greater culture when we develop a public voice (rationale) grounded in our fundamental cultural value—the public realm—and when we make clear that this realm can only be implemented through the process of ethical and aesthetic growth. This growth demands from all of us a desire for quality; for what we might call an intimate engagement with personal intellectual virtues and the practice of civic virtue in and through our institutions. This added value elevates education and makes us realize that, beyond a legal document, for example, our Constitution serves as a curriculum for the nation and a symbol of the story of America that provides its citizens with meaning and a moral light. Enlightened or educated citizens display, and expect in others, such characteristics as fairness, cooperation, integrity, responsibility, and the performance of high-quality work. When these virtues are placed in the highest priority, we will see education take its rightful place among the professions. But, for this to happen we need to make a simple yet profound change in the way we answer the question: what’s a school for?
A school is a way for a people to find out what and how to put first things first. In a free society this is, perhaps, one of the most difficult tasks that people do, because first principles often seem counter intuitive. To insure that our children are not corrupted, for example, schools must first of all serve a public purpose - to enhance the public realm. To the degree that we give our students the idea that they are first and that the school is there to serve them, to that same degree we will corrupt them. School has a public purpose. Students go to school to take on the cultural heritage...to know who they are, and what is expected of them. They go to school to become civilized...civil, self-disciplined, and reflective of the wisdom of people and the principles of the republic. They go to school to construct knowledge and serve the community with that knowledge. They go to school to learn how to run the highest office of the land...the office of citizen. Thus, within the context of our republic, schools serves a public purpose before a private need. If we fail to understand our relationship to the public good (the public realm) our schools will makes no sense, particularly for the 70% of our people who have no children to send to school, and simply ask why they should support the private wants of parents and their children. Without a clear public voice We the People will continue a non-support attitude toward education, and some will continue to put the public schools in the category of a national evil, as Senator Dole did when he ran for the presidency in 1996, until educators and policy makers understand why our schools are in business.

Moving education and ourselves from the status of lesser culture toward a full measure of respect, however, will take a willingness to go far beyond the notion of rationale construction. We will also need to understand that culture is more profoundly manifested in our sense of the sacred. Above all else, a culture's essence is wrapped in mystery, myth, and the narratives that define the beginning, survival, and venerability of the culture. The sacred is that common intellectual and ethical place where people build and share meaning. It defines what is important, what is worth living for, and even what is worth dying for. It suggests how rightful habits are acquired and prepares us for the constant struggles that we must face alone and together as we try to implement the best of what we are. Above all, the sacred points us toward the future with the assurance that the common elements in which we believe and act upon will serve us well.

The beginning of wisdom is knowing what is in place and what is out of place. Within the democratic republic education is in place when learning is seen as a sacred responsibility. This special place calls us to responsibility in the sense that we do not have a right to read, we have a responsibility to know how to read. We do not have a right to know our history, we have a responsibility to know it. We do not have a right to practice intellectual virtues, we have a responsibility to use them in all of our endeavors,
knowing that all good actions among the people will depend upon the knowledge, skills, and ethics practiced by the citizen. It is in the acceptance and practice of our social or public responsibilities that we gain personal liberties. This is the something more that creates the family, the community, the nation. This is the democratic attitude that helps us understand that there is no private wealth without common wealth. This is the value added energy that transcends the individual and enhances her or his achievements at the same time. And, this is the love that holds community and competency together in sparkling communication. This is education for a democratic republic. And, this is the purpose and practice of educators; certainly not the children of a lesser culture.
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BOOK REVIEWS

Myths, Metaphors and Morality


Review by MURRY R. NELSON, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, 16802.

Since the issuance of “A Nation at Risk” in 1983, American education, particularly American schools have been pummeled by critics, internal and external, for supposed shortcomings and misguided direction. Many educational bureaucrats and self styled critics have taken the schools to task for a variety of practices, most notably the notion of multiculturalism. These critics see American society and American education being split with the concomitant result an America riven, no longer unum, but fractionated plures. E. D. Hirsch, Allan Bloom, Charles Sykes, Dinesh D'Souza, William Bennett, Diane Ravitch, James Atlas and others have presented themselves as crusaders in a holy war to save American education and American society.

It was in response to this fervent din that Lawrence Levine, unlike the pundits noted above, began to investigate the charges and more important, the evidence. Levine, a past president of the Organization of American Historians, recognized the parameters of the problem that was identified as “multiculturalism, [the] destroyer of America” and, in a unique twist, sought to substantiate the charges hurled at American education, most notably American higher education. Though Levine is obviously and unapologetically a political leftist, he was not driven by ideology to find disconnected pieces of educational minutiae to support his preconceived conclusion. Instead Levine pursued the path of legitimate scholarship to rebut the charges of the critics who had determined that American education had abandoned its historical foundations, and that multiculturalism was the major cause of such abandonment.

Levine’s conclusions are simple, but substantial. The foundations of American education have always been dynamic, not static; only since the mid-20th century has the so called traditional canon of western civilization been in place. The “classic works” in education have been continually altered over the past two centuries. Doomsayers predicting the demise of education, and of American society as a result, have been prominent each time change has been proposed or implemented in the American curriculum. The strength of the American educational ethos, Levine makes clear, lies in its constant reshaping.

Levine makes his argument through the use of innumerable historical sources, some obscure and others prominent. College catalogs, journal
articles, books, speeches, courses of study, and reports of academic organi-
izations from as far back as the early nineteenth century are scrutinized and
analyzed in order to present an accurate picture of what the curriculum of
American higher education looked like, and how it evolved. And although
Levine did not address lower education, except in passing, the sources and
statements of historical and current descriptions are often the same for both
lower and higher education. Clearly Levine’s work buoyed me since it fit
so neatly with the arguments that I have made in my own writings over
the past fifteen years or more.

The Opening of the American Mind is presented in three parts. The first
portrays the contemporary landscape of attacks upon universities, their
faculties and students. Part II provides the historical context for the cur-
ricular unrest by examining the major debates in higher education over the
past two hundred years and thus offers a different perspective from which
to examine today’s arguments as part of a larger question; that is, “How
did such a disparate people become American and what did the term en-
compass?” (p. xiv). And how do today’s concerns reflect the changes that
continue to reshape the notion of American culture? The handwringing of
a conservative, frightened group of critics are succinctly noted at the end
of Levine’s prologue:

It is precisely because the changes taking place in the nation are
so manifest in higher education that universities, along with their
faculties and students, have become prime targets for those frus-
trated by the shape and texture of modern America. (p. xix)

With that Levine lists some of their best known books on higher edu-
cation published during the past ten years. Their titles, which include terms
like “the decline of discourse,” “profscam,” “the demise of higher educa-
tion,” “the fight for our culture and our children,” to name but a few, con-
vey the authors’ pessimistic view of the state of higher education. As Levine
notes, “it’s a small growth industry, this jeremiad against the universities
and the professoriate, this series of claims that something has suddenly
turned sour in the academy...” Levine quotes many of these authors, al-
lowing them to fulminate briefly, but then cuts “their legs from beneath
them” by countering their claims with actual data. He sees his critics as
having a faulty sense of history and, more, not caring that that is the case.

The methodologies of these critics are scrutinized in order to better
appreciate their misleading claims. In discussing William Bennett’s eager-
ness to espouse the unabashed superiority of the Western Canon, Levine
notes:

Without pretending to have studied the cultures of Asia or Af-
rica in any depth, Secretary of Education William Bennett did
not hesitate to inform the faculty and students of Stanford Uni-
University that “the West is a source of incomparable intellectual complexity and diversity and depth.” (p. 21)

Levine notes that Dinesh D'Souza visited The University of California at Berkeley and wished to speak with “Asian-American students” as part of this investigation, but claimed he could not find an Asian student willing to talk to him, this despite the fact that such students constituted one-third of the undergraduate population. Thus he ended up interviewing a student from UC-Davis (60 miles away) who was visiting a friend at Berkeley, but “knew about it” and served as D’Souza’s informed source.

These examples of “research,” and there are many more, would be laughable if so many readers had not accepted these books as having some intellectual basis in fact. Many of these critics tend to cite each other, but no matter how many citations there are, they cannot change sweeping allegations into well founded research.

Levine counters this pathetic excuse for scholarship by presenting a detailed historiography of the cantankerous creation of the curriculum in higher education. From the early 1800s the definition and presence of a “classical curriculum” was debated, and Levine examines the contemporary arguments presented at Yale, Columbia, Princeton, Dartmouth, and Harvard, among other universities, institutions which have been lionized by today’s critics for their glorious classical curriculum past. Levine notes the worship by some of the teaching of Greek and Latin and the predicted demise of the entire university were they no longer to be taught to all students.

In the 1850s any innovation was suspect. The president of Princeton proudly proclaimed in 1854, “We shall not aim at innovations...no chimerical experiments in education have ever had the least countenance here” (p. 39). These comments by traditional educators forward into the 1950s belie their real fears—the dynamic change in American society and culture. It was from these fears in post World War II America that Robert Hutchins and Mortimer Adler developed the Great Books of the Western World, a canon seized upon by Allan Bloom as wisdom of the past. It was from these most recent roots, moreover, that arose the storied foundation of today’s Western Civ, a cause that had nearly died after WW II.

Levine goes back to the American Historical Association’s Committee of Seven in 1899 to find that United States history was insufficient without its “natural foundation—European history,” yet that claim was narrowly interpreted. European history was the history of England, France, and Germany. Little attention was paid to Eastern, Southern, or Nordic European history. To transform the new waves of immigrants into “real” Americans meant to make them emulate western European cultural roots and call that American.

The broadening of curricular requirements (in the 1970s and 1980s) to include Eastern and other Western civilizations was generally accepted
by educators who saw a changing American culture and a change as well in areas of study by historians, and specialists in literature and cultural studies. No argument in higher education has ever sought to eliminate Western civilization; rather the intention has been to remove its aura of primacy to broaden the view of American thought and culture.

In many cases material recommended for student use has remained constant as contexts changed. "The canon changes constantly because historical circumstances and stimuli change and people therefore approach it in myriad ways, bringing different perspectives and needs to it, reading it in ways distinctive to the times in which they live, and emerging with different satisfactions and revelations" (p. 93). In relating this thinking Levine notes, "the acceptance of change, then, has been built into the historical canon to such an extent that it often appears that there is no canon" (p. 96). This is certainly disturbing to those who long for an immutable, historically pure canon—one that exists in some ideal universe. Thus, Levine concludes that multiculturalism may be a new term, but the debates over multiculturalism have been occurring since early in American history.

Levine concludes with an analysis of the search for an American identity, beginning with Crevecoeur, Benjamin Franklin, John Quincy Adams, Henry Ford and Henry Kallen (the coiner of the term "cultural pluralism" in 1915). The question he poses is do we want cultural unison or cultural hegemony, much as Kallen asked in 1915? Clearly the latter better describes the dynamic that is America, while the former laments an America that existed only in belief, not reality.

The dramatic change in both techniques and subjects for historical study is seen by critics as "Balkanization" (The Arthur Schlesinger lament) while more serious researchers recognize that in order to truly understand our society we must study all its members. As Levine notes:

At its core, then, multiculturalism as a historical approach means that to understand American culture it is not enough to understand only one of its components, no matter how important it may have been. It is crucial to study and understand as many of the contributing cultures and their interactions with one another as possible, not as a matter of "therapeutic" history, as opponents of multiculturalism keep insisting, not to placate or flatter minority groups and make them feel good, as they also assert, but as a simple matter of understanding the nature and complexities of American culture and the processes by which it came, and continues to come, into being. There is no conflict between multiculturalism and the study of Western European culture, which itself is a product of multiculturalism as the various peoples of Western Europe met and interacted on American soil. (p. 160)
The naysayers cannot accept this message, and so they “kill the messenger, or more accurately...denounce the message as politically correct.” Rather than scholarly arguments, they offer fears and cries of heresy in its place.

So Levine ends his plea for the opening of American intellectual thought with the “radical” notion of Paul Ricoeur that we no longer view some groups as “the other.” Rather, “when we acknowledge the end of a sort of cultural monopoly...it becomes possible that they are just others, that we ourselves are an other, among others” (p. 173).

Review by WAYNE MAHOOD, State University of New York at Geneseo, 14454.

Because problem students are the bane of every teacher's existence and because Jere Brophy articulately addresses the issue, this book ought to be a winner. Based on a grant from the Program for Teaching and Instruction, NIE, to the Institute for Research on Teaching at Michigan State University, Brophy has synthesized three sources of ideas about dealing with problem students (p. viii.), which is intended for teachers in training as well as those inservice. Brophy's grant project, Classroom Strategies Study, offers correlational findings from (1) scholarly literature on child development, (2) "helping strategies" developed by "treatment professionals," and (3) classroom teachers' experience in an effort to deal with 12 "problem-student" types he identifies. The goal is to help teachers to develop "an integrated set of principles" (not the more conventional "bag of tricks") to create an effective learning environment.

Consistent with his work on effective teaching, Professor Brophy offers teachers strategies for developing a classroom environment characterized by "social construction," rather than the more traditional notions of compliance (p. 13). By this approach "problem students" are encouraged to "choose to adopt [the teacher's] guidelines for themselves;" that is, to engage in "self regulation" (p. 17). The comprehensive, but eclectic, guidelines focus on "socializing" and resolving conflicts among these students through the techniques of behavior modification, strategy teaching, crisis intervention and counseling.

The teachers for whom this book is intended obviously are not the garden variety. Rather, these are "teachers who are willing to invest significantly in the socializing role along with their other teaching roles, and thus to go the extra mile in working with problem students" (p. 7). This includes a commitment to making changes in themselves first, even where "significant obstacles within [themselves]" exist (p. 411). Yet, Brophy reminds the reader that teachers have an advantage over "treatment specialists" (therapists and mental health specialists) who deal with these same problem students, because teachers, who can take direct action, interact with the students for long periods of time in a variety of settings (p. 414).

The Classroom Strategies Study (CSS), the project which obtained and examined the data, conducted interviews of 98 K-6 teachers drawn from 54 small city and 44 inner city schools who responded to 24 vignettes (2 vignettes/each of 12 problem-student types) in terms of how they would treat the student featured. The 12 problem-student types were broken down into four categories: (1) students with achieving problems, (2) students with hostility problems, (3) student role-adjustment problems and (4) stu-
dents with social relationship problems. The responses to the vignettes by the teachers, who were selected by their principals, were subsequently labeled “lower-” and “higher-rated” and were compared with the scholarly literature on child development and education and “helping strategies” offered by professionals. The reader is encouraged to respond to each vignette before reading the teachers’ responses or research findings, which are discussed afterward. This format constitutes the bulk of the book, 12 of the 16 chapters.

Not surprisingly, CSS found that while teachers were generally caring and employed strategies that “probably served [them] well,” they relied largely on experience, rather than on any research-based knowledge. Teachers’ responses also differed in terms of grade level and type of school. As one might expect, the study found that “lower-rated” teachers tended not only to misread the situations presented, but that their responses tended to be shorter, less articulated and less certain in terms of helpful strategies.

Brophy’s intent here is to provide an antidote: a clear, comprehensive, integrated set of principles based on research that will offer an effective learning environment where problem students can become self regulating.

Though Brophy’s approach is well-intentioned and clearly articulated, there are some problems. The first, of course, is whether the book will be widely read or the strategies adopted. It is not bed-time reading. More problematic is Brophy’s assumption that it is possible to get to know students well enough and to employ the appropriate remedies while instructing increasing numbers of difficult students in the school-bashing environment that exists today. (This is an especially questionable assumption in the case of middle and secondary school teachers, who were not part of the study. Their responses would have been particularly helpful, especially to strengthen the study’s findings and the applicability of the proposed strategies.) Even in the cases of elementary teachers who have more opportunity to know their students, the task is formidable. That is, in order to provide the necessary “socializing” these teachers must be able to categorize their students as spontaneously and neatly as the CSS does and then apply the appropriate strategies. In turn, the latter may require the assistance of a variety of other persons, including parents, who may well be unresponsive, even hostile. Additionally, we cannot assume elementary school teachers will get to know their students because of absenteeism, frequent transfers and pull-out programs.

Another concern with the book is that the data were collected over fifteen years ago (1977-1981) when some of today’s problems, including crack cocaine babies, were less publicized, if not less prominent. While Brophy acknowledges this, he claims that the study’s findings probably still hold today, because many of the problem-student types are as old as schooling. Still another problem with the book is that the current reform focus tends to be on subject-matter teaching and cognition rather than on
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classroom management, though Brophy argues that without appropriate strategies, any attempts at instructional reforms will prove futile and frustrating (p. 410).

Brophy has articulated a well-organized approach to a perennial problem for teachers—classroom management—that is consistent with current reform goals. The key would be to use this book as a reference, to which a teacher could turn periodically. Whether teachers beset by pressures to attain standards within classrooms with increasing numbers of problem students (including those not identified here—the disabled or challenged) will do so, remains. Teaching Problem Students at least offers the teacher a starting point for creating an “informational style” learning environment.

LETTER

To The Editor:
Keith C. Barton’s “Everybody knows what history is...” in the symposium of TRSE’s Fall 1996 issue pointed to a valid concern in the teaching of history: that there is difference between “history as a story” as a philosophy of history, and “history as a story” as a teaching method. The latter can be very effective in the hands of a teacher who is a good story teller, but unless the story conforms to disciplinary standards for historiography within a context of inquiry and discussion such a method can result in misinformation or indoctrination. Barton complements Levstik’s contribution in “Negotiating the History Landscape.” Barton and Levstik provide a needed reminder that the past confers power on those who control its interpretation.

Joseph M. Kirman
Professor, Social Studies
Faculty of Education
University of Alberta
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