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Rhetoric and Educational Policies on the Use of History for Citizenship Education in England from 1880-1990

Jessie Y. Y. Wong
Nanyang Technological University

Abstract

This article attempts to review the rhetoric and the educational policies on the use of history for citizenship education from 1880-1990 in England. In many instances, the rhetoric served as powerful tools to gain the support of educational authorities, namely, the Board of Education, Ministry of Education and Examination Boards. Their support was reflected in the change of educational policies and school syllabi that followed. This study shows that there was strong and consistent widespread rhetoric on history's contribution to citizenship education throughout the century, neither stopped by the two great wars nor impeded by the challenge of social studies as a citizenship subject after the Second World War. Instead it was challenged by the discipline itself in the early 1980s when some historians began to doubt the "new" history on the ground that the "real" history was being devalued. Consequently, there was evidence that the "new" history did not take off widely. In many schools, history was taught for its own sake. Its value for the education of modern citizenship was not being emphasised. This article ends with the argument that under the environment of the National Curriculum, first implemented in the country in 1989, history still claims its relevance for citizenship education.

History for Moral and Patriotic Citizenship Education

Claims for history as a citizenship subject dated back long before it became an academic discipline. When Herodus, the father of history began to write history, it was for its social relevance. Since then, history has experienced a number of phases of development but its utility as a citizenship subject continued. Early this century, F. J. Gould, a British Educationist and humanist, published a large quantity of literature using history as a source for citizenship education --- promoting moral and patriotic citizenship in young children. Other publications from historians and from the Board of Education also demonstrated the value of history for moral and patriotic citizenship education.

Gould, different from a modern historian, saw history as an all-embracing subject which could, properly taught, provide social, moral and civic education for training children to be good future citizens. His approach was not only patriotic but also humanistic. He proposed seriously the use history for the training of patriotism and social loyalty. At the same time, he was aware of the importance of an international perspective. Through story-telling and through history, he worked out numerous schemes for the training of citizenship. He provided more than just rhetorical support for the subject. It was evident in the 1904 Elementary Code that history was approved as a school subject because of the emphasis it gave to the
lives of great men and women, and the lessons to be learned from them, by means of which the characteristics of the good citizen were thought to be inculcated. Gould's work indicated the potential he saw of history's capacity to promote citizenship education. His writings began to be published for this purpose from the 1880s until he died in 1938.

In fact, when history was first introduced in the school, its only objective was, like what Gould had often mentioned, to inculcate those values, social and political which the nation and the people had come to accept as characteristic of itself. As time passed, history was seen futile as a school subject except in providing citizenship education. Examples could be found in Laurie's work in the late nineteenth century. Laurie (1867, p.144) wrote:

"To the school-boy ... [History] is of value in so far as it brings to his knowledge wonderful deeds done in the discharge of patriotism and duty. In all other respects, it is utterly barren of good results, and involves a futile expenditure of valuable school-time. A dim outline of royal genealogies, of dates, the intervals between which are full of plottings and counter-plottings, and of parts which, however capable of interpretation by the matured capacity ... to the raw experience of the child or the boy, little more than an exhibition of the worst passions that afflict humanity, and all these epitomized into small compass and only partially and fragmentarily acquired --- such is school history. It seems to us, therefore, that the reading of history in the primary school is little better than an abuse of time."

Of course, Laurie had a narrow view of citizenship education. He believed that the training of patriotic, dutiful and passive citizens was the only goal of learning history. His *History in the Primary School* was published nearly four decades earlier than most of Gould's work on history and training for citizenship. His work showed that history was the subject for citizenship education before Gould. History could serve this purpose by mere dispensation of knowledge. It was true that school history has all the time included the acquisition of a body of knowledge: facts of events, dates, great names, etc. This knowledge, filled with false representation, bias and imperialistic feelings, was all that was thought necessary to provide models for future citizens.

By the last decade of nineteenth century, some historians and educationists had begun to be more alert as to a wider scope of history for citizenship education, to lead away from partiality, bias and the false representation of the patriotic approach. Pitt published *English History, with its Wars* left out in 1893. It was a reflection of a change of attitude towards history for citizenship education, believing that 'drum and trumpet' history could no longer achieve the objective of training for future citizens. Pitt's book marked the beginning of history textbook revision.

Consequently, in the twentieth century, history had increased in popularity both in the universities and in the schools because of its change of content and its new role to disseminate a wider perspective of citizenship education. In particular, by the time of the 1902 Act, the teaching of history within the curriculum of both public elementary and secondary schools had begun to lay particular emphasis upon political and constitutional aspects which led many historians to believe that the teaching of civics was the special task of history teachers. The primary aim
behind the framework of many history textbooks began to change. Most would emphasize the

"inculcation of the ideas of citizenship which themselves developed from a mere prescription of various rights and duties to that of equipping the future citizen with a full knowledge of how his society had evolved." (Cook, 1978, p.42)

Having to know how society had evolved required no short history. The consequence was the encouragement of the discernment of 'movements' and 'trends' over large sweeps of history in the school syllabi in order to convey an awareness of human progress and to foster a realization of the past as an essential prelude to the present. It was generally urged that the pupils should be led to a greater awareness of the national society in which they lived and how it had developed to its present stage. Thus the emphasis on national citizenship was clearly shown. For example, Withers (1904, p.200) wrote:

"It is because of its bearing on the future of our civic and national life, even more than on account of its value to the imagination and the understanding that the study of history may claim an honored place in the timetable of our primary schools."

It was in 1905, when Bourne's famous book, *The Teaching of History and Civics in the Elementary and the Secondary School* was published, that history's role for civic and citizenship education was re-emphasized. Bourne was the well-known professor of the College for Women at Western Reserve University of the United States. Most people involved in education at the time, whether in England or North America would have accepted fully or in part his contention that civic and citizenship education was the responsibility of history and that

"pupils may be instructed in the duties of citizenship in two ways: First, by studying the structure of government and the duties of the individual in relation to it (that is to be taught through history lesson), and second, by discipline in the performance of such social duties as fall to them during school life, with the expectation that thereby sound habits may be created and good citizenship may be only a continuation of the earlier training in conduct." (Bourne, 1905, pp. 93-94)

In all cases, history textbooks tended to merely describe institutions and offices of government. Bourne's book was different. He called for a more active involvement of pupils within and without the school to make training for citizenship more effective. He was very much in advance of time. His work had not only influenced the Americans but also the British in looking at history's contribution to citizenship education. In Britain, evidence of a new dynamism in historical studies was indicated, at school level, by the Board of Education's publications. The first edition of *The Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers* in 1905 included a chapter on the problems, objectives, content, methods and aids of history teaching in elementary schools. This chapter offered a fresh look at the new ways of history teaching under which its contribution for the training of future citizens was reconsidered in favor of Bourne's suggestion. For secondary schools, the introduction of new ideas along these lines was also evident. The Board's
circular, *History*, published in 1908 and *Modern European History* published in 1914, both offered some cautiously progressive ideas in content, notably in local and European history and in methods.

The catalyst of, and the principal pressure group for, this new-found ferment in the teaching and study of history was the Historical Association, founded in 1906 by a number of distinguished teachers in schools and universities. Thus in 1909, this Association indicated its commitment to an important role for history in citizenship education by publishing the leaflet No. 15 entitled, The Teaching of Civics in Public Schools.

The notion of nationalism was the most important part of citizenship education then. Thus in the Wiltshire Memorandum 1910, it stated that:

"The amount of information a child can retain is small, and efforts to make it extensive are thrown away, but it is most important that a child should realize before he leaves school how his country is governed, what he inherits from the past, and what duties he owes as a patriot, and a citizen". (1910, pp. 16-17)

The Wiltshire committee realized the massive amount of facts in history. Therefore the selection of content on agreed criteria was the only sensible way to reduce it. The general consensus seemed to be that anything could go except national history. Thus the emphasis on history's role in citizenship education remained at the national level of citizenship.

Later, Hayward, a supporter of public elementary schools offered a more progressive thought in citizenship education. He noted that mere dispensation of historical knowledge was an insufficient and ineffective way of training for citizenship. Thus he urged for more stress to be laid on the transmission of values such as

"the high sense of duty, the patriotic devotion, the subordination of self-interest to the good of the community and the magnificent conception of public service." (Hayward, 1910, p. 355)

Very much involved with the great public schools, he promoted the transfer of the spirit of great public schools to the elementary schools. He acknowledged that the moral climate of the school was as important as historical facts in promoting good citizenship. This idea of his is still present in the minds of many modern educationists. The ethos of the school is still believed to be an important but hidden aspect of citizenship education today.

After the First World War, history continued to play an important role in citizenship education. However, there appeared a number of publications which geared towards a more positive form of citizenship education. The war had definitely had an impact on the type of citizenship education which history should offer. Hughes's *Citizen to Be* was a typical one, in which she expressed the hope that the elementary history syllabus should rid itself of "the details of remote wars, of court intrigues, of royal pedigrees, of much constitutional history". Hughes' book was meant to be used in the teaching of history. Her shift from viewing history for promoting patriotic citizenship to more progressive citizenship was characteristic of the beginning of a general shift away from more chauvinistic views in citizenship education after the War; thus marking the beginning of a new notion to teach progressive and international citizenship in history.
decade saw the use of history to promote international understanding. The purpose was to avoid conflict and to prevent another world war.

**History for International Citizenship**

Significant changes in the attitude towards using history as a form of citizenship education were necessitated by post-World War I society. An history which reflected nationalism, and which was capable of producing law-obeying citizens of the nation was seen as insufficient to lead the new generation into social reconstruction. On the one hand, there was the pressure to introduce an expanded concept of citizenship education. On the other, there were variations among the historians as to how history could best be used to transmit citizenship education.

During this difficult time, two polarized ideas about history teaching for citizenship could be traced. Firstly there was the 'horrors of war' --- the pacifist school of thought, which believed that history teaching could help to avoid war, and argued that nationalism was the prime cause of war. So narrow, nationalistic history content should be removed from the syllabus. Protagonists of this school of thought believed in the ability of history to promote international citizenship and thus to avoid war. They advocated the study of world history which would foster international cooperation and social progress. Secondly, there existed a continuing support for the study of national history --- the nationalist school of thought. It stressed patriotic pride in the navy, the army and the unity of the empire. It accepted history's contribution to the education for imperial citizenship and showed little enthusiasm for change. This group had probably unconsciously launched an attack on the pacifist school of thought in history teaching as early as 1916 at the A.G.M. of the Historical Association, where all speakers favored the teaching of naval history, and the whole audience was 'exhilarated with the imperial ideas'. The only organization at that time which was in support of the pacifist school of thought was the League of Nations Union which argued for the inclusion of the aims and instruction of the League of Nations in history. History syllabi according to this union should be purged of war if they were to become an effective instrument for peace.

This nationalist school of thought was as emphatic in preserving imperial ideas as the pacifist school was in promoting change. However, both schools had some common grounds of agreement on history teaching, and on history as an instrument for citizenship education. They both agreed that the past could be used to explain the present, therefore history teaching must include contemporary social, economic and political issues, not least citizenship issues.

The belief in the efficacy of history to explain and draw conclusions spread far beyond the university teaching of the subject. In 1918, despite the difference of ideas between the pacifist group and the nationalist group, the discipline of history entered a new period of popularity. It stood in high esteem in universities and schools and with the Board of Education, examination boards and the general public. With the expansion of the syllabus to include contemporary European and world history, and often that of each school's locality, a new relevance was promised. History could then be used to foster local, national, European and world citizenship. These underlying objectives for history were reinforced in 1923 by the Board of Education, in its Pamphlet No. 37, The Teaching of History, which stated that the period after the First World War was a period

"in which the arguments for studying history, both on the civic and
international side, have been brought home to us and intensified in a way never possible before." (HMSO, 1923, p. 9)

This was a period of expansion of the concept of citizenship whether taught in history or in geography. This history pamphlet went on to give a clear view of the character of history teaching which the primary and secondary schools should follow. In the primary schools, pupils should follow a course of general stories drawn from all countries, by which the first interest in history should be inspired. In the secondary schools, an unbroken course in English history from the first form onward to the first school examination was proposed. The work should be planned in line with the Board's Circular on The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools, No. 599, 1908. Thus advocated the teaching of everything in English history, with European history as ancillary to it. The advance in history in the schools had also had, to some extent kept pace with the public desire to study the history of other countries which had been stimulated by the First World War. The aim of history teaching, therefore, was to implant firmly in pupils' minds what the committee considered as fundamental outline and to extend their range of ideas, enrich their minds and give them a world-wide interest. In modern terms, it would be to foster international citizenship. Accordingly, in the advanced course, especially at "A" level, a period of English history and a corresponding period of European history should be given. In this way, it should provide history a wider opportunity to cover the expanded notion of citizenship of the inter-war period.

Equally, history teaching was intended to have concern for social and civic issues. The pamphlet devoted a section to social and civic education in which it discussed the more recent development in history for this purpose. Social history was given attention in all classes. It was hoped that through the study of the account of the developing life of the whole people of the country, some kind of social education could be promoted. This connected well with the increased attention given to local history which was another growing feature in history at that time.

The concern for civic and social issues in the teaching of history indicated that the teaching of civics as a separate subject was not taken seriously. Most teachers, unlike those in the United States, preferred to allow the lessons which civics would impart to flow naturally from the ordinary school history course. The general opinion was that history should contribute to civic education. Thus it followed that some teaching of modern history and modern problems was vital in any history course.

Throughout the 1920s, optimism for history both as a subject in itself and as a citizenship subject continued. It was argued by Hadow committee in 1926 that the study of history was of "first importance". This positive view reached a peak by the end of 1920s and continued to be strong in the 1930s. The protagonists of citizenship education (The League of Nations Union, The Association for Education in Citizenship) did not hesitate to seek more support from all subjects to promote the study of citizenship in schools. From the two major books published by the Association in the 1930s, it was clear that the Association sought to promote citizenship education through all subjects in the school curriculum. The League of Nations Union in Britain also continued their campaign to encourage the subject lobbies to include the aims and instruction of the League of Nations in their teaching, as a device for promoting, in particular, international citizenship. History was no exception to include the Covenant of the League in its instruction to teach
citizenship education.

The teachers were urged to take care to use the words and phrases found in the covenant with a certain frequency in general instruction, and thus informally prepared the way for their employment in the recital of the League's activities. The ultimate goal was for them to assimilate and practice these values. Most of them were related concepts of international citizenship, such as cooperation, peace, security, obligation, law, justice, sincerity, representations, voting, aggression, political independence, arbitration, convention, decision, dispute, mutuality, freedom of conscience, mitigation of suffering, etc.

The League advocated history as a subject capable of dealing with international citizenship issues. In its agenda for the second session in 1935, the Advisory Committee on League of Nations Teaching drew up a program for the teaching of history. Changes in the conventional history teaching were made necessary. It also endeavored to teach international relations and the League of Nations. Its interest in using history to cover citizenship education indicated the preconceived notion of history as a citizenship subject. In the following year, a report was made on The League of Nations and Teaching of History and Geography. In it, suggestions were given on how history and geography could be used as a tool for teaching the League's notion of citizenship. In Britain, the League of Nations Union was in the position to carry out promotional work and provide help to teachers. It committed that history "undoubtedly offers ample opportunity for implanting in the hearts and minds of young people League ideas, such as the guaranteeing of an international system of law involving the limitation of national sovereignty in consequence of the renunciation of war as a final argument, the necessity for collaboration between peoples in the economic and intellectual sphere, and the ideal of humanity and peace." (League of Nations, 1936, p. 16)

The Association for Education in Citizenship, established in UK in 1935, was another organization which added pressure to introduce citizenship education into the school curriculum. Having failed to set up a separate subject for citizenship education, its alternative method was to give impetus to other subjects to cover this area. The Association published Education for Citizenship in Secondary Schools in 1935. In it Doyle claimed history's responsibility for the education of a democratic citizen. Four years later, it published Education for Citizenship in Elementary Schools. In it, Strong made a similar statement:

"If it comes as some surprise to certain readers of this book that there are so many subjects in the elementary school curriculum through which it is possible for citizenship to be taught, there are, on the other hand, probably few teachers who would be disposed to deny that history is the most positively civic subject of all." (Strong, 1939, p. 112)

When the Second World War broke out in 1939, it was assumed that neither education for international understanding nor education for democracy sufficed in itself as an effective mode of citizenship education, judged as peace education. Neither the League of Nations nor the Association for Education in Citizenship succeeded in their common aim to prevent war.
However, the challenge for history to contribute to world citizenship was more apparent only from 1950 onwards. This was evident in Education Pamphlet No. 52 which stated that its aim was to consider world history as an important dimension of history to teach world citizenship. It was indeed a movement which had already shown itself in its introduction into schools and public examinations. The history syllabi were no longer concerned mainly with British history, or with Commonwealth or European history, but with topics taken from world history, intended to encourage a better understanding of world affairs.

In fact, the main change that world history introduced was the attempt to make the world look like a whole. Topics of major civilizations in the past or of world significance were treated in their own right, free from bias and impartiality. This type of world history syllabi represented themselves, a new development in history teaching. This was the continuation of the link between history and citizenship education in the context of promoting international and world citizenship of the inter-war period. World history still remained in the history curriculum today. However, the emphasis was not on the teaching of world citizenship but on national history.

**History as Social Education**

Social studies movement in late 1940s and 1950s posed a challenge to traditional subjects for their contribution to citizenship education. Through rhetoric and pressure groups, it found itself a place in the school curriculum. Parallel to this movement, geography and history were also reflected as subjects responsible for citizenship education. For example, Norwood Report stated that

"It is in such a treatment of history... that we believe the best contribution can be made in schools to the growth of an informed democracy... the instruction (i.e. citizenship) springs most naturally from the study of ordinary school subjects, particularly history...." (HMSO, 1943, p. 100)

Among historians, Burston argued that

"there are few who would doubt that history can help to make our pupils better citizens. Some go farther, and say that if history is properly taught, no new subject, such as civics is needed." (Burston, 1948, p. 225)

Burston's conclusion was that

"History imparts that touch of intuition which the sagacious citizen needs in handling the future, and we must never forget that the citizen's task is invariably to decide future policy, rather than to pronounce judgment on the past." (Burston, 1948, p.239)

While there was evidence supportive of history as a subject for citizenship education, history was also facing a tough challenge within itself and from social studies. In 1950, the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (IAAM) reported that the methods of history teaching had been attacked in the light of new ideas about the aims of education and about the content of curriculum. At the same
time, it held firmly that history was

"well fitted to exercise and improve certain skills of mind: weighing of evidence, detecting bias, appraising the probable, and separate it from the impossible, recognizing cause and effect; recommending it also for its capacity to enlarge sympathy and to develop a questioning attitude." (Betts, 1982, p. 11)

IAAM was, in a way, arguing for history's relevance for citizenship education. It stated that special attention should be paid to those branches of history which would promote interests in one's surroundings so that pupils would learn something of the problems of organized societies and of their political inheritance so that citizenship should not be merely negative and passive but alive. So long as the social purpose of history could be preserved and content and method of teaching for this purpose improved, there would be no danger for it to lose ground. But then history was open to the challenge of social studies --- an approach which was thought would better meet the needs of society. New attitudes toward education encouraged the expansion of material for history in terms of aspect (social and economic) and scale (world and local). History had already had too much subject matter to be covered in the school syllabi. Thus there arose the problem of selection and creation of space for the expanded matter - the materials for the transmission of citizenship values. Such problems of selection created opportunities to follow American examples whereby history was linked to social studies. In America, history had already been subsumed into integrated courses in elementary and secondary schools - mainly in social studies. But in Britain, the subject lobby was strong. History would not easily be dislodged from the school curriculum, but needed to respond to this challenge. Thus history began to change its content and aims to contribute to what social studies claimed as their area of citizenship education. When social studies began to lose ground in Britain in late 1950s, support for history to teach citizenship increased, leading to the New History Movement.

**The New History and Its Link to Modern Citizenship Education**

The New History argued for the inclusion of citizenship concerns in history lessons. By 1970, widespread change was evident in the teaching of history. The Historical Association sponsored the publication of Teaching History, a journal which could bring new teaching strategies to history teachers in all corners of Britain. The Schools Council set up two projects: History, Geography and Social Science 8-13 and History 13-16 in the early 1970s. Both of them initiated change in history teaching and provided supportive materials for the teaching of new history.

History, Geography and Social Science 8-13 project adopted a unique approach which favored the fostering of active citizenship. It looked at every teaching situation as characterized by the interaction between four variables - children, teachers, schools and environments. Of course citizenship formation was seen as the interaction of more than just these four variables. The following ideas taken from Spotlights connected it well to citizenship education:

1. the project emphasized critical thinking;
2. the project emphasized empathy;
3. the project's subject area was a sensitive area;
4. Place, Time and Society 8-13 must be closely related to the rest of the curriculum and to the rest of schooling;
5. the project emphasized interrelation rather than integration.

The idea of interrelation rather than integration as reflected in this Schools Council History, Geography and Social Science 8-13 project provided the source of key concepts for the teachers to base their selection of content, as in the issue of empathy. It also demonstrated history and geography's relationships with other social sciences and how more effectively they could be used to foster education for modern citizenship. It also emphasized the fostering of critical thinking which was necessary for participation. It laid less emphasis on content and more on the process of learning. Thus teaching was through the inquiry approach and content was selected according to the educational objectives to be achieved and the historical skills to be acquired. In this way, history was made capable of enabling pupils to develop the various skills of active citizenship. It provided initiation for changing the link between history and citizenship from its more passive role to its more active role.

The History 13-16 project was another example of the new history movement which adopted a more progressive inquiry approach to tackle citizenship education. The project was really seen as to help teachers to help themselves after the publication of the article, "History in Danger" by Mary Price in 1968. This project aimed to encourage teachers to promote more pupil participation in their study of history and to foster modern citizenship - active and participating. This project published A New Look at History, which was well received by this movement. In addition, it came with four other titles meant for citizenship education. They were "Conflict in Ireland," "China," "Arab-Israeli Conflict," and "The Move to European Unity." Both political and controversial issues were discussed in these four books.

Developments in new history have also taken place in the universities where the content of undergraduate history courses began to change. The most significant swing was towards the modern period and towards world history. Blows found that the great majority of universities taught English and European history post-1939, and almost all offered courses on American, and nearly half on African, history. Asa Briggs pointed out that social history was the main area of development in history in the 1970s. Methods of teaching and studying history were also changing. These changes were translated to the school situation. During the 1970s, there was also a noticeable swing from preoccupation with the content of the history lesson to a concern for the ways in which children came to understand history. Thus the two Schools Council project discussed earlier both contained a chapter on the nature of history. Curriculum planning was objective-based, getting teachers to think carefully about what they were seeking to achieve and, in particular, it led to a heavier emphasis on deductive thought and skill acquisition, an important aspect of modern citizenship education.

The assumption underlying the earlier chronological outline syllabus, that the pupil could gain a sense of development and change, and a grasp of chronology was called into question, though not totally discredited. The History 13-16 Project, for example, adopted a 'study in development' as a part of its examination syllabus. Pupils studied the development of medicine from early times so that they may better understand 'the process by which change takes place in human affairs and
continuities from the past survive into the present'.

As the chronological outline syllabus declined in popularity, so study in depth became more fashionable. The new history was reflected in the structure of history syllabus. The History 13-16 Project survey of 'O' level and CSE Mode I syllabi in 1971 and 1972 respectively found that, in both, 94% of pupils studied modern history either as British social and economic history, as British and/or European history, or as world history. Consequently, world history became popular in school in the 1960s. It continued to flourish in the 1970s, but faced competition for time from the various branches of social history, particularly local and environmental history, family history and historical demography.

There was also an increase in emphasis on using the activity method including simulation and drama techniques. Teachers favoring simulations had argued that they called on a range of skills, including the ability to use sources, communicate ideas, and appreciate other people's points of view, as well as providing the experience of making decisions. This strongly support the subject's

"flexible and open to new ideas but at the same time capable of assessing them against the traditional, aware of mankind in its variety," (Elton, 1970, p. 226)

which would be valuable for the vast majority if not all school pupils whatever their future intentions might be. In this way, history offered a comfortable home for citizenship education. Because of this, Holloway and Heater both argued that an association between history and social studies was necessary. Heater suggested that the syllabus should be constructed either chronologically or on an era basis, and the material should be selected for its usefulness in exemplifying social science concepts, as well as for its inherent historical significance.

This association of history and social studies, had brought about a significant and lasting effect on the methods of the teaching of history in British schools. In the context of the development of and changes in citizenship education it was worth looking at since its main objective was to bring out the relevance of the subject for the practical needs of the pupils in their daily life and in their future life. The fact that the new history was more flexible than the old meant that it could create more opportunities for citizenship issues to be explored. Through the inquiry method, the children could acquire information and perceive relationships, draw conclusions and make decision. The mental training and the broadening of experience that were made possible was a fine education for young people. In this way, both the nature of history and the citizenship value of history were seen to be maintained.

After a decade of development, new history was officially questioned on the ground that 'real' history was being devalued through this approach. In many schools in the 1980s, history continued to be taught through a chronological or an era approach. Inquiry approaches did not take off widely. In many schools the
emphasis remained on history for its own sake. Historical facts were stressed more than approaches. Its contribution to citizenship education thus tended to swing back to that of providing civic education. But it was at least generally different from the 'drum and trumpet' history of the earlier period. Some rhetoric and policies of history's preparation for its continuing contribution to citizenship education were still in place. For example, the document "History from 5-16" stated the aims of history teaching as

"to contribute to personal and social education by developing certain attitudes and values; for example a respect for evidence; and toleration of a range of opinions;" and "to communicate clearly, employing a wide range of media." (HMSO, 1988, p. 3)

This document also made a number of claims of history's capacity to cover different areas of citizenship education and cross-curricular dimensions and themes. For example, it claimed that "history is well placed to enrich the school curriculum, and to prepare young people for life in contemporary society..." and it "has a particularly important role to play in preparing pupils to participate in multi-ethnic society...." Finally it emphasized that

"a successful course in history ought to contribute towards the development of broadly educated people who are effective in their various roles as citizens, parents and contributors to the common good." (HMSO, 1988, p. 28)

In this way, it brought to light the continuity and change, and the rhetoric and policies concerning history's duty and capacity to teach citizenship education throughout the twentieth century.

Having said that, attention should also be drawn to Purkis's article in Teaching History, "The Unacceptable Face of History?" It uncovered some of the hidden agendas of history teaching, such as the continuing influence of R. J. Unstead, considered as the brand leader in school history. Though in the 1960s and 1970s, history had experienced rapid changes in favor of citizenship education, Purkis revealed that the most influential of the history school texts in primary and secondary education remained to be the old fashioned, Unstead's books, published in the 1950s. The following quotation supports this argument.

"History teachers everywhere would agree that for more than twenty years our brand leader has been R. J. Unstead, some of whose early works the publishers A. & C. Black are now re-issuing. Although some of the material has been re-arranged, for example, making what was originally one book into two by adding photographs, maps, an index and sometimes a bibliography - the text remains substantially what it was in 1959... His approach is structured, safe and conventional, using a chronology that traditional teachers, especially those non-specialists teaching in primary schools, remember from their own schooldays. He emphasizes the long-running, happy and glorious success story of the great (white) British people." (Purkis, 1980, p. 34)

Today, citizenship education still has a place in history. Rhetoric and
policies about it could be found, for example, in the National Curriculum documents entitled History Interim and Final Reports and the History Statutory Order of the 1990s. Though there was much early controversy, with the Secretary of State demanding more British History and giving a sharper focus for British experience, both Interim and Final Reports maintained a case for citizenship education. Four attainment targets were proposed to justify history's place in education, but the Statutory Order modified and reduced them to three. Citizenship education was there but not emphasized. Its implementation would therefore be left to chance. However, history non-statutory guidance document predictably and, in terms of official thinking appropriately, devoted some space to citizenship and cross-curricular themes such as:

"National Curriculum (for history) relates to the main components in National Curriculum Council's Curriculum Guidance 8: Education for Citizenship, i.e. work, employment and leisure, the family and the nature of community." (HMSO, 1991, p. 15)

Apart from providing ample lip service to citizenship education, the statutory order did not, of course, restrict the potentiality of the use of history for teaching citizenship components. Thus, it remained positive that citizenship education could be taught through permeation method through history under the National Curriculum environment.
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