DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 384 SO 015 047

AUTHOR Howard, James; Mendenhall, Thomas
TITLE Making History Come Alive: The Place of History in the Schools. Report of the History Commission.
INSTITUTION Council for Basic Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Aetna Life and Casualty, Hartford, Conn.; National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 88p.; Prepared by the Commission on the Teaching of History in Schools. Funding also provided by the Institute for Educational Affairs.
AVAILABLE FROM The Council for Basic Education, 725 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC ($5.50).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Area Studies; *Core Curriculum; Definitions; *Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; European History; History; *History Instruction; Introductory Courses; Literature; Non Western Civilization; Novels; Paperback Books; Resource Materials; *Teacher Education; Thematic Approach; United States History

ABSTRACT

This report argues for renewed attention to the teaching of history in the schools and provides suggestions for improving the state of history in our educational system. Much of history's trouble in the schools derives from a misunderstanding about what the subject is and what it is not. History is not social studies; it is essentially narrative. Through narrative, human experience is made understandable. If history is to assume its rightful place in the curriculum, teachers must be adequately trained. Teacher education should begin with a coherent, rigorous liberal education and should include a concentration in history, taught by professional historians and augmented by significant study in related fields. The preparation of history teachers should also include courses in the writing of history, historical method, and writing and should include pedagogical training. At the elementary level, the irreducible minimum of a history program should acquaint students with the past through progressively sophisticated narratives. The irreducible minimum for secondary schools should include a topical study of U.S. history, a survey of European history, and a survey of U.S. history. Beyond the irreducible minimum for secondary schools, the history of a non-Western country or area should be included. Appendices describe aids for the teacher and recommend books for elementary and secondary students. (RM)

MAKING HISTORY COME ALIVE:

The Place of History in the Schools

by James Howard
and
Thomas Mendenhall

Report
of the History Commission
of the
Council for Basic Education

Special acknowledgment for funding the CBE Commission on the Teaching of History in the Schools:

Aetna Life & Casualty Foundation, Inc.
Institute for Educational Affairs
National Endowment for the Humanities
Rockefeller Foundation

Cover design by John Connors.

Price: $5.50

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This book is the report of a commission formed by the Council for Basic Education (CBE) to study the place of history in the schools. The CBE Commission on the Teaching of History in Schools had its origins in the fact that history is in trouble. The Commission's efforts have been sustained by the conviction that schools should give care to history, one of the disciplines which everyone's education needs. Only history can provide the truly broad foundation on which students can come to understand themselves and their world. How history fell to its low estate, how and when it has been moving over and virtually out of the center of the school curriculum where it seemed so firmly located 75 years ago, are not the central concerns of this report. The decline has been frequently addressed, whether by professional historians intermittently concerned over history's "state of crisis," as one defined it in 1975, or by advocates of the social studies, perennially seeking to give order, scope, and sequence to their "patchwork," as one of them discovered the dilemma to be in 1977.[1] The Commission went to work out of the conviction that the time is ripe to do something about the decline. This report sets out what the Commission believes can and should be done; reaches general agreement on what history is and offers to the school curriculum; ensures a realistic and irreducible minimum of a history program; and determines who must cooperate to bring it about.

The Commission has concluded that much of history's trouble in the schools derives from a misunderstanding about what the subject is and what it is not. History is not social studies, although in many schools the history teachers find themselves in a department of that name. The Commission does not take issue with the expansion of secondary school history courses to include materials from such social sciences as government, economics, and sociology--an expansion in which historians took an active part. What is of first concern to the Commission is the result: today the social studies have subsumed the place of history in the schools. Yet the social studies, however one chooses to define them, are not history and cannot perform the role of history in the curriculum.

If history is not social studies, what is it? The Commission concludes that it is essentially narrative, and that out of history's narrative dimension comes its creative power. Through narrative, human experience is made understandable. Seen in this light, history is much more than the memorizing of facts and dates that so often students dismiss as boring. Remembering is not knowing. Facts must be acquired, but facts are not history. In the last analysis no one actually learns history, but everyone learns from the narrative that is history. Narrative, of course, must move through time, and the Commission sees perspective, heritage, citizenship, and mental discipline not only as ends for education but among the chief benefits of history.

If the subject is to assume its rightful place in the curriculum, the teaching of history must be equal to the role. Too often teachers have come to their classrooms poorly prepared to teach this basic subject, whether because of insufficient study of history or meaningless certification requirements. Once in the classroom these history teachers too often lack professional support from their counterparts in higher education and the historical societies, and they are subject to the full measure of miscellaneous duties that plague all teachers. Their departments are too often "the place where you hide your coaches." In the Commission's view both preservice and inservice preparation of history teachers must feature mastery of their subject, starting with a liberal education, a proper concentration in history, and good training in historiography.

The Commission's recommendations on what history is to be taught in the K-12 sequence, and where, begin by setting a limit to the history young Americans can do without and still presume to be basically educated. To be effective, the teaching of history requires a method that suits the style of the teacher, is responsive to the aptitude of the student, and is appropriate to the objective of the course.

It is the hope of the Commission that its report will prove encouraging to the teachers of history, sobering to those responsible for the preparation of these teachers, illuminating to all who administer, and ultimately helpful to students by rendering their courses less of a bore, more of a pleasure, and even an inspiration.

Sponsored by the Council for Basic Education and funded by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Rockefeller Foundation and supplemental grants from the Aetna Life & Casualty Foundation, Inc. and the Institute for Educational Affairs, the Commission began its work in November 1979. Its 12 members and two consultants represent a useful range of experience in the teaching and writing of history in school and college. Both the preparation of history teachers and the general public's hopes for school history

were also represented on the Commission. Thanks to a research assistant, the Commission was able to survey the extensive literature on the subject and to consult professional organizations of historians and teachers who shared its concern. Meeting five times (twice in Washington, D.C. and Boston, and once in Portland, Oregon); the Commission's 14 rather strong-minded participants were able to reach a consensus on the problem. All the Commission's members visited classrooms in different parts of the country, and all are grateful to the students, teachers, and administrators who were unfailingly hospitable. The project assistant, David Kolkebeck, helped the Commission as both an energetic researcher and an efficient chronicler of the Commission's tortuous progress toward a final consensus. The CBE staff were always cheerfully prepared to support the work of the Commission.

The text of this report is the work of James Howard, the Commission's project director, co-author of Empty Pages,[2] and editor of Basic Education. He patiently endured the efforts of the Commission to write a report in full committee, and the more sustained efforts of the consultants and the chairman, who served as an editorial committee.

Perhaps the most heartening, satisfying aspect of the Commission's work, for both project director and chairman, is the fact that eventually the Commission unanimously endorsed the report. If a group so varied in background and experience could reach such agreement, perhaps the time may indeed be ripe and history will find the way back to its rightful place in the schools.

September 1982

Thomas Mendenhall

History Commission Members

Thomas C. Mendenhall
Chairman, History Commission
President, Smith College 1959-1975

James Howard
Project Director, History Commission
Editor, Basic Education

Kathleen N. Conzen
Associate Professor of History
University of Chicago

John Demos
Professor of History
Brandeis University

Henry Drewry
Director, Teacher Preparation
and Placement
Princeton University

Peggy Hunt
History Teacher
Audubon Elementary School
Baton Rouge, LA

Charles O. Moody
Director of Development
Music Educators National Conference
Washington, DC

Nancy Roelker
Professor of History
Boston University

R. Winfield Smith
Former President
National School Boards Association

Mary Jo Thomas
History Teacher
Churchill High School
Eugene, OR

Elliott Trommald
History Chairman
Blair Academy
Blairstown, NJ

Edward M. Warren
Principal
Burnt Hills-Ballston Lake
High School
Burnt Hills, NY

Henry Zabierek
Social Studies Coordinator
Brookline Public Schools
Brookline, MA

Consultants

Jacques Barzun
University Professor Emeritus
Columbia University

Paul Ward
Executive Secretary Emeritus
American Historical Association

(Positions as of the first meeting of the Commission in November 1979.)

I
History and a Fuller Life

"In the reconstruction of American schooling that is going forward, I would put properly taught history second on the list of goals to be achieved--right after literacy."[1]

"History is bunk," said Henry Ford--but no one took him seriously.

Since Henry Ford's time, historians have multiplied and prospered. David Hackett Fischer writes in The New Republic about "young historians rocketing along at a great rate ... sustained by a new confidence in their calling which is stronger than at any time since the 19th century."[2] Popular interest in the past has reached unprecedented proportions. The long run of "The Adams Chronicles" on television; the phenomenal sales of books in John Jakes's "Kent Family Chronicles"; the extraordinary attention given Alex Haley's Roots--all bear witness. Such developments reflect more than nostalgia or escape from the present.

The truth is that history can mean a richer, fuller life for people. All people. History is valuable, even necessary, not because it teaches them "survival skills" or assures them of job opportunities, but because it is one of the subjects on which their entire education depends.

"Both logic and experience suggest," Clifton Fadiman wrote in 1959, "that certain subjects have generative power."[3] Fadiman was explaining the idea of basic education at a time when the "life adjustment" notion of education was infiltrating the schools. It was the persuasion of many individuals prominent in the education establishment of the day that the traditional subjects of schooling were not appropriate for the masses of young people coming along after the World War II baby boom. They did not hold that all children could, or needed to learn such academic stuff; and under their influence, the familiar curriculum of elementary and secondary education gave way to instruction deemed better for socializing the young. Today, the life adjustment notion has been born again, wrapped this time in "survival skills" and embedded in the curriculum of many schools. At the same time, ironically, the "back-to-basics movement" has fostered a popular conception of basic education that threatens to settle for minimum competence in the perennial Three Rs.

"Basic education," Clifton Fadiman continued, "concerns itself with those matters which, once learned, enable the student to learn all the other matters, whether trivial or complex, that cannot properly be the subjects of elementary and secondary schooling .... It has been the general experience of men that certain subjects and not others possess this generative power. Among these subjects are those that deal with language, whether or not one's own; forms, figures, and numbers; the laws of nature; the past; and the shape and behaviour of our common home, the earth. Apparently these master or generative subjects endow one with the ability to learn the minor or self-terminating subjects. They also endow one, of course, with the ability to learn the higher, more complex developments of the master subjects themselves."[4]

> History in the schools today--overshadowed and undervalued in the curriculum; often neglected by professional historians and found boring by many students.

History is one of these master subjects, and the pity is that people get so little of it in school. They get a lot of what Jacques Barzun has called "bald factual listing punctuated with dates"[5] and a good deal of subjects called "social studies," but precious little real history. Those who say they "hate history" because they have had nothing but factual listings punctuated with dates do not understand what they are learning; those who have mistaken an assortment of social studies for history do not know what they have missed. Either way, their education is basically deficient.

In most schools today, the subject of history is subsumed by the curricular genus of "social studies." Teachers of history belong to social studies departments, they commonly identify themselves as social studies teachers, and they teach other subjects in addition to history. Parents are likely to presume that if their children are taking any social studies courses, they are learning history. They may or may not be.

The term "social studies" came into use in the 1920s after two decades of efforts on the part of academicians (including a number of historians) to reform American education. Their earnest endeavor was to make education more appropriate, more functional, for a society that since the late 19th century had been expanding prodigiously and changing dramatically. They intended to exploit new knowledge and new forms of knowledge, notably the social sciences. To carry out that intention, teachers' colleges and university schools of education raised up professional social studies educators who, over the years, have adapted the social sciences for use in the schools, revised the treatment of history, and introduced a variety of new subjects. The aim has become to provide "an integration of experience and knowledge concerning human relations for the purpose of citizenship education."[6]

"The content of social studies is a smorgasbord of this and that from everywhere," say Professors Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis in Defining the Social Studies. "It is as confusing and vague as is the goal of citizenship."[7] History is only one of 25 "disparate areas" identified in a recent study under the social studies rubric. The others range from anthropology, career education, and consumer education at one end of the alphabet to sexism education, social psychology, and urban studies at the other--with legal education, moral education, and multicultural education in the middle.[8] However legitimate in the curriculum of schooling any of these may be, or however useful in the lives of schoolchildren, none of these other subjects is history, and none is generative or basic in the sense that history is.

In general, the focus of social studies is the present; the aim, to prepare students too narrowly for the here and now. In 1981, when he was New York State's Deputy Commissioner of Education, Robert Spillane spoke of social studies as "current-events-based," and called for a "history-based curriculum."[9] Referring to recent developments in Poland, he said, "Only people who have studied history for its own sake and have experience thinking clearly and writing about the events of the past will be able really to comprehend these crises and the crises of the future which we cannot predict today." The practical value of studying the past could hardly be better put.

The social sciences and their adaptations for schoolteaching, moreover, deal largely with fragments of human experience--sociology with conditions of unemployment, for example, political science with governance, anthropology with comparative cultures. By contrast, history uniquely provides the continuity that gives human experience wholeness. And just as a tailor had better know all his customer's measurements before he cuts the sleeves and trousers of a suit, so a child in school needs to gain some comprehension of human experience whole before being able to make sense of the fragments.

Yet history is basic to all learning in every subject.

Literacy is a condition of education, the prerequisite. History provides a way of weaving together the threads of learning--current, traditional, analytical--into whole cloth. Schoolteacher Martha Doerr Toppin calls it the glue that holds together skills, concepts, and facts "culled from across the curriculum" and prevents them from becoming "like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle scattered across the table."[10] She makes the point that history reconstructs the human context in which ideas such as freedom and equality have meaning. "Finally," she maintains, "a knowledge of the past increases our options. Things do not have to be the way they are in our neighborhood, in our suburb, in our time. We are not isolated or insulated in the present. We are not leashed to the limits of our own experience. We are not time's orphans."[11] History is not just a subject that is "good for you if you're a thinker," as one

social studies educator has said. It is a subject needed by everyone who hopes to become educated.

This report argues that history is one of the basic disciplines of education. Although history still appears in the curriculum of most schools, it has been stripped of much of its value. Its peculiar organizing power is not recognized or understood. Teachers are poorly prepared to teach history, and until more are better prepared, American education and American students will suffer the lack of this basic discipline. The following chapters speak to the urgency of these conditions, as CBE's Commission discovered them.

II
The Dominant Curriculum

"We may be living in historic times, but history as a field of study is experiencing a highly publicized crisis of neglect .... Social studies, partly out of an attempt to broaden its appeal and scope, has undergone a steady reduction in the amount of history in its curriculum."[1]

Every day, in thousands of classrooms across the country, teachers routinely press the facts of history on tens of thousands of students. Virtually every state now makes history a requirement for high school graduation, and it would be difficult to find a district in any state where the curriculum does not feature the subject. How can anyone say the amount of history in the schools is declining?

The cover of the May 1980 issue of Social Education delineates what recent studies have found to be "the dominant social studies curriculum pattern in the U.S. today." Here is the pattern, kindergarten to 12th grade:

K - Self, School, Community, Home

1 - Families

2 - Neighborhoods

3 - Communities

4 - State History, Geographic Regions

5 - U.S. History

6 - World Cultures, Western Hemisphere

7 - World Geography or History

8 - American History

9 - Civics or World Cultures

10 - World History

11 - American History

12 - American Government

History as it is taught today: usually required but poorly learned.

With so much exposure, young Americans might reasonably be expected to know at least their own country's history pretty well, but evidently they do not. In 1976, The New York Times conducted a nationwide test of college freshmen "to measure in this bicentennial year the level of historical knowledge of an important segment of the population."[2] As multiple-choice tests go, this was not an easy one; but, as the social studies coordinators or history chairmen in 18 schools in six cities agreed, a college-bound high school graduate should have been able to score at least 70 percent. In fact, only one student in 12 scored that high.

Reporting the results, Edward B. Fiske, Education Director of The New York Times, expressed concern less about the memorizing of facts than about the understanding of them by students entering college from American high schools. "They may know about the high points of American history," Fiske observed, "but their knowledge of details and the context of these epochal events does not run deep."[3] And one of the freshmen who took the Times test commented, "Let's face it, de Tocqueville was right: we are mediocre."[4]

There is no dearth of data to confirm such estimates, or even to suggest that they are generous. In 1978, the National Assessment of Educational Progress found that the ability of 17-year-olds to explain the essentials of democracy had declined 12 percentage points in six years. An article in The Washington Post of January 16, 1979, reporting a Gallup Poll, led with this sentence: "Only three percent of the nation's 17- and 18-year-olds can correctly identify Alaska and Hawaii as the last two states to join the Union."

These statistics, however, do not tell us what is actually happening in history classrooms--what and how teachers are teaching, or how their students respond. To find out what is happening, it is necessary to be in classrooms where teachers and students are giving and taking courses that make up the curricula of our schools.

U.S. History A 232, for example, proved to be one teacher's version of the 11th-grade course one high school requires of college preparatory students. The school's curriculum description said this about A 232:

> U.S. History is required by law for all students. This survey course is designed to familiarize the student with the American Experience and seeks to mold in each student a sense of pride and appreciation for our country's development.

In their textbook (History USA, by Jack Allen and John L. Bates), the students had reached the decade preceding the Civil War. Beyond a

disinclination to allow his charges to leave school unpersuaded that the North was at least as much to blame as the South for the War Between the States, the teacher was little tempted to go beyond the text. His standard operating procedure was to furnish each member of the class with a ditto sheet of questions on the current chapter. Questions of the multiple-choice, true-false, or fill-in-the-blank variety could be answered in a sentence or two, if not in a word or a phrase. For Chapter 12, there were 51 questions. Here are samples:

--Multiple-choice. The Chief Justice who made the ruling against Dred Scott was A. John Marshall B. Earl Warren C. Roger Taney D. John Jay.

--True-false. Douglas still managed to win the Senate seat from Lincoln in Illinois in 1853 because his fellow Democrats were elected to the state legislature which in turn chose the Senators from that state.

--The _____ _____ was a secret organization which quietly assisted fugitive slaves in escaping to the North.

--When the case finally reached the Supreme Court, how did Chief Justice Roger B. Taney rule on it?

With few exceptions (there was only one exception among the 51 questions for Chapter 12), all the right answers were in their textbook, and the students were expected to dig them out, record them on their ditto sheets, and be prepared to answer the questions in class recitation. When a volunteer gave a wrong answer, the teacher gave the correct one. When the volunteer was right, the teacher might elaborate for a moment before proceeding to the next question.

This recitation made for slow but thorough coverage of material. Class and teacher were congenial enough, but there really was no discussion. From time to time during the course of the school year, the standard procedure was varied when a student made special preparation to conduct the class, and one period a week was set aside, regularly, for a movie, at which attendance was not required. Once concerned about writing, the teacher had long since left "grammar and all that" to his English-teaching colleagues, and at examination time, questions like those on the ditto sheets made up the examination.

History as it is taught today: imposed values and meaningless facts.

The variables are far too many to call any class typical. U.S. History A232 might better be called "average." There are more--and less--imaginative teachers, more and less able students. Assuredly there are less congenial classes, not to say classes where poor discipline and disorder are more the rule than the exception. Yet A232 is in the mainstream of the schoolteaching of history. It is in what social studies educators call the "citizenship transmission tradition," which, they say, most teachers follow. In Defining the Social Studies, the authors explain that "citizen transmission teachers begin with a set of oughts and givens--that is, knowledge, assumptions, and beliefs which are treated as self-evident truths which need to be accepted at face value."[5] Whether this explanation is always operative or not, it is patently true that oughts and givens so dominate the schoolteaching of history that students are bored to tears with "facts" that seem irrelevant to them and to the world in which they find themselves. When an Illinois high school asked graduates from 1974 and 1977 for "input from the clients we serve," history courses earned the distinction of being the least valuable they had taken,[6] and one of the freshmen who took The New York Times test put the matter this way: "Who cares what went on back then? We have enough to worry about in the future."[7]

There was a time when little or nothing more was expected of history in school than the inculcation of facts for moralistic and patriotic ends. It may be that two and three generations ago teachers were more successful in making inculcation interesting or that because schoolchildren were less mature (we are told) and had fewer of the distractions with which advancing technology has since "enriched" young lives, they were content with such instruction. Times and students have changed, and educators have made attempt after attempt to keep up. Although none of the attempts has unseated the transmission tradition, one attempt deserves recognition for its promise.

History as it is taught today: discovering history through the New History.

The so-called inquiry method emerged with what was dubbed the "New History" of the 1960s. In part a latter-day reaction to traditional teaching and learning, it was also in part a concerted effort to apply the disciplines of the advancing social sciences to history in the schools. The argument for this departure was that "the student learns best as an active inquirer--by asking questions and pursuing their answers--rather than when he is asked, as an end in itself, to master the answers of others to questions which may be quite irrelevant to him or which he may only dimly understand."[8] Let two proponents of the New History explain. Charles G. Sellers quotes Richard H. Brown:

> This "discovery learning," as Professor Brown calls it, is not confined to the use of original sources or to a simple method of learning. Like the historian, the student "will doubtless learn both inductively and deductively, pursuing his question not only to the original sources but to good books, to reference books such as a text, to the findings of social scientists, to anyone who can tell him something he wants to know, even the teacher." Necessarily abandoning the traditional goal of "coverage," discovery learning instead asks "what the student can be expected to do with the subject in terms of his own development." Through the intensive study of selected episodes the student is invited over and over again "to discover for himself paradox and irony, to confront dilemma, to see that not all problems are solvable, and to appreciate the nature and uses of value judgments, while practicing making them." The hope is that the student, "in trying to explain for himself why particular human beings acted as they did in particular situations, will deepen his own understanding of what it is to be human, that he will come to appreciate man's necessity to act in the midst of uncertainty, to grapple with the moral dimensions of man's behavior, and to comprehend more fully the nobility and frailty of the human condition."[9]

The New History did not sweep away the old. Its methods of inquiry or discovery were so radically different from the accustomed practice of many teachers (and required so much more training and preparation than they had) that many resisted. Those who used the method were not all or always successful when it came to "postholing"--the inquiry technique of digging into history here and there, rather than plowing the surface of the entire field. They dug holes, but they did not finish the fence the posts were intended to support. Nor did they have the materials to show them how. Critical of textbooks written to make the New History a classroom reality, Frances FitzGerald comments, "The form of the inquiry text permits authors to avoid what they choose to, and some of them avoid the main issues."[10]

Nevertheless, this effort to "save education from losing a dimension which history alone can bring"[11] was not without virtue or effect. If, when it was still new, the New History did not draw a mighty following in the schools, it was up against students who assumed that learning was a passive occupation, not a self-directed endeavor. One member of the Commission recalls a group of students who were indignant because their teacher used a New History textbook to insist on a single point of view. All year long they argued with him, drawing on materials in the book, only to find at the end of the course that they had learned

a great deal of American history. In such ways as this the New History has had its influence. It remains an option that challenges properly trained, well-prepared teachers, and it can enhance traditional teaching.

History as it is taught today: innovations in the hope of catching the pupil's interest.

In recent years, social studies educators have tried to sweeten the bitter pills of citizenship transmission--often, if not always, to the detriment of history. During the expansive 1960s and early 1970s it was the innovative teacher, principal, or school that enjoyed prestige and popularity in most communities, especially when new features of instruction could be billed as "exciting." Many of the innovations that proved ineffectual have been abandoned and forgotten, and the back-to-basics mentality has combined with a general need for budgetary retrenchment to end the fashion. The compulsion of teachers and schools to provide excitement is still strong, however, and the diluting and adulteration of history continues.

One has only to browse through school social studies programs to get an idea othe variety of changes. Some--like the introduction of "gut courses" students may elect to meet history requirements--amount to concession, pure and simple. Some represent the initiative of teachers or curriculum specialists who want, sincerely enough, to make history interesting, or at least meaningful, to indifferent or restive pupils. Much of this new pedagogical tackle is worth no more than its novelty. Still, to reject it hook, line, and sinker would be neither to fish nor cut bait.

Folk history, for instance, can serve to enlighten the study of almost any period or movement--America's westward expansion, for an obvious example. Out of the stuff of recollection comes what is now called "oral history." To listen to an old-timer recall days gone by (better still, perhaps, to record him recalling) may not provide students with altogether accurate information, but putting them in touch with a 91-year-old survivor of the Titanic may give them a sense of that historic disaster's reality, and at the same time give them an opportunity to learn how to ask questions about the past. Attempting histories of their families or home towns can give students an appreciation of their heritage that neither teachers nor textbooks can, affording them at the same time the experience of resolving conflicts of evidence and the priceless benefits of writing to learn. The profession suffers not at all if, for a few short weeks, sixth- or eighth-graders, or even high school students, are called student historians.

Activities like these are not out of place. It is conceivable that, under the supervision of a teacher well trained in history, any or a combination of them might constitute an entire history course for

elementary school children. For high school students, such activities can have important supplementary value, although they cannot take the place of more comprehensive and disciplined study.

History as it is taught today: television makes a show of history but needs active minds.

Television is a different problem. The "vast new presence"[12] is not an innovation schools and teachers are free to take or leave. Widely recognized now as a present danger to education, television is also a present reality in education. Explaining that, like school, television is a total system of teaching and learning, Neil Postman argues persuasively, "Not only is television a curriculum, but it constitutes the major educational enterprise now being undertaken in the United States."[13] All but one in a million schoolchildren are enrolled in the TV curriculum, many for more than all the hours they spend in schools. Prime time and all the time, television goes right on teaching, no matter what goes on in the schools.

There are many, many questions about the role of television as a teacher. The question here is, how does television affect the teaching of history in schools? Of course, history is not a major subject in the TV curriculum, but now and then documentaries take viewers into history, and splendid productions such as "The Adams Chronicles" occasionally bring the past to life for those who watch. And there are "Roots" and "Holocaust." Surely all these must be a boon to schoolteachers who strive to make history interesting and meaningful.

They may be. Teachers who know enough history to help students distinguish between fact and fiction can use these shows to good advantage, but it is important to remember that television "does what its structure makes it do, and it teaches as it must."[14] Television teaches by putting on a show. That is what its structure makes it do; that is how it must teach. TV documentaries are "docudramas"; even the television produced expressly for instructional use in schools (ITV) teaches by putting on shows, with good guys and bad guys and happy endings.

This is not to suggest that good teachers may not also be good performers. The classroom, after all, has ever been a place for showmanship, and teachers are often remembered as great precisely because they put on good shows. One recalls Walter (Buzzer) Hall at Princeton a generation ago, giving his famous lecture on Garibaldi, or watches John Rassias stride costumed into his class to take the part of Montesquieu and teach "in a storm of theatrics" at Dartmouth today.[15] But good teaching and showmanship are not one and the same. Nor have television performers the pedagogic earnest of a Buzzer Hall or a John Rassias.

Both a danger to and a reality in education, television may from time to time lend interest to the schoolteaching of history, but it can hardly do more. "The mere knowledge of a fact is pale," says Mark Twain's Connecticut Yankee, "but when you come to realize your fact, it takes on color."[16] Television can help students realize their facts. Given the pervasiveness and the appeal of television, history teachers have an opportunity--perhaps a responsibility--to exploit the TV curriculum. Even if they do not show television in class or assign it for homework, they are sensible to find out what programs their students watch. Those programs that draw on or purport to be history offer teachers an opportunity, not simply for comment and discussion, but most especially for teaching their students how to be critical in their use of the new medium. Teachers who passed over the television productions of "The Adams Chronicle," "Roots," or "Holocaust" forfeited one of the most available means they now have of helping young people to learn and make good use of history.

A teacher makes the point, "When you say something about TV, all of a sudden you've got instant attention."[17] Television will exploit teachers who do not exploit television.

The new historians did not succeed in saving the day for history, but history still looms large in the dominant curriculum of the social studies. Much diluted and often adulterated to a degree that renders its content indistinguishable from ordinary personal opinion, the subject of history is virtually a universal requirement for high school graduation--and students find the subject boring. Most teachers follow the sturdy tradition of citizenship transmission, pressing values and facts ("oughts and givens") on students, who find them of little worth or interest--in a word, irrelevant. Neither television nor any other innovation of recent years has done much to help the students comprehend their facts or hold the values as their own.

History as it is taught today: historians share responsibility for school textbooks and teacher preparation.

The explanation for this contradictory state of affairs is complicated, more cultural than educational. Nevertheless, professional historians and teachers of history have to answer for the situation. That is to say, while they cannot be held entirely responsible, it is to them we must look for a remedy.

In a review of contemporary historical writing in the United States, Michael Kammen observes that "the [historical] profession has grown rapidly in recent years, its geographical scope and methodological sophistication have increased dramatically; and, most of all, a creative proliferation of new historical literature is altering our perception of the past."[18] Kammen details the "vocation shifts" in the profession, brought about by:

> quantitative methods and computer technology; by the "discovery" of women, blacks, ethnic groups, the laboring and so-called dangerous classes; by the application of social theory and psychoanalysis; by the striking growth of area studies programs by the development of urban and rural history as sophisticated genres that have been enhanced by the application of historical geography; and by the emergence of local history and historical archaeology as innovative sub-disciplines with far-reaching implications.

Creative as it may be, the proliferation of new historical literature has not been much of a boon for students in school. Historians who came of age following World War II, Kammen acknowledges, "eschewed traditional narrative history in favor of analytical history,"[19] and like other contemporary professionals, historians since have tended to be specialists, cultivating narrow strips of a broad field.[20] Eugene Genovese, a past president of the Organization of American Historians, deplores the fact that "overspecialization is reaching new heights of absurdity." He writes,

> It was bad enough when economic history was mechanistically divorced from political history, and social history from intellectual history. Now we have such further fragmentation as the separation of econometric from institutional-economic history, and of quantitative from non-quantitative social history.[21]

All of which is to say that the people who write history are not yet writing much that is usable in school. Their special interests have effectually abetted fragmentation of the knowledge of human experience and put them out of touch with the need of young students to gain some comprehension of human experience whole. As Charles Sellers admitted a decade ago, college professors have been

> complacently indifferent to the freshman and sophomore courses that afford the only opportunities for historical learning to the vast majority of students, and to the history courses in the schools that afford the only opportunity for historical learning to the vast majority of the population. Worse, when we had thought about these channels for historical learning at all, we had more or less unconsciously conceived of them in terms of their utility in preparing students for the advanced historical learning that most of them would never undertake.[22]

Of such is the ivory tower. Richard Brown translates the Sellers confession into a blanket indictment: "The sad fact of the matter is that the historical profession has really been guilty of almost total indifference to the world of education."[23] Brown is one professor who recognizes the basic place of history in the schools, and he has scored his peers for their failure to help train schoolteachers of history properly. "The fault," he said in 1965, "lies not so much at the feet of those people who train him [the teacher] in methods courses, as it does at the feet of those who do not train him properly in the so-called content courses."[24]

On balance, Brown was probably right. In addition, the failure of university and college professors to set an example of teaching that encourages self-directed learning may account for the plight of history-teaching in the schools. Let it be acknowledged at once that in the schools today there still are excellent teachers of history. Excellence, however, is lamentably rare.

History as it is taught today: the great variation in the preparation and commitment of those who are called on to teach history.

There are more than two million teachers now in practice in public schools. Their average age is 36. The oldest among them probably had some pretty solid, fact-oriented history when they went to school--American history without a doubt, very likely ancient history, and perhaps English or European as well. Others arrived after the now-dominant curriculum was more or less in place, when the downgrading of history was under way and adulteration advancing. The majority took "teacher education" programs as undergraduates in college. Those who intended to teach history may well have had nothing more than freshman and sophomore courses in which they were not trained to use evidence critically. Having met the other requirements after graduation, they were certified or licensed as social studies teachers under state regulations that require little and sometimes no special preparation in history.

With backgrounds like that, only the brightest and best can be expected to give students the benefits of history as set out next in this report. But even that prospect dims when newly certified teachers meet their classes. Few professions or occupations leave beginners so soon or so utterly on their own as schoolteaching. Young teachers rarely have the close support of mentors whose knowledge and experience they need; and even as they gain experience of their own, their teaching is informed largely by bland "instructional materials" that have been approved for their use by higher authority often as remote from the actual classroom as a state adoption committee.

There is no denying that state certification requirements leave the door wide open to poorly prepared teachers of history. It is possible that the authorities who make the requirements up carry on under the tenacious misapprehension that "social studies is history anyhow." More likely, superintendents of schools and principals are grateful to have a curriculum area like social studies, plastic enough to conform quietly to miscellaneous requirements of school administration.

Nowadays school administrators are obliged to marshal a parade of "educations" that have nothing to do with the traditional curriculum. We have mentioned career education, consumer education, and one or two others. The line of march is long, however, and even as death education goes by, the end is not in sight. Perhaps because many of these can be associated more plausibly with citizenship than with quadratic equations, or irregular verbs, these "educations" are more likely to be added to the teaching loads of history and social studies teachers. One teacher said to the Commission, "We're kind of a dumping ground for anything that comes along."

When shrinking school enrollments make necessary "reduction in force," untenured or junior teachers of history and social studies give place to senior teachers of home economics or music, because it is generally assumed that anyone who has a college degree can teach history and social studies--though not physics or French.

And administrators have to find teaching billets for the coaches of athletic teams. The curriculum supervisor of a Midwest school district called social studies "the place where you hide your coaches." Although coaches in classrooms are not the unexceptionable scandal many would like to believe, it is probably true that more coaches are social studies teachers than teachers of any other academic subject. We do not doubt there are first-rate history teachers among them, but to the best of our knowledge there is no intellectual basis for the correlation between coaching sports and teaching history.

The coincidence is common, though perhaps not everywhere as striking as it is in Iowa. There, a survey of the public schools found that in 1977-78, "almost 40 percent of all the history teachers in Iowa coached a sport, and 57 percent of the respondents of our questionnaire identify themselves as coaches." These teacher-coaches "place less value on having a major in history than do their non-coaching colleagues"; and superintendents concede "that the necessity of filling coaching positions sometimes results in the appointment of history and social studies teachers who are less competent in their subject area than non-coaching candidates for the same position."[25]

The Iowa study does not prove that coaches make poor history teachers. It simply indicates that in one state, coaches and history teachers are commonly the same individuals, and that they tend to be casually qualified to teach history and prefer to be identified as coaches. Most importantly, the study exposes an order of public priorities that mines the field of history teaching in every state. The importance of winning teams in interscholastic athletic competition is not lost on superintendents who value their jobs, and if the price of winning teams is losing history classes, so be it.

History as it is taught today: the unhappy result.

If the air rings with cries that our young citizens know too little history, and if polls and surveys persist in particularizing their ignorance, there is no reason to be surprised. The ringing and persistence serve warning, and we neglect it only at the students' peril.

The warning is not that we confront another routine crisis which we can meet with routine crisis mentality. It is that our highly prized democratic education--the education we pay so much for, count so much on--is unraveling. Although it does provide young Americans with useful skills, important information, and even some ideas of significance, the tie that helps make these fragments of learning comprehensible and holds them together has come undone. To borrow a figure from the writer and philosopher Alston Chase, "fission has replaced fusion as a source of energy on campus."[26]

The condition is serious. Unchecked, it will bring up a citizenry of individuals who may be experts but yet lack the kind of education that sustains a society of free women and men. History alone cannot save society from fragmentation, but it can help mightily to give coherence to the subject matter of education, to make democratic education effective. The moment to consider seriously the benefits of history has arrived.

III
History as the Commission Sees It

"The past is one way--and not the worst way--of acquiring the right and the criteria to judge the present."[1]

Underlying all the reasons for the "lamentable state of history in our educational system"[2] is a misconception compounded by a presumption. The misconception is the persistent and pervasive notion that history is nothing but an aggregate of facts; the presumption is that mere knowledge of the facts--knowing them "by heart"--will ensure the benefit of good citizenship.

There are hosts of adults "out there" who remember history as a dreary business of keeping kings on the right thrones, presidents in their proper order, laws, battles, and treaties paired with their dates. They have a hard time remembering dates, and facts bore them. Like others who avoid writing because they hated grammar and never could spell, they give history a wide berth. History may be important, but it is not for them.

These good souls, many of them, hold college and university degrees. They are practical people. They may not reject history as bunk, but they probably agree with Henry Ford that "an educated man is not one whose memory is trained to carry a few dates in his head--he is one who is trained to accomplish things.... You may fill your head with all the 'facts' of all ages, and your head may be just an overloaded fact-box when you get through."[3]

Yet even such unhistorical or even antihistorical folk probably know more history than they suppose. They may recall "stout Cortez," for example, "when with eagle eyes/He stared at the Pacific and all his men/Looked at each other with a wild surmise/Silent, upon a peak in Darien." And who doesn't know that "In fourteen hundred ninety-two/ Columbus sailed the ocean blue"? Rhythm and rhyme have made 1492 not only an unforgettable date, but that immortal doggerel's subject and verb--"Columbus sailed"--have helped generations of Americans remember the story of one of history's greatest excursions. The phrase recalls Europe at the end of the 15th century, reaching and pushing out. It brings to mind Columbus himself--persuasive, persistent, brave--who, sailing west to reach the East, began the history we call American.

What is history? It is a story, of a particularly creative sort.

That story is history. The date serves only to help put the story in perspective. Simply defined, all history is story. True story. History tells what real people have actually done over time, and insofar as their motives and objectives can be ascertained, history seeks to explain why and answer, "What of it?" Its truth makes history important; its narrative form makes history intelligible and vital.

Let it be said at once that not all history is equally intelligible and vital. Such qualities depend upon the skill of the teller or, as it may be, the teacher. Nor are all histories equally important, true as they may be. This is because virtually any human endeavor that lasts long enough has a history. Big business has a history. So has bee-keeping, but the history of bee-keeping is important to fewer people than that of big business. These and many other histories will always be told for the edification of those to whom they are important.

Saying that all history is story is neither to imply that the subject is nothing but bedtime stuff for children nor to suggest that for adults its value is not different from that of a Gothic novel, or even a literary classic. Although professional historians might be happier with some such definition as "critical thinking about the past,"[4] to define history as story is to feature the form that gives the subject its peculiar generative quality.

"There is more to narrative form than meets the eye or the ear," says Professor Stephen Crites of Wesleyan University.[5] Arguing profoundly that it is through "sacred" and "mundane" stories that one gains a sense of one's self and one's world, Crites insists that "only narrative form can contain the tensions, the surprises, the disappointments and reversals and achievements of actual, temporal experience." History, we have said, is true story--the actual, temporal experience of men and women whose tensions, surprises, disappointments, reversals, and achievements have made our world. To know something of their experience is to broaden one's sense of the world and of one's place in it.

"But remembering is not knowing," Crites continues. "Its chronicle is too elemental, too fixed, to be illuminating. Experience is illuminated only by the more subtle process of recollection." He illustrates with the recollection of this episode from his own childhood:

> In an impetuous fit of bravado I threw a rock through a garage window. I recall the exact spot on the ground from which I picked up the rock. I recall the wind-up, the pitch, the rock in mid-air, the explosive sound of the impact, the shining spray of glass, the tinkling

> hail of shards falling on the cement below, the rough stony texture of the cement. I recall also my inner glee at that moment, and my triumph when a playmate, uncertain at first how to react, looked to me for his cue and then broke into a grin... Then I recall that moment in the evening when I heard my father's returning footsteps on the porch and my guilty terror reached a visceral maximum the very memory of which wrenches a fat adult belly--for remembering is not simply a process in the head! The details of the scene that ensued are likewise very vivid in my memory...
>
> I have had many insights into this chronicle that I could not have had at the time its events occurred. Yet the sophisticated new story I might tell about it would be superimposed on the image-stream of the original chronicle. It could not replace the original without obliterating the very materials to be recollected in the new story. Embedded in every sophisticated retelling of such a story is this primitive chronicle preserved in memory. Even conscious fictions presuppose its succesive form, even when they are artfully recorded.[6]

What Crites calls recollection is nothing less than the power to abstract, which makes possible the explanation, manipulation, and control inherent in knowing, as distinct from remembering or memorizing facts. "In this sense," says Crites, "all knowledge is recollection."

Facts, to be sure, are important. Without them as the relatively firm building blocks of truth, there would be no subject of history. And just as it is fundamental to know some facts or some functions to proceed in any subject or discipline, whether it be mathematics or science, music or art, or any other, so the study of history must begin with events, happenings, and experiences we call history. Facts are not the end of the study, however. Few are driven to history by a passion for miscellaneous information or incidental intelligence. It is the human need to know and understand that impels us to recollect the events and experiences of history.

The etymologies of both "history" and "story" go beyond differing antecedents to their common beginning in a word that means "learned" or "knowing," and it is not a coincidence that the first historians were storytellers. So have the great historians down through the centuries been storytellers, and their narratives have made it possible for us to consult the experience of the past, to understand our world and recognize our place in it. If young people today are to become educated women and men in more than a superficial or perfunctory sense, they need history's stories to consult.

What is history? It is the heritage of both the individual and the group.

"History," said Carl Becker, "is no more than things said and done in the past."[7] What are young people expected to do with these said-and-done things? Why, specifically, do they need to consult history's stories?

One reason is to become acquainted with their heritage. The word rings with hollow rhetoric, but when heritage is taken literally to mean that which is inherited, the word becomes big with meaning. Ignorant heirs may waste their substance with riotous living; those who know the history of their inheritance are more likely to use and enjoy it constructively. Collectively, the citizens of the United States have inherited some 3.5 million square miles of land peopled by successive immigrations from the rest of the world, developed and exploited under the leadership of hosts of heroes and villains, and characterized by distinctive institutions and cultures.

Heritage is more than history, and to learn all one's heritage (as if that were possible) one must turn to other subjects--for expert knowledge of political and economic institutions, to political science and economics; for heroes and villains, to biography and folklore; for literature, art, and music to the arts. Yet because heritage accumulates over time, there is no way of making its acquaintance without consulting history. The experiences of stout Cortez and of Columbus are part of our heritage. So are the commitments of those worthies we honor as the founding fathers, the travails of the pioneers who crossed the continent and opened up the West, and Lindbergh's heroic solo flight across the Atlantic. Slavery is as real a part of our heritage as the Emancipation Proclamation, and so are both the admirable achievements of American industrialists and their wanton exploitation of people and resources. All this and much more belong to our heritage and to the actual, temporal experience we call history.

The acquaintance with their heritage that students make in school may be superficial and fragmented, critical and extensive, or something in between. To develop a reliable sense of the world that is really theirs, they need as much as they can get, and history is the subject that gives them most.

Does it follow that they need history to be good citizens? If good citizenship means only the feeling commonly mistaken for patriotism or unwavering loyalty to a party line, the answer is clearly "no." If it means constructive participation in organized society or the body politic, "yes." But let the reader be wary. Neither history nor any social studies course intended to teach citizenship can make good citizens. It is folly to presume that because young people have been exposed to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights they will be defenders

of American democracy, or that because they know something about national or local elections they will flock to the polls and judiciously cast their ballots.

Good citizens are not made or produced in school. People only become citizens. Whether students become good or poor citizens depends on what they have learned to value, in and out of school--in their homes and neighborhoods, from television and all the other media that bring the facts, fictions, and confusion of human life to their senses. If history in school has indeed given them an appreciation of their heritage, chances are that history will affect their citizenship for good. Those who have no proper acquaintance with their heritage can hardly be citizens, except in a legal sense. Those who are familiar with it are likely to be citizens in a fuller sense--not only or necessarily by casting ballots or seeking public office, but by seeking to safeguard or to change the conditions and opportunities they have inherited. The seeking of some is bound to be wrongheaded or ineffectual, and that of others will be corrupted by self-interest or ambition. Notwithstanding, history enhances citizenship. To paraphrase Martha Doerr Toppin (see Chapter 1, reference 10), knowledge of our heritage increases our options. "Things do not have to be the way they are in our neighborhood, in our suburb, in our time."

> What is history? It is at the center of the curriculum, for it provides a dimension to all subjects as well as its own kind of mental discipline.

History is a mother subject in education that envelops many of the other subjects that make up the curriculum of schooling. Most of the social sciences were the actual offspring of history, and in many instances the social studies have cannibalized their parent, history. But history now draws data and concepts from all the social sciences, and the development of the physical and natural sciences offers "facts" that history does not overlook. Developments in mathematics and technology, in music, literature, and the arts, are part of the past that history examines, too. (These subjects, of course, have histories of their own that find places in the curriculum, more often in college than in school, however.) Because so many other subjects do--and any may--become part of the subject of history, history provides the context for all learning in school.

But history's basic role in education by no means depends entirely on the value of the subject's content. The purpose of history in school is not so much to fill the minds of the learning young as it is to train their minds. Not only does good citizenship (in the sense we have acknowledged) call for trained minds; good achievement in almost every human endeavor--public, private, or personal--requires disciplined intelligence. Our society has never been more aware of the need for

trained minds, never more intent on having the schools graduate young people with certified skills; the minimum competency movement bears witness. Beset locally, nationally, and internationally by difficulties of disheartening complexity and unprecedented magnitude, society cries loudest for problem-solving and decision-making skills. Today, innovators in education understand that the best case they can make for any proposal is to tout its merits for teaching decision-making and problem-solving.

Schools that are sensible of the need to train young minds should recognize the proper if not the singular role history can play in meeting the need. Even the simplest historical narrative depends upon factual accuracy and orderly development, and any study of history requires appreciation of context and a critical eye for the strength or weakness of evidence. In history class, therefore, discussion of alternative views demands some command of the relevant evidence in just this fashion. Homework, so often slighted these days, is a prerequisite for successful learning in most high school subjects. But any history teacher with reasonably high expectations is under special pressure to see that it is done not only regularly but intelligently, through interesting, manageable assignments of note-taking and writing.

Any study of history that approaches sophistication calls for research, analysis, and synthesis, not to say imagination and clear exposition, all of which are indispensable in solving problems and reaching decisions. Other disciplines offer training in the same skills, but it is history that always provides the context of change over time, which is necessary to put human problems in perspective and afford the detachment for making decisions intended to solve them.

What is history? It is the
training and exercising of perspective.

History deals centrally and comprehensively with the phenomenon of changes over time, and perhaps its chief benefit is that property of mind known as perspective. Just as high places afford long views and as woodsmen can distinguish trees from forests, so history helps people view human events in their true relationships and recognize the difference between a crisis and a condition. One needs the perspective of history to be spared the disappointment of Utopian expectations, and to avoid treating every difficulty as a problem, every problem as a crisis.

To suppose that a child in school can gain the perspective that comes only with experience would of course be nonsense. However, to insist that in school, history can afford young minds the training to gain perspective with experience makes the best of good sense.

Historians use good, hard data in their quest for truth, but of necessity they often work intuitively, and imagination plays an indispensable part in any reconstruction of a true story out of scattered historical facts. By the same token, history calls on its students to stretch their imaginations. They must learn to put themselves in the places of others--to imagine what it was like, for example, to be a farmer or a merchant in colonial New England, a British empire-builder in the 19th century, or a German student between the two world wars. This kind of exercise helps adolescents understand that positions different from their own and their parents' can be as reasonable and tenable as theirs, and that although history does not repeat itself, the dilemmas and dangers of their own time are not without precedents. Humankind has survived recurrent difficulties and disasters.

By looking carefully into the past, young people in school will come to recognize that the cause of change is rarely singular or simple. It may be true, for instance, that "bad King George couldn't sleep in his bed,"[8] but no one who has had a proper course in American history could conceivably believe that that royal personage's wickedness, or his insomnia, was the cause of the American Revolution. Even a child whose knowledge was only the most elementary account of the Revolution would have--if the account were history--some awareness of the economic and social causes, as well as the political causes, that are represented in the person of King George III. At all great turns in the course of human events, history looks not for the cause, but the causes; and history seeks not to reduce them to the statistical reality of data, but rather to arrange these causes so as to make intelligible the confusion of realities they represent.

Familiarity with the actual, temporal experience of those who have met challenges and opportunities in the past breeds a sense of probabilities akin to but different from the kind of probability one learns in mathematics. Knowing what has worked in the face of comparable circumstances--or failed to work--in the past, a president or a legislator or a private citizen may have a reliable sense of what will or will not work to avert a confrontation with the Soviets, let us say, or to conserve resources and safeguard the environment. The same sense of probabilities enables one to anticipate, though not to predict, the future. The greater one's familiarity with and the clearer one's understanding of the past, the stronger one's sense of probabilities and the more trustworthy one's anticipations.

Not to be told, but to understand that cause is seldom simple, that not every difficulty is a problem nor every problem a crisis; that virtue and reason seldom if ever belong entirely to one of the adversaries in a struggle; to know what is probable and to look ahead

realistically--these are functions of historical perspective. In the life and work one shares with others, the fruits of perspective are restraint and good judgment. In one's personal life, the fruits are poise and confidence. Everyone needs perspective; and if by the time they finish school young people cannot have much, history will have shown them a way of thinking that brings perspective with experience. If they have learned no proper history, they can never have the benefit of historical perspective.

IV
Teachers Equal to the Role

"Becoming an expert in anything--plumbing or quantum physics--takes brainwork and time. To become expert in a subject requires mulling it over, touching and smelling it from many different angles and carefully filing away its various facets in the toolchest of the mind. This exercise promotes expertise and problem-solving ability, and can help save the nation from mind rot. Or, alternatively, we can let it go and watch television."[1]

Except for the blackboards and a single bulletin board where old lists and stale notices lingered, the walls were bare. The classroom was about as congenial as an abandoned hospital ward.

In the center of the room, 16 students sat facing each other, four on each side of a square of tables under fluorescent light. They were juniors in a Midwest city high school, in a district where some parents wore white collars, some blue. The community was neither altogether affluent nor much disadvantaged. Call it middle class American.

When the moment arrived for class to begin, the teacher was sitting at a desk apart, seemingly busy reading papers. On their own and with more effort than ease, his students entered upon a discussion of America's declaration of war in 1917. A listener might have distinguished references to prominent historians--Seymour, Link, Bailey, and others--but the discussion lacked the spunk of worthy opponents in school debate.

In the fullness of time (perhaps 10 minutes), the teacher pushed his papers aside and sprang to his feet. Circling the square of tables, asking questions, drawing on the reading students had done and the statements they had been making, Rod Karr brought his class to life in animated give-and-take about submarine warfare, economic and political issues, propaganda, and the complication of causes that brought the United States to go to war in 1917.

Mark Twain would have been impressed. By the time the period was over, those students had properly comprehended many facts that students in school commonly memorize and quickly forget. They had the advantage of a well-prepared teacher.

History cannot be expected to have a central, beneficial role in education unless the schoolteaching of history is equal to the role. Though the sorry state of the subject must not be ascribed only to the schools or to teachers in the schools, it is to them we must look for improvement.

And let us be sensible and realistic in expectation. Even under the best auspices, improvement will not come quickly, nor can we expect massive federal funding to bring it about. At this writing, spending on the teaching of history is not likely to be among the priorities of government at any level; but even if it were, it could not take the place of the concern of individual principals and teachers, which, in the last analysis, is the only assurance of quality in education.

To expect government appropriations to accomplish all or even much of what needs to be accomplished, therefore, would be sheer folly, and to wait for it would be totally irresponsible. First, last, and always, schools and teachers must learn to make the best of their circumstances. So must school boards, and so must all those educators and citizens outside and beyond the schools, whose theories and concerns affect the conditions of teaching and learning. Improvement will at best follow only gradually, but a sense that a new trend has started can have powerful consequences.

The formal preparation of schoolteachers includes both preservice and inservice training.

Preservice training is usually a function of teachers' formal education; inservice training is the training they receive on the job, after they become full-fledged classroom teachers. There will be more to say about the latter. It is enough to say here that both are important. Preparation does not begin and end with preservice training.

Given the general want of sound preparation among teachers of history and the fact that declining school enrollments have reduced the number of openings for beginning teachers, it may be argued that inservice training may seem more important than preservice. The needs of teachers now in the schools are great, and compensation for the training they lack must be a matter of urgent concern. Yet, to discount preservice training would be short-sighted, if enduring improvement is the goal. It is not as if history teachers learn everything or nothing at all by the time they are certified; and although necessity and convenience mandate specific parts of training as preservice or inservice, the general requirements of sound preparation hold for both. What is needed is radical reconsideration of teacher education, together with a new conception of inservice training not as a compensatory expedient--a kind of quick fix for teachers who are "staying and graying" on the job--but as an enterprise to meet the continuing needs of all teachers of history.

The preparation of all schoolteachers should begin with a coherent, rigorous liberal education.

However and whenever history teachers get their training, they need to be liberally educated men and women, at once well grounded in the subject they teach and conversant with the literature, art, and religion--as well as the science and technology--that our culture embraces. In the United States, the conventional route to such education is by way of a baccalaureate liberal arts program with a concentration or "major" in history. Even if the concentration is intensive, it will hardly assure the most diligent undergraduate enough history for a career of teaching; however, the coherent study of a respectable major will lay a foundation of historical knowledge on which a committed teacher can build. It will also afford the bachelor of arts a taste of the inherent rewards of historical research and writing, which are both important enhancements of teaching.

The preparation of history teachers should include concentration in history, taught by professional historians and augmented by significant study in such related fields as literature, the arts, anthropology, and the social sciences.

In addition to such benefits of a history major, the liberal arts route offers prospective teachers a range of studies that will enhance their effectiveness. And if the word "enhance" suggests those activities of schools and teachers pejoratively and indiscriminately called "frills," make no mistake: teachers cannot give history its due unless they are familiar with literature, economics, the arts, science, and government. No one can study all these subjects, or learn all the disciplines that describe our culture, but history majors who intend to teach will be poorly prepared unless they selectively investigate other subjects that illuminate their own.

It is mistaken to suppose that the teacher education offered by teachers' colleges (now more commonly by university schools of education and college departments of education) prevents or precludes the kind of liberal education described above. Teacher education meets the so-called professional requirements of state certification (educational psychology, methods and techniques of teaching, etc.), but almost to a professor, the professors of education have long since disclaimed responsibility for "subject matter preparation"; it now rests with professors in those university and college departments that claim the subject matter as their own.

The professors of education disown the responsibility, and the professors of history are "complacently indifferent" (see Chapter II, reference 22). Their indifference is understandable. The history they profess is sophisticated, specialized; they became professors because they were called to teach college and graduate students who, they plausibly presumed, were beyond the subject matter appropriate for schoolchildren. It follows that their interest in the schoolteaching of history is, at its most real, limited to moments of finding their incoming students miserably prepared. Just as many college professors consider teaching freshman composition beneath their dignity, many professors of history find training schoolteachers an unwanted chore.

Understandable though it may be, their indifference is inexcusable. Would they be content if the professors of education undertook, on their own, to improve the history preparation of teachers? Are they, indeed, happy with the place and substance given to their subject by the specialists known now as social studies educators? Who, better than the professors of history themselves, are better qualified to train prospective teachers in the discipline they profess?

The liberal arts history major is fundamental preparation, but, as it now stands, it is less than adequate to all the needs of schoolteachers of the subject. This is not to suppose that these can be met all at once, as it were, in the course of undergraduate study. But undergraduate programs should anticipate more of the peculiar needs of history teachers, and inservice programs that combine practicality with liberal arts quality should be available as other needs emerge in classroom experience. In both circumstances, professors of history are best qualified to speak to such needs.

> The preparation of history teachers requires courses in the writing of history and historical method, to make them aware of differences in interpretation and capable of evaluating the textbooks available for their use.

Conspicuously missing in the training of teachers are historiography and historical method. Although the word looks highfalutin, "historiography" simply means the writing of history. It is not enough for teachers to know what historians write; they must also understand why and how they write. There are honestly different interpretations of the same facts among historians, whose insights and interests, backgrounds and training, times and circumstances are not the same. Teachers need to be aware of such tensions and appreciate them, not to make a display of erudition, but to help their students to one of history's chief benefits--the judgment born of respecting different and often conflicting points of view.

Obviously, teachers in training cannot make anything like an exhaustive study of historiography. But even as undergraduates they can come to grips with some of the principal writers whose histories have, in effect, given their majors substance and interest, whereas teachers in service can come to know the works of historians whose writing informs the courses they teach.

In this connection, no study of historiography should neglect the textbooks written for use in school. Even a casual comparison of three of the most widely used American history texts--Rise of the American Nation (Todd and Curti), History of a Free People (Bragdon and McCutcheon), and A New History of the United States (Fenton et al.)--will reveal significant differences. A comparison of the two texts that Frances FitzGerald praises in America Revised, David Muzzey's American History and Charles Sellers's As It Happened, will disclose the possibilities historiography makes for teachers, as well as the inherent difficulties. It is hard to imagine committed history professors who would not relish such exercises with teachers in training, and teachers must go through them in order to select appropriate textbooks for classroom use, or to make the best of inappropriate texts with which they may be stuck.

Undergraduates majoring in history occasionally write research papers, and sometimes a "senior thesis." These call for rudimentary use of historical method, but teachers need more than that to be soundly prepared. For their own intellectual growth as well their work in the classroom, teachers must be able to deal confidently with the welter of information from which history is written--the "primary" and "secondary" sources furnished by books, articles, documents, diaries, and letters. They must know how to distinguish between the true and the false, the more and the less reliable; to select and discard material for their particular purposes while doing justice to other points of view; and to use material without distorting it, whether in reconstructing historical situations for discussion and debate or in evaluating what they happen to see on television. These are fine skills, neither easily nor quickly learned. At the same time, they are essential skills. Teachers who lack them can scarcely give their students some of the most important benefits of history.

Historiography need not be the subject of a separate course. In fact, it may be better taught and learned in almost any course of a conventional history major, but it must be recognized as part of the stuff of which good preservice and inservice training are made.

> The preparation of history teachers requires such training in writing as to make concern for effective learning through writing an integral part of their history teaching.

Well-prepared history teachers write competently. Not many are published authors, but all are men and women who use writing with confidence and effectiveness in their daily life and work. And unlike others who leave "grammar and all that" to teachers of English, they set their students to writing because they understand that writing is a basic discipline of learning, nowhere more basic than in the subject of history. Teachers who are in this sense writers perceive that when one writes, one is obliged in the solitude of one's own mind to sort out what one has been taught, what one has read and discussed, and to put the sortings together (compose them). What one has put together, or composed, one has learned. As no other skill or science does, writing generates, at the same time that it substantiates or confirms, learning.

Exceptional teachers of history who have such a perception of writing today probably came upon it by revelation. For more than a generation, the schools have been unable to meet the requirements of literacy, and until quite recently the colleges have done little more than swell the litany of complaint in the face of what is taken to be the failure of the schools. The explanation of this state of affairs is more cultural than educational, and the resulting neglect has been devastating. In both school and college, students have responded to multiple-choice tests, filled in blanks, and declared statements to be true or false, but they have had little experience of writing and correspondingly little experience of the disciplined learning writing achieves. It is fair to point out that a great many of the professors and teachers of history who now preside in classrooms suffered from this disadvantage when they were in school.

Nevertheless, literacy still has a chance. Sensible and constructive activities such as the National Writing Project are helping to make all teachers better writers and better teachers of writing. Programs such as Elaine Maimon's at Beaver College (Glenside, Pennsylvania) are encouraging "writing across the curriculum" to help teachers of all subjects at both the college and school levels to make better and more use of writing in their classes. In elementary and secondary school, there is now a great deal of initiative and activity to meet the requirements of literacy in general, and in writing particularly.

Bright as the prospect seems, writing is not likely soon to become part of the whole fabric of learning in American education. Until it does, the inservice and preservice training of history teachers must make deliberate provision for this basic discipline of learning. For undergraduates, term papers and senior theses can play an important part, but, again, these are not enough. Undergraduates need to write frequently, but with the objective of quality, not quantity. A 10-minute quiz that calls for an intelligible paragraph is excellent discipline; three short papers may provide better training than one long paper; and professors who want to examine students for their knowledge and understanding of history will have them write.

Teachers on the job can find any number of plausible (and sometimes compelling) reasons to neglect their own writing and avoid having their students write: they do not have time to write themselves, they cannot cope with correcting students' papers, and teaching writing is not their business. But writing is their business, and if their students are to have the benefits of history, these teachers must be helped to make time for writing and learn to cope with the paperwork.

To see how much students have memorized, schoolteachers need only have them fill in blanks. To find out how much student have actually learned, teachers need the written discourse of students, the kind of writing called "exposition." They can begin by doing the assignments they give their classes--quizzes, tests, reports. Teachers who need help should turn to others who can give it, if they are available, or press their principals to arrange appropriate inservice training. By persisting, they will find how to form questions and set topics that make writing not a waste of everyone's time, but worth everyone's while.

The preparation of history teachers requires pedagogical training.

Teacher education, meaning the preservice training administered by university or college departments of education and given by professors of education, is a controversial venture. Its proponents and promoters have sought academic peerage by making a profession of pedagogy and the techniques, rather than the substance, of teaching. They are the Doctors of Education. Those among them who model their discourse on the jargon of science and technology have come to be known as the "educationists," whose "methods courses" and "mickey mouse" activities have cost them the respect of the Doctors of Philosophy. And while the Ph.D.s have looked away in disdain, the Ed.D.s have prescribed state certification requirements and controlled advancement through the ranks of public education. The result of this academic cold war has been what James Koerner called The Miseducation of American Teachers.[2] Viewed more calmly, the controversy looks unnecessary, if not silly. Schoolteachers, after all, are pedagogues; pedagogy is a sensible and important component of their preparation and training. Sensible and important, too, are the history and philosophy of education, school organization and governance, law, the interpretation and use of tests--all proper subjects of professors of education. The primary goal of the preparation and training of teachers of history, however, must be their competence in and with the subject of history, and the same competence should be the first consideration in their certification and advancement.

The most critical phase of undergraduate preparation is student or "practice" teaching. Practice teaching should not be a perfunctory business of going through the motions of teaching for six weeks to tick off "competencies" drawn up by professors of education. It should be a painstakingly supervised apprenticeship, under the supervision of a

master teacher of history who can deal with frustrations and make suggestions along the way, and who, when the time comes, is qualified to judge whether the candidate has the knowledge and the skill to begin teaching in a regular post.

The time to judge comes all too quickly, and even the longest practice teaching experience is the shortest kind of apprenticeship. The introduction here and there of internships for newly certified teachers is encouraging. By this plan, interns are given provisional teaching certificates, and if, after a two- or three-year probationary period, their performance is deemed satisfactory, they become eligible for permanent certificates. If those who judge are master teachers, and if their judgment depends not only on assorted competencies that have been singled out as marks of "good classroom management" but on competence in the teaching of history, such internships can move history-teaching in the schools one step forward.

Right now, when teacher competence has been questioned so generally, and when accountability is both the order and the fashion of the day, the profession is scrambling to develop and put in place acceptable procedures of evaluation. The politics of accountability are fraught with danger. Veteran teachers are sensitive about evaluation, and their unions may not stand for it. Nevertheless, teachers must be prepared to put their competence to the test. Those who continue to learn and to better their competence after they acquire permanent certificates should have no qualms and no difficulty.

The essence of inservice preparation is that the teacher should never stop learning.

"Inservice training, as it is, does little to improve the quality of teaching. The one thing I remember from seven years of it as a teacher was the fact that I didn't have to wear a tie."[3]

So writes Peter Greer, who was a teacher of history before he became a principal and then a superintendent of schools. Greer was referring to the typical "inservice days" that happen from time to time during the course of a year in most schools and school districts. Often hastily arranged (but commonly provided for in the contracts negotiated by teachers' unions), these days are generally conceded by teachers and administrators alike to be a notorious waste of time. "Schools and school systems often do not know how or what to plan," Greer observes. "As a result, inservice training is reduced to shallow answers to ever-new demands--special education; [government] regulation; competency testing; career and bilingual education; sex education and family living; student identification procedures for breakfast programs; immunization; truancy laws that direct schools to spend inordinate time coaxing unwilling students back."[4]

Greer speculates that the most serious condition that works against effective inservice training is "the supposition that the content of teaching--mathematics, English, history, science, and so on--is not an appropriate matter for inservice programs."[5] Of course, inservice training is not limited to occasional days. It includes workshops, seminars, and institutes conducted over longer periods of time during the school year and in the summer. Some of these offer "subject matter support"; however, teachers responding to their appeal have come away disappointed from even the most promising. Hailed for their promise, the institutes for history teachers that burgeoned in the 1960s under the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) fell short because "they were not designed on the basis of a thorough study of, or acquaintance with, the needs and problems of teachers and schools."[6] If sensibly planned, however, inservice programs could form an essential part of the continuing education of history teachers. And the prospect is not hopeless.

Writing in The Past Before Us, Hazel Whitman Hertzberg notes "a nascent revival of interest in school history" among professional historians.[7] She refers to the American Historical Association's sponsorship of regional conferences for teachers at the secondary school level and to an "interest group" recently formed within the National Council for the Social Studies. To prevent the stillbirth of new interest, professional organizations of historians should sponsor more conferences. If financial retrenchment in the 1980s precludes grand enterprises like the NDEA institutes of the 1960s, more modest programs will serve the purpose, and serve it better, if they are designed to accommodate the needs and problems of teachers and schools.

No inservice training is likely to be more effective than that which takes teachers away from their schools--if only for a week or a weekend--and gives them an opportunity to be immersed in their subject with others who know the subject well. Such meetings can accommodate no more than a fraction of all the teachers who might benefit from them, but there are ways of sharing the wealth. The National Writing Project, for example, expects participants to return to their home schools as "teacher-consultants," to conduct inservice workshops for other teachers there. This scheme promises no miracle, but it has intrinsic merit and might be adapted for inservice training in history.

Professors can take active interest in school history without waiting for sponsorship by their associations. Professor Paul S. Holbo of the University of Oregon directs workshops for teachers throughout the western states. His co-director is Mary Jo Thomas, once his student and now a schoolteacher of history and a member of the Commission. In a personal letter, Holbo writes of their endeavor,

> One of the things I learned from the experience of the 1960s was that a great gap existed between the

> erudition of the professor and what the classroom teacher could handle . . . . [So] we try to teach a lot of history, focusing on new and important interpretations, but we constantly pay attention to the methods that teachers might try in order to use what we have been teaching. Indeed, after every workshop, many teachers tell me that I am the only professor they've known who was concerned with method. Part of what I do is to distribute and explain materials that I have gathered on teaching, preparing exams, grading papers, etc. Second, after every lecture on history and historiography, or after a discussion, we turn our attention to how this material can be used in a class. Sometimes I show the teachers how this can be done; sometimes they will think of ideas of their own, thus enriching my store of techniques. Hence, as participating teachers quickly recognize, the workshop intertwines substantive history and method.
>
> We use many other devices to the same end. For reading assignments, I generally avoid books and instead use articles--sometimes scholarly articles from professional journals if these items accomplish what I want, and sometimes articles from such publications as The American Scholar and Commentary. The articles are always serious, if provocative, and usually written by historians. I simply try to find short pieces that elucidate an important thesis, are readable, provoke thought, stimulate the teachers themselves, and can be assigned directly to high school students or easily summarized. By this time, I have gathered together a considerable number of such items. The reaction of teachers has been enthusiastic.

The prospect of effective inservice experience is perhaps brightest when teachers take the initiative to provide for their own needs. In Portland, Maine, a little "network of concerned history teachers" meets occasionally to dig into a topic or a book members agree upon and prepare ahead of time. At one meeting early in 1981, they tackled Christopher Lasch's The Culture of Narcissism. Joined on that occasion by a college professor who was using the book in an undergraduate course in intellectual history, they spent three hours discussing the book and how, or whether, they could use it in their classrooms. If their discussion was inconclusive, it was nonetheless spirited, enlightening, and constructive. They reached a consensus that Lasch's gloomy view of American culture amounted to a kind of "radical conservatism"--

an appeal for change, but change anchored in the past. Their exchange of ideas suggested more about their students than how to use the book in class, and they shared and sharpened views of their purposes in teaching history. The cost of so simple an inservice seminar is negligible--in this instance, only paperback copies of a book, an urn of coffee, and "danish." The value, clearly, is high. In the last analysis, it is the interest of teachers themselves and a sense of their own need that combine to bring about good teaching.

Because good history teachers become better history teachers as they gain experience, inservice training assumes an importance transcending that of compensation for inadequate preservice training. Right now it serves neither purpose well. It wants attention on the part of the history professoriate, understanding and action on the part of school officialdom, and initiative on the part of teachers. Professors must not allow responsibility merely to rest with them; they must first recognize that schoolteachers require different training from that of graduate students preparing to be scholars and college teachers, and then do something about it. School board members and administrators must be sensible of the special needs of history teachers, make provision for them, and give teachers credit toward pay and promotion only for study that contributes to their effectiveness as history teachers. And teachers must assert their initiative to get the training they need. No amount of money and no program, however well conceived, can make them equal to their role unless they take the interest and initiative to become better teachers.

V
An Irreducible Minimum of History

"New knowledge is worthless if the old knowledge is lost on the people. They may sit, watching a screen on which a fellow does something to Mars that they do not understand, or hearing a celebrity making a fool of himself; but they know no history, no geography, no languages."[1]

He was a tiger among teachers. Feared by the faint, respected by all, Sidney Morgan Shea pressed his students as hard as he chewed the stem of his pipe. But they liked it, and they learned. Shea was never undone, but if anything came close to undoing him, it was the accumulation of history. Every year there was more, "and," he was often heard to growl when final exams came in sight, "I haven't even reached the election of 1932!"

There was a lot of history when Sidney Shea taught school in the 1940s, and there has been more since. There is always more than history teachers can cover, however well prepared they may be, and no school should overreach its capabilities with a curriculum that is too ambitious. At the same time, there is an irreducible minimum of history, distinct from social studies, that every school district ought to afford students during their progress from K to 12.

This chapter will outline what the Commission proposes as the irreducible minimum. Any resemblance to the dominant curriculum described in the preceding pages is not accidental. There is much in that curriculum which, with correction and cultivation, ought to be included. But first, two caveats are in order.

One is to say that the precise step at which each part of the minimum may be best scheduled is what educators would call a "developmental" consideration. And that is only to say that the complexity of the subject at any step needs to be calibrated to the intellectual development, or "readiness," of the students who are expected to learn it. This is only partly a matter of their ability to think about relationships and concepts. It is also a matter of their stage of interest in life's complexities and drama. A good way to nip their sense of history in the bud is to expect primary graders to make sense out of the economic implications of the industrial revolution, for example, or to assign high school seniors stories of discovery written for young children. Without drawing lines too hard and fast, however, it is not difficult to suggest the reasonable sequence of an irreducible minimum.

A second warning has to do with the compulsion of history teachers to cover everything a syllabus or textbook includes. History is divided, arbitrarily, into periods. Textbooks--presumably for the convenience of teachers and students both, not to say the convenience of those who develop curricula and make tests--are composed in units. The world did not come to an end because Sidney Morgan Shea in the 1940s never reached the election of 1932. Nor will any student's education be seriously neglected if, in the interest of understanding, that student does not reach the end of every period of history studied or complete every unit in a textbook. Granted, both necessity and common sense dictate limits to this contention. Something is radically amiss, either with the teacher or the students, if a class in U.S. history from the colonial period to the Civil War never gets beyond the War of 1812, and wholesale examinations like the College Board achievement test presume knowledge of entire periods. Even in the face of such presumptions, however, to sacrifice comprehension for coverage is a deadly sin. Better educated is the student who reaches some understanding of part of a period or most of the units than the student whose teacher covers all just to reach the end of the course.

These are necessary warnings, but behind any compulsion to cover a period in full, or to reach the present, may lie a more fundamental consideration. To function in our lives as true stories, pieces of history must fit unambiguously into the sequence of whatever else we know about our past. Time and place, for example, are essential emphases in every history that claims to be a true story or part of a true story. Chronology and geography thus provide the basic coordinates for history. Only when an event, a person, or an idea can be fixed in time and place, in challenging relation to other things a student knows or half-knows as historical facts, can it serve as an historical fact itself, adding to the student's comprehension of the story of himself and his world. If Sidney Shea was unable to bring his students as far as the election of 1932, he might have improvised, in giant steps, a concluding story line to link to the present they independently knew the past they had studied in class. Or else that history may have ended, floating in the minds, as unreality--like details about American Indian "ancient ones" that float like fiction in the minds of park visitors after a tour of Mesa Verde, our own North American medieval village.

For an event in a true story, place is quite as necessary as date, hence the importance of geography within and alongside history classes. In studying history, students often must begin with "where," and thereafter be kept sensitive to the continuing influences of geography on history. The essentials of physical or economic geography, such as conditions by land or sea, of climate or crops, often explain the sensitivity of one human neighborhood to another, or the movements of power politics as the story proceeds. The locations of the Great

Lakes and the Mississippi River account for the French encirclement of England's North American colonies, just as Martinique's sugar crop explains why France gave up most of Canada in order to recover one West Indian island at the end of the Seven Years' War.

Similarly, dates fix events in time, giving them full significance for the story. The Peace of Paris that ended the Seven Years' War in 1763 drifts in meaningless isolation until the student grasps its place in the Second Hundred Years' War, and its importance as a milestone of the roads that led to the American and French Revolutions. Taken alone, a date may have little or no meaning, so that to memorize it may be to erect a barrier to further learning. Taken in context as the illumination of a major change, a date becomes fundamental to historical understanding and a positive stimulus to thought. As we have noted, the practice of "postholing" to achieve depth and vividness of understanding requires attention also to the strands of fencing between postholes--the connections that keep the larger story line alive and true. For beginning students of history, these have to be highlighted.

> The irreducible minimum begins in the elementary grades by giving the K-6 student an acquaintance with the past through progressively sophisticated narratives.

To those who are indifferent to the schoolteaching of history, teaching history to elementary school children may be altogether unthinkable. And if teaching history to elementary school children means retailing the kind of material commonly organized in textbooks, they are justified in that opinion. Facility in constructing and keeping in mind the elements of a long story is rare among young children.

One teacher recalls inheriting on short notice a class of children younger than any he had taught before. With the class, he inherited a textbook--coarse, thick pages between hard green covers--that surveyed the history of Western civilization from the Fertile Crescent to the Land of the Free in the 20th century A.D. He met his new charges for the first time when they had been assigned a chapter on the revolutions of 1848. Tough going through the revolutions, he attributed to his own inexperience. When the green book brought the class to the Triple Alliance and Triple Entente, however, he recognized that it was their inexperience, not his, that made the way impassable. Simply presented though the facts were, they were beyond the realization of his pupils.

He closed the book and determined that they should read books of their own choosing. The only requirement was that the books be about someone who lived or something that happened before they were born--fact or fiction, five years or 5,000. With their help and the school librarian's, he developed a list of books that made the past credible

and interesting to his young readers, and left them with incentive to study history in a more disciplined way as they went on through school.

What young children need is acquaintance with the past. They need to become aware of the past, and to be helped not only to find it interesting, but to perceive it as real and credible.

The interest of children can be tapped and turned to history as early as they will listen to stories. It may be too much to say that reading aloud to children is the best thing adults can do for their educability, but for a certainty they need and deserve to be read to, both before and after they begin school. There are good stories for children, grounded in the stuff of history and in the folklore and legends that are part of history. It is important to avoid the pap that grownups too often have judged right for children simply because it is both sweet and bland. We have suggested some titles (see Appendix B), but any properly trained public or school librarian should be able to help parents and teachers find stories with satisfactory historical content.

As young children in school learn to read and write, they can read (and write) about real people and events in the past as readily as they can about most of the subjects in the standard repertoire of school "readers." An elementary school teacher and a member of the CBE Commission put the matter this way:

> For our students to be able to make a practical application of the study skills presented in a reading lesson, we can and should use history as the day's reading lesson when appropriate. We have then integrated the lessons without "we'll now do history--now do reading." The fragmenting of lessons serves to reinforce "this is history--this is reading" and never the two shall meet.[2]

In addition to using history in the routine of daily lessons, enterprising teachers can do much more to acquaint elementary school children with the past. Here is one teacher's account of an opportunity she had to teach young students "in a unique way."[3] They were "gifted" children, but she sees no reason why others could not learn the same way. Because the acquaintance of young children with the past is so important for their education, her account affords an example worthy of emulation:

> There being no history of our city written for children, my fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-graders decided to remedy the situation. We did not write a history book, but we did develop a slide-script presentation on the history of Baton Rouge for children.

A discussion at the beginning revealed that they (1) knew practically nothing about the early history of Baton Rouge, (2) thought that the only way to find out about it was to consult the encyclopedia, and (3) were interested in knowing about their own city.

The group took a bus tour of Baton Rouge, provided by the Foundation for Historical Louisiana. The tour was excellent, but since it moved so swiftly there was not time for active participation or for inquiry. The children just looked and listened, but the tour gave them a good overview of what we were undertaking.

Class meetings for several days after the tour were centered around activities such as sharing the photographs and pamphlets we had collected. I shared my large file of maps of the city from earliest times, maps of present-day Baton Rouge, news articles, postcards, and more pamphlets and brochures. Much time was spent going over the maps of different years, comparing photographs with the maps, and comparing information in the brochures. We made a time-line and attached to it not only information about Baton Rouge, but a few "benchmark" historical dates.

The students then selected sites they wanted to revisit, according to their own interests. We took them in small groups to gather more information (from exhibits, historical markers, etc.), to take pictures, to question museum curators, and to wonder about what we had seen. Each of the groups was responsible for writing information for the scrapbook in which our photographs were put and then, later, writing that part of the script concerned with the group's "area of expertise."

By the time this was done, our photos and slides were back and the process of selecting which were to be used began. We discussed possible arrangements both for the scrapbook and for the slide presentation, and decided to arrange them chronologically according to the historical time-line.

Since the objective was to create something that could be used to teach other children about the history of our city, the information was checked for accuracy and rewritten so that others could benefit from our work.

The slide presentation, notes this teacher with pride, is now in the Louisiana State Department of Education's slide library for dissemination throughout the state. She maintains that the project gave students experience in gathering information (from both primary and secondary sources) and in selecting the most relevant data for a stated purpose. It also helped them develop their organizing and writing skills. Perhaps above all, they began to see the relevance of the past to their own experience, in and out of school:

> The sixth-graders who had studied ancient Egypt found that the art work on the present state capitol was similar to the art work of the ancient Egyptians. They also saw the relation of the climate and agriculture of Egypt to our own Louisiana. Fifth-graders who had studied the American Revolution were surprised to find that the only battle of the Revolution fought outside the thirteen colonies was fought here in Baton Rouge. They found that the Marquis de Lafayette visited Baton Rouge when they read the marker on the Lafayette Building. LaSalle, de Soto, and others became real when they read accounts of the explorers' visits near the location of our city. The fourth-graders became interested in historical preservation, and they were disappointed to find that Zachary Taylor's homesite is now nothing more than a historical marker. Some have written letters of protest when they learned that places of historical importance were marked for destruction. They now have a possessive feeling about their city.

The possessive feeling those fourth-graders have about their city is part of the sense of belonging, of knowing where one comes from and where one is, that is peculiarly a benefit of acquaintance with the past. That it can be established in young children is clear from the experience of elementary school teachers here and there, whose sense of history gives them the wisdom and the wit to provide the right conditions. As much as all young children need the skills they gain in elementary school, they need the same kind of possessive feeling. They need it for their learning and for facing the problems of life.

The irreducible minimum in the secondary school must meet clear standards.

With perception of the past as interesting and credible, most young people are willing, some patently eager, to embark on more disciplined study of history when they come to secondary school.[4] If they also have basic skills as readers and writers, they are both willing and able.

Youngsters who have had the kind of elementary training we have just described ought to be good readers and writers when they come to secondary school. Legions of others are not, even though some may have passed minimum competency tests with flying colors.

The matter is relevant here because in every grade of secondary school, reading and writing have to be part of the irreducible minimum of the teaching of history. This is not only because history teachers have to share responsibility for remedial instruction in a generation of impoverished literacy; it is because reading and writing are not subjects separate from history. Even students who read and write creditably well need to be taught how to read history and to write about it.

History teachers may balk at the contention that all teachers must be teachers of reading and writing. That is not their department, they do not know how, and they do not have the time. Teaching reading and writing is not their job, but helping students learn the subject they teach is their job, and reading and writing are the chief means--the technology, if you will--of learning history.

This function of teaching history is difficult at best, and it is especially so when the literacy of so many schoolchildren is as limited as it has been in recent years. All history teachers have to find their pupils' literacy levels, meet them there, and help them gain the literacy history requires. This takes time and effort, imagination, and untold patience, and the job is never done, because students need greater literacy as they proceed from less to more complex study. Teachers whose objective is to cover all of every period and complete all the units in a textbook are not likely to take the time or make the effort. Those who teach children to comprehend the history they study are likely to do so and likely to feel repaid by the result.

> The irreducible minimum for secondary schools should include a topical study of U.S. history, a survey of European history, and a survey of U.S. history.

The Commission recommends this sequence for the more disciplined study of history in secondary school: a topical study of U.S. history and a survey of European history, followed by a survey of U.S. history and--beyond the irreducible minimum--the history of a non-Western country or region. To some readers, the inclusion of U.S. history twice may look suspiciously like the dominant curriculum of questionable virtue; the specification of European history, anachronistic; and the omission of world history, alarming in a season of nascent global awareness. We will reassure the suspicious, convince the up-to-date, quiet the alarmed. First, however, three general comments about the Commission's recommendations are in order.

The recommendations, remember, are for an irreducible minimum. The Commission argues that all students should have this history, at least. Members of the Commission were not of one mind that the last component (non-Western history) needs to be numbered among the requirements for high school graduation, but they were unanimous that each of the others does.

Implementation of these recommendations may mean that other subjects in social studies or elsewhere in a school's curriculum have to give place. It also means that superintendents and principals must hire and assign staff members who are qualified by interest and preparation to teach this history. Any social studies teacher will not do; neither will coaches who need academic billets.

Each of the components in the sequence must be real history. Adaptations or watered-down versions that carry history labels may satisfy school or state diploma requirements, but they do not represent history as the Commission is defining it. Only a competent and conscientious principal (or a competent and conscientious deputy in the person of a curriculum supervisor or department chairman) can make the distinction with authority, but the distinction has to be made if students are to have the benefit of history.

For a number of reasons, political history provides the best "story line" for the study of history in school, but school history should never be confined to the chronicle of Presidential elections, the reigns of kings and queens, or the rise and fall of dictatorships. Even mediocre textbooks make stabs at social and cultural history, and teachers who are well prepared can and should be expected to give students more than the political facts of history. They should enable students to find a relationship between the political facts and economic, social, and cultural changes that are the warp and woof of history.

In this connection, textbook publishers are already busy "correcting" their histories to include minorities and women in action. By the time the wars for civil rights and women's rights are ended, historians will have made sober corrections that will give teachers and students more comprehensive access to the past.

The first approach: a topical study of American history.

Although the subject as administered in the present national curriculum leaves a great deal to be desired, no one could convincingly gainsay the appropriateness of teaching young Americans the history of their country. Repetition of the subject, however, gives it a deja vu quality that takes a high toll of that attribute teachers find so elusive, motivation. It is not surprising that interest flags when teenagers come to U.S. history in 11th grade after they have had American history in

fifth and again in eighth, with civics or something like it along the way. Whether or not each successive course has been just a little more of the same (and chances are that is the case), their attitude is commonly, "We've had this before."

The Commission suggests that the remedy is to take two different approaches to American history: one early in secondary schooling (perhaps eighth grade), the other in 11th or 12th grade after students have some knowledge and appreciation of the European antecedents of American history.

Instead of making a simplified survey of the entire American history course, younger adolescents can dig into the subject to examine some of the ideas and issues of which they are aware but about which they are still untutored--liberty and justice, for example, and "liberty and justice for all." Critical periods such as the years of colonial settlement and dramatic events such as the Civil War provide the context for this kind of study, while textbooks or teachers provide the connections that keep periods and events in history's continuum of change.

This first approach should encourage students to stretch their imaginations and put themselves in the positions of individual men and women who have had to make decisions--decisions to be patriots or tories, to go west or stay east, to hold slaves or set them free, to enlist or be a conscientious objector, to call strikes or call them off. Such mining of their country's history will give students familiarity with its substance, and at the same time help them to learn that the issues of history are seldom simply resolved and that they are ultimately personal. They may find, as well, that studying history is interesting and worth their while.

By no means should this work neglect or subordinate the discipline of history. Critical thinking is the primary objective, and the content of a first history course in secondary school--which puts little premium on coverage--and the stage of a student's intellectual development both offer almost optimum conditions for the cultivation of reading, writing, and discussion. Students can read in primary and secondary sources, and their reading should demand careful teaching, not merely assignment. They can write short papers once a week or more often, and they can rewrite papers that fall short of clear comprehension. A teacher with any skill as a moderator can help them learn to offer opinions supported with evidence, and train them to listen to the opinions of others and entertain views different from their own.

Beginning history in secondary school this way makes it possible for young people to recognize that things said and done in the past are "done, but not done with," in Carl Becker's phrase,[5] and leave them sufficiently interested and well prepared to study more history.

The irreducible minimum for secondary schools should include a survey of European history.

Before they study more of their own country's history, young Americans need firm grounding in European history. The reason is straightforward: the roots of American institutions as well as the roots of the majority of American citizens lie in the history of Europe. The Commission recommends such grounding in the intermediate years of secondary schooling.

Because by definition European history is so comprehensive, a course for freshmen and sophomores probably has to be a survey. Again, however, coverage is not the only consideration; emphasis on the development of critical thinking and on reading and writing skills remains of paramount importance. More difficult reading and more exacting writing assignments are reasonable to expect of ninth- and 10th-graders, but not necessarily longer assignments.[6] By the same token, class discussion ought to become progressively more directed, more searching. Although high school freshmen and sophomores are not likely to achieve great depth of understanding, they can reach beyond memorized definitions of absolute monarchy, socialism, and communism, for example, and learn to use such terms accurately in discussion and in writing.

The second American course: in U.S. history.

After they have dug into American history and found its roots in European history, high school students should be ready for comparatively mature study of United States history. The distinction here between "American" and "United States" is deliberate, to suggest a difference in scope, the latter beginning perhaps with the Constitutional Convention in 1787 rather than with the age of discovery or the colonial settlements in the New World. The Commission recommends a survey of the major issues, events, and developments--economic and political, social and cultural--that have brought the nation to its present condition.

Coverage now becomes more important, but never a transcendent concern. This may be the last formal study of history for many students before they enter the world of work, the last others will have before they take college entrance examinations. In 1982, they need to get beyond the election of 1932, but no student's world will come to an end because of failure to reach the election of 1980 in a history class, nor does a school need to compromise standards of teaching and learning if the survey is offered in less depth for some students than for others.[7] Those who are able may be in "advanced placement" classes, where teachers expect them to do extensive reading in comparatively difficult texts and in other sources, rather complicated writing assignments, and other projects that ordinarily set "honors" work apart. Those who belong to the large academic middle class of "average students" deserve

teachers who expect them to come up to rigorous academic standards, though they work with less sophisticated material and their assignments are less complicated. Those who are not so well endowed desperately need teachers who expect them to reach a measure of reliable understanding of the history included in the survey, even if they resort to material that is unsophisticated.

We emphasize the expectations of teachers because they are critical. Self-fulfilling are the prophecies of teachers who assume that their students cannot or will not learn--but when their teachers expect them to, students ordinarily do learn. This assertion, substantiated by research, underlines the imperative of good teacher training. It also recalls the contention that the history teacher's job with respect to reading and writing is never done, once and for all. Above all, it insists that the teacher has an opportunity to help students learn U.S. history with a lasting sense of achievement and satisfaction.

Beyond the irreducible minimum for secondary schools, the history of a non-Western country or area.

The Commission recommends a year's study of non-Western history, but as a diploma requirement its time has not come. All the non-Western nations in the world have histories, but their histories have not yet been written for the edification of young people in U.S. schools. American scholars study these histories, and teach them in American colleges and universities. Even if they decided to become schoolteachers tomorrow, all the undergraduates who major in these histories and all the graduate students who go farther would not be enough to carry out a recommendation to make non-Western history a requirement for high school graduation.

Yet the advantage of including non-Western history in the secondary school sequence is worth pursuing. Since 1965 when Adlai Stevenson gave us his nice metaphor of the earth as a spaceship, the importance of educating Americans with informed awareness of the rest of the world has become increasingly clear. The recent report of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies held that "nothing less is at issue than the nation's security."[8] Even if less were at issue, the advantage of non-Western history would be an educational benefit that cannot be denied.

In some measure, social studies courses such as "World Cultures" may provide the benefit. The advantage of history over a cultures course lies in the greater understanding and the improved perspective of American history that students can gain from comparisons of the stories. Especially when U.S. history comes at the end of the line, in 11th or 12th grade, students tend to see it as the inevitable unfolding of a predetermined plan, as if it were their country's manifest destiny to be

Number One. Study of the history of a people whose political and economic, conceptual and cultural underpinnings are distinctly different tends to correct that commonplace kind of narrow vision.

The correction is not often achieved by the teaching of "World History," a practice general enough to occupy the 10th-grade position in the NCSS curriculum (see beginning of Chapter II). One member of the Commission put the matter this way:

> The word "world" connotes the inclusion of a variety of geographical regions, usually very different. The varying vocabulary and conceptual schemes involved tend to create confusion in students' minds, together with an impression that these are interchangeable in their "otherness" from "us." Worse yet, in a course composed of units, one of which may be Europe, another Japan or Brazil, or perhaps one on the "modernization of Africa," even an able student will emerge with little content or sense of the special character of the area studied.[9]

As for what is called "global education," the Commission is not at all sanguine. On the eve of this nation's bicentennial, the National Education Association (NEA) revisited its landmark "Seven Cardinal Principles" of 1918, found them obsolete, and enunciated the belief that "educators around the world are in a unique position to bring about a harmoniously interdependent global community, based on the principles of peace and justice."[10] As if to the NEA's drummer, global educationists are now on the march. True believers among the global educationists want to reform American education all the way, up and down, according to their own lights. Bright as their lights may be and however noble their aspiration, their vision of restructured schools, furnished with all new instructional materials and staffed with retrained teachers, is neither practicable nor desirable. Such a reform enterprise would flounder in confusion, and impoverish history, not to say other subjects, even more than they are now impoverished.

The day may come when it is generally practicable to include non-Western history as a requirement for high school graduation. The President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies sounded the alarm, calling for more international studies, and such organizations as the Atlantic Council of the United States are echoing. In time, the universities and colleges may provide better opportunities for schoolteachers in training to become prepared in the histories of non-Western countries, and young men and women may seek them.

In the meantime, schools with teachers who have had undergraduate majors or substantive work in regional studies programs (Asia, Africa, the the Middle East, Latin America) may be able to offer creditable courses

in the histories of those regions or individual countries within them. In fact, any properly trained history teacher with the initiative and the time ought to be able to "work up" an acceptable course. Few have the background, however, and probably few schools can afford to relieve those who have from their responsibilities as teachers of American, European, and U.S. history.

Notwithstanding, the advantage is worth pursuing, and the Commission recommends pursuit.

Making a place for a modest but irreducible minimum of history.

The Commission's recommendations for an irreducible minimum of history in school are modest. In summary, they call for the integration of sound historical content in the teaching of elementary school children, for three histories and a fourth when practicable in secondary school. That much history takes no more schedule time than most schools now allow history, no more teachers, no more classrooms--and appropriately less time than the entire social studies "curriculum area" enjoys.

The Commission hopes that when schools make provision for the irreducible minimum, they can also make provision for good electives in history. Most students can profitably take more than the minimum, and those whose interest is keen ought to have the opportunity. Where teachers have the bent, the preparation, and the time, and where students have the interest, schools do well to offer the history of England or Russia, for example, or one of the non-Western regions or countries. And certainly the "ancient history" of Greece and Rome can always take a valuable place in the curriculum of schooling.

The implication of this suggestion is not that history should take over the social studies, although social studies courses of questionable worth might well give place. Perhaps the obvious way to make more room for history in the curriculum is to unload the "add-ons" that social studies teachers are expected to carry: career education, values clarification, death educaton, and so on and on. The issue is controversial, and beyond the scope of this report. It is enough to say here that in order to give students more than the minimum benefit of history, schools already overcommitted must begin to sort out the commitments and decide which of them have the most pressing claims, which hold the greatest promise for the education schools are established to provide. History's claim, the Commission believes, can hardly be denied.

EPILOGUE

In this report the Commission has argued for renewed attention to the teaching of history in the schools. History--by which the Commission means discriminating, intellectually fruitful recourse to appropriate pieces of past human experience--unquestionably plays a vital role throughout our society. More to the point, it retains the power to contribute elements of order and insight to the student's learning in many other subjects. Yet almost everywhere in the schools it lacks this vitality and this power. In particular, it suffers from confusion with the social studies, and its aims and perspectives suffer from being subordinated to other ways of studying society. History's claims and perspectives, as sketched out in Chapter III, are at the heart of the Commission's argument. For fuller understanding of what is at issue no student of history can do better than read, thoughtfully, some of the examples of first-rate historical work listed for this purpose in Appendix C.

In its recommendations, which are set forth previously and also summarized below, the Commission speaks to a variety of audiences. It addresses the full range of those who respect the study of history and are now in a position to help restore it as a powerful contributor to student learning in our schools.

First, of course, are the school board members and school administrators who together are in the primary position to restore to history the resources and distinctness in faculty structure that may be indispensable for its effectiveness.

Second come all who share in the training, preservice and inservice, of history teachers for the schools. It is the Commission's hope that in the near future history teachers will enjoy a sounder foundation in the liberal arts than is currently afforded them. But at the center of their initial preparation and its subsequent updatings there must be a lively sense of the difference between flaccid, routine historical study on the one hand, and on the other the invigorating kind of historical work that communicates to students. In particular the Commission hopes that historians in college and university departments will show a more

dependable readiness to play their part in this education of history teachers, contributing a better sense of the intrinsic power of history at the same time that they themselves come to grasp better the constraints and opportunities of learning in high school classes.

Third, and probably most important, are the teachers in the classrooms and those who as their immediate supervisors can most directly support them. Even before aid arrives from higher administration or distant education faculty, some teachers will find it possible to take heart, to establish contact with like-minded colleagues, and to hit upon realistic improvements in their own procedures. The fading away of external supports has led in many places to unrealistically low expectations of what students will do, and can gain, in historical study. Expectations are crucial, and the initiatives of teachers themselves, in parallel with those of administrators and teacher-trainers, can accomplish more than either alone.

The Commission is also addressing this report to the parents of young people who are studying history. Whatever the home, historically sensitive minds can mean just as much to the student's growth in skills and understanding as can the historically well-educated teacher in the schoolroom, and neither works well without some support from the other. Parents do well to appreciate that the acquisition of historical understanding is a multifaceted process which gains from leisure-time reading, from trips to historical sites and new parts of the country (and world), from living room or dining room arguments that involve quick recourse to reference books, as well as from the regular homework that means profitable classroom hours in school. If parents are themselves readers of history, this alone may help their children come to appreciate it, notwithstanding the currents of teenage interests. (Selected reading lists in history and historical fiction are suggested for all ages in the appendices to this report.) But the classes at school are the most powerful enrichers of the horizons and overtones of teenage discourse, and parents who lend words of appreciative support to the history teacher, or make well-timed suggestions at PTA meetings or in words with school board members, both help their children and serve as responsible citizens.

These are merely the chief roles in which readers of this report can contribute to enabling history to play its part in restoring education in the schools to full vigor. For convenience, the report's recommendations follow here, even though in this form they are only the bare bones of what the Commission is convinced is a lively and urgent matter:

I. The preparation of all schoolteachers should begin with a coherent, rigorous liberal education.

II. The preparation of history teachers should include concentration in history, taught by professional historians and augmented by significant study in such related fields as literature, the arts, anthropology, and the social sciences.

III. The preparation of history teachers requires courses in the writing of history and historical method, to make them aware of differences in interpretation and capable of evaluating the textbooks available for their use.

IV. The preparation of history teachers requires such training in writing as to make concern for clear writing an integral part of their history teaching.

V. The preparation of history teachers requires pedagogical training.

VI. The essence of inservice preparation is that the teacher should never stop learning.

VII. The irreducible minimum begins in the elementary grades by giving the K-6 student an acquaintance with the past through progressively sophisticated narratives.

VIII. The irreducible minimum in the secondary school must meet clear standards.

IX. The irreducible minimum for secondary schools should include a topical study of U.S. history and a survey of U.S. history.

X. The irreducible minimum for secondary schools should include a survey of European history.

XI. Beyond the irreducible minimum for secondary schools, the history of a non-Western country or area should, as a rule, be included.

Appendix A
Aids for History Teachers

Throughout the report the Commission has stressed the need for history teachers to keep learning more history. In particular, teachers who are already in the classroom should take every occasion and any means to acquire more knowledge of the subject. Such efforts cannot fail to increase the teachers' enthusiasm for and love of history and eventually to inspire their students.

Both the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians support programs and publish materials for the specific use of the history teacher. The Society for History Education publishes a quarterly (The History Teacher) that reports on promising classroom strategies, analyzes new interpretations and trends in historical fields, and includes critical reviews of textbooks and other materials for classroom use. Teachers are urged to familiarize themselves with the resources available through these three organizations. Often the pamphlets, newsletters, or other publications for teachers can be purchased separately by non-members. For The History Teacher, write The Society for History Education, Inc., Department of History, California State University, 1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90840. Individual numbers are $5.00; a year's subscription is $15.00.

The journal of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), Social Education, includes reports on materials of interest to the history teacher. In addition there is a Special Interest Group for History Teachers (SIGHT) within the NCSS. United by a professional concern about the teaching of history, SIGHT publishes a newsletter that welcomes new subscribers for $5.00 a year. (Check payable to SIGHT may be sent to Catherine W. Edwards, 4340 Drew Circle, Boulder, CO 80303.)

In view of the abundance of aids now available to history teachers, our suggestions are highly selective. We mean to concentrate not on classroom strategies or curriculum planning but on materials that can add to the teacher's store of historical information.

The American Association for State and Local History (AASLH)

The AASLH offers many resources of value to history teachers. Of first importance is its Directory, which can be found in most libraries and historical associations. In it are listed the names of almost 10,000 societies and organizations. With entries arranged by states, the directory makes it easy for a teacher to identify the organization that is most likely to answer questions or make available useful materials.

In addition to the directory, the AASLH has published more than 30 books and sponsored the writing of the national history state by state. Although some of the AASLH's books are primarily of concern to archivists and historical societies, many represent a most useful resource for the classroom teacher: books on oral history, a pictorial guide to styles and terms in American architecture (1600-1945), and a recent publication by Thomas J. Schlereth, Artefacts and the American Past. The 51 volumes of state histories are now complete and are available through the publisher (W. W. Norton and Co., Inc.).

Through its monthly magazine (History News) and a variety of education programs, the AASLH offers so many resources for the teacher of American history that teachers should urge their local library to join the association or even become individual members. Inquiries should be addressed to the American Association for State and Local History, 708 Berry Road, Nashville, TN 37204. Individual numbers are $3.00; a year's subscription is $20.00.

The American Historical Association (AHA) Pamphlet Series

Between 1956 and 1970, the AHA published more than 500 pamphlets for use primarily by teachers in the schools. In 1970 the original series was dropped, to be succeeded by the present one. Included are narrative and critical essays, bibliographical guides on topics in history, historiography, U.S. history, ancient and medieval history, modern European history, and the history of Africa, Asia, and the Pacific. A complete list of titles including earlier ones still in print is available on request to the American Historical Association, 400 A Street, SE, Washington, DC 20003. The pamphlets (usually 25-50 pages long) are sold at $1.00 to $3.50 each, prepaid.

Historical Association Pamphlets

For many years the Historical Association of London has published several series of pamphlets on English, European, American, and world history, complete with bibliographies and usually about 20-50 pages in length. A list of the pamphlets presently available can be obtained

from the Secretary, the Historical Association, 59a Kensington Park Road, London, SE 11 45 H, England. Please send an addressed return envelope with International Stamp Coupons for postage. The association also publishes Teaching History three times a year with articles on teaching and lesson planning, and reviews of textbooks.

More Popular Publications of Possible Use to the History Teacher

In their different ways the following periodicals all represent continuing sources of additional, often novel, and different historical information for classroom teachers. Libraries should be encouraged to subscribe to them.

1. History Today: For more than 30 years the English monthly, History Teacher, has featured a great variety of historical articles. Each issue contains 8-10 articles ranging from ancient history to contemporary history, dealing with periods, events, and biographies from all over the world. Popular in style and with excellent illustrations, each article includes a brief bibliography. In addition to book reviews, the new editors have added special departments on military affairs, food, architecture, and archaeology. Inquiries should be addressed to the Longman Group Limited, Subscriptions Department, Fourth Avenue, Harlow, Essex, CM195 AA, England.

2. American Heritage: An American publication, also more than 30 years old, American Heritage comes out bimonthly. It was founded by the American Association for State and Local History and the Society of American Historians. Featuring pictures, its articles are usually on topics of American interest or relevance. It includes book reviews. Write American Heritage Publishing Company, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, NY 10020. Individual numbers are $6.00; a year's subscription is $24.00.

3. Current History: Founded in 1914 and appearing nine times a year, Current History includes a wide range of articles on contemporary affairs and personalities as seen in an historical perspective. Write Current History, 4225 Main Street, Phildelphia, PA 19127. Individual numbers are $2.75; a year's subscription is $20.00.

Appendix B
History for the Early School Years

A wealth and variety of materials are available to help introduce students to history in the elementary grades. This summary is merely representative and is meant to suggest what is available by citing a few titles of proven worth. Textbooks have not been included, nor have audio-visual materials--now appearing in ever-increasing quantity--which can be most useful in introducing a topic to a class. Most of the books listed could be defined as historical fiction and biography. In both genres the setting is historical, and both can begin to acquaint students with the past. Young schoolchildren can also come to history through folklore and legend.

Geography and Resource Materials

Although an understanding of any continuous time-line comes later for children, a curiosity about far-off places appears early, especially when the young student peoples them with historical or mythical figures. Here are some useful books that will help weld geography and history indissolubly together:

Isaac Asimov, Words on the Map. Houghton-Mifflin, 1962. All of the states and major cities in the United States are covered, as are most of the major cities and countries throughout the world, their mountains, rivers, lakes, and seas. For 10 years and older.

Bernadine Bailey, Picture Book of Alabama. Albert-Whitman, 1966. One of a series of books on all the states. Simply and clearly written, giving a brief history and geographical information on each state. For middle and upper grades.

Allan Carpenter, New Enchantment of America, Alabama. Children's Press, 1968. First of a series on each state. Gives an excellent history and reference section. For middle and upper grades.

P. E. Cleator, Exploring the World of Archaeology. Children's Press, 1966. Describes the scientific methods used to piece together a picture of life in Pompeii, along the Nile, in ancient Troy, and in the lands of the Inca, Maya, and Aztec Indians. For 10 years and older.

Edgar B. Wesley, Our United States, Its History in Maps. Denoyer, 1961. A presentation of American history maps and charts. Stresses acquisition of information from the maps. For 10 years and older.

As they begin their acquaintance with the past, elementary school students need to acquire the habit of searching and researching as many sources as possible; too often they use the encyclopedia as the primary resort for information instead of the last. The following books are representative of the variety of other resources that elementary students should begin to explore:

Roger Duvoisin, They Put Out to Sea: The Story of the Map. Knopf, 1944. Beginning with the early traders, this book traces the exploration of the world through the discoveries of Magellan. Grades 5 and up.

Colin McEvedy and Sarah McEvedy, The Classical World. Macmillan, 1974. An atlas of world history, beginning at 300 B.C. and continuing to 400 A.D., from Alexander the Great to the decline of the Roman Empire. Well-illustrated with more than 50 historical maps and excellent commentaries. Grades 6-12.

Ann McGovern, If you Lived in Colonial Times. Four Winds Press, 1969. This favorite asks and answers questions children might ask about New England life between 1650 and 1730. Grades K-3.

William C. Langdon, Everyday Things in American Life, Vol. I (1607-1776) & Vol. II (1776-1876). Scribner's Books, 1937 & 1941. During the period 1776-1876, the community element steadily grew in national emphasis. Discusses everyday activities and improvements.

Edwin Tunis, Frontier Living. World Publishers, 1961. This book describes the life of early settlers of the American frontier: where and how they lived, what they wore, and how they governed themselves.

Tunis Edwin. Colonial Living. World Publication, 1957. The details of daily life in the colonies, from earliest times to the American Revolution, are found in this volume. The work of the craftsman and many other aspects of colonial life are well-illustrated and clearly defined.

Snyder, Gerald. In the Footsteps of Lewis and Clark. National Geographic Society, 1970. The author and his family retrace the journey up the Missouri River and on to the Pacif . There are historical illustrations by artists of p . eer times as well as present-day photographs.

Main, Mildred. Footprints. Steck, 1957. A collection of brief biographies of 25 pioneers of the South including national and lesser-known leaders.

A source of a different sort is Cobblestone: The History Magazine for Young People. Each monthly issue concentrates on a single topic (Our Voyage to the Moon, The Presidential Elections 1789-1980) by means of stories, poems, maps, puzzles, and suggestions for further reading (Digging Deeper). For more details, write Cobblestone, P.O. Box 959, Farmingdale, NY 11735.

History Reading for Elementary Grades

The list is for reading aloud, a (perhaps daily) practice that delights students and can provide a welcome change of pace for both students and teacher. Books that the students seldom select for themselves, and books that make a strong social statement of the time prove successful.

Scott O'Dell, Island of the Blue Dolphins. Houghton-Mifflin, 1960. The story of an Indian girl who spent 18 years alone on the Island of St. Nicolas off the California Coast. It is the story of her courage, self-reliance, and acceptance of her fate. Grades 7 and up.

Elizabeth B. De Trevino, I, Juan De Papeja. Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 1965. The story of the lives of two men, one a slave and one a portrait painter, at the Spanish court in the 17th century. Grades 7 and up.

Jean L. Latham, Carry on Mr. Bowditch. Houghton-Mifflin, 1955. Apprenticed at the age of 12, Nat spends his days working and his nights learning about ships and the sea. Grades 6 and up.

Mark Twain, Huckleberry Finn. The classic can still be read as a "funny, touching, rambling, shrewd, and honest story of boyhood." Grades 5-10.

Eloise McGraw, Mocassin Trail. McGraw Hill, 1952. A white boy attacked by a grizzly is rescued and raised by the Crow Indians. Grades 5-8.

Marjorie K. Rawlings, The Yearling. Scribner, 1938. The story concerns the adventures of a boy growing up in the scrub country of Florida. Grades 4-7.

Holling C. Holling, Paddle to the Sea. Houghton-Mifflin, 1941. The story of the voyage of a tiny model canoe from the Canadian wilderness down to the sea is remarkable as a lesson in geography as well as a story of courage. Grades 4-6.

The following highly selective list is recommended as reading material for students to read on their own.

Historical Fiction:

Clyde Robert Bulla, Viking Adventure. Crowell, 1963. On the long voyage to Vinland and home, a Viking's son grows into a man. Grades 3-4.

Erik Christian Haugaard, Hakon of Rogen's Saga. Houghton-Mifflin, 1963. Set at the end of the Viking period, this is the story of the powerful ruler of the Island of Rogen in Ancient Norway and the impetuous deed which brought about terrible calamity and nearly robbed his son of a rightful inheritance.

Rosemary Sutcliff, Warrior Scarlet. Walck, 1958. Despite a crippled arm, Drem regains his tribal status in the Bronze Age of England. Grades 5-9.

John R. Tunis, Silence Over Dunkerque. Morrow, 1962. A powerful story of the evacuation of Dunkerque. Grades 5-9.

U.S. Historical Fiction:

Zachery Ball, North to Abilene. Holiday, 1960. The resourcefulness of orphaned Seth is challenged in a 1000-mile cattle drive in this fine tale of the early cattle industry. Grades 4-6.

Carol Ryrie Brink, Caddie Woodlawn. Macmillan, 1935. The adventures of Caddie growing up in Wisconsin in 1864 provide interesting reading. Grades 6-8.

Clyde Robert Bulla, Down the Mississippi. Crowell, 1954. Storms and Indian raids add plenty of excitement as Erik leaves his Minnesota farm to go down the river on a log raft. Grades 5-8.

Bruce Catton, Banners at Shenandoah. Doubleday, 1955. An absorbing tale of Civil War days of young Bob Hayden, flag-bearer for General Sheridan. Grades 7-9.

Alice Dalgliesh, The Courage of Sarah Noble. Scribner, 1954. The story of eight-year-old Sarah who courageously accompanies her father into the wilderness and stays with an Indian family in her father's absence. Grades 4-5.

Walter D. Edmonds, The Matchlock Gun. Dodd, 1941. This book vividly describes an Indian attack on colonial settlers. Grades 5-6.

Esther Forbes, Johnny Tremain. Houghton-Mifflin, 1943. The story of a boy's desire to be a silversmith during the American Revolution. Grades 5-7.

Irene Hunt, Across Five Aprils. Follett, 1964. An impressive book both as an historically authenticated Civil War novel and as a beautifully written family story. Grades 6-9.

Jean Lathan, This Dear-Bought Land. Harper, 1957. An outstanding story of Captain John Smith and the settlement of Jamestown. Grades 5-7.

Scott O'Dell, The Kings Fifth. Houghton-Mifflin, 1966. Set in old Mexico, this is a story of a mapmaker whose search for knowledge was clouded by a lust for gold. He learns that man needs the light of the spirit to guide him. Grades 5-8.

Scott O'Dell, Sing Down the Moon. Houghton-Mifflin, 1970. Written in a simple, almost terse style, this book makes more vivid the tragedy and danger faced by a young Indian couple forced from their homeland. Grades 5-9.

Elizabeth George Speare, Calico Captive. Houghton-Mifflin, 1957. A stirring junior novel of Miriam Willard, a young Indian captive taken to Canada during the French and Indian War. Grades 7-9.

Appendix C
History in Paperback

The following short list of books has been drawn up in the hope that the readers of this report may be moved to read more history. Although availability in a paperback edition was of importance, the works chosen all satisfy in their different ways the criteria developed in the report. All contribute to the narrative story of the past, providing readers with a perspective of themselves and their world, and strengthening their judgment by means of vicarious experience. There is also considerable excitement, satisfaction, pleasure, and even inspiration to be found in them.

Philippe Aries, Centuries of Childhood, A Social History of Family Life. Knopf, 1962. Full of stimulating, fresh views and new kinds of evidence, this book opened up a field of study now being pursued vigorously in ways the author himself appreciates as yielding a sounder picture of a part of our past hitherto ruled by stereotypes.

T. S. Ashton, The Industrial Revolution 1760-1830. Oxford University Press, 1948. After describing earlier forms of industry in England, the book analyzes the coming of technical innovations to the factory, foundry, and mine. Thanks to growing supplies of land, labor, and capital, there resulted an expansion of industry so rapid and widespread that it has been called a revolution. In fewer than 200 pages, the book explains the revolution's significance--social and intellectual, as well as economic and technical --for England, all of Britain, and eventually the world.

M. I. Finley, The World of Odysseus. Penguin Books, revised edition, 1978. In the author's words: "If it is true that European history began with the Greeks, it is equally true that Greek history began with the world of Odysseus." His world was a coherent society with social institutions and values, perhaps quite alien to today's, but neither improbable

nor unfamiliar to anthropologists. Using the whole range of literary, historical, and archaeological scholarship, the author has brought new light to an old subject.

Richard Hofstadter, The American Political Tradition And the Men Who Made It. Vintage, 1948. Through 12 biographies, from the Founding Fathers through Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the author provides an interpretation of the American past. He sees in American history a unity of cultural and political tradition upon which American civilization has stood. In the past, this culture has been intensely nationalistic, often isolationist, fiercely individualistic, and capitalistic. Hofstadter asks whether in today's cultural crisis these traditional ideas and values will prove successful.

John Keegan, The Face of Battle, A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and the Somme. Random, Vintage V-402, 1976. In this dramatic reconstruction of what three crucial battles in Western history were like for the soldiers in the midst of them, the author combines analysis with narrative, the most difficult of all the historian's arts. In making the reader experience a battle as it really was, he succeeds at the historian's highest duty and propagates understanding of, not merely knowledge about, the past.

Georges Lefebvre, Coming of the French Revolution. Princeton Press, 1947. The French Revolution has been called "the greatest turning point of modern civilization," yet there has been a continuing debate over its causes. Although this book carries the story only a few months into the Revolution, it sets out clearly "the dynamics by which the Revolution continued to be moved." In particular it examines the different interests of such social classes as the aristocracy, the bourgeoisie, the peasants, and the town laborers.

Garrett Mattingly, The Armada. Houghton-Mifflin, Sentry 17, 1959. A skillful narrative weaves together the varied causes of one of the great events in 17th-century English and European history, realistically appraising its short-term and long-term significance for all parties.

Samuel E. Morison, The Maritime History of Massachusetts. Houghton-Mifflin, 1942. In the author's words, "for 200 years, the Bible was the spiritual, the sea the material, sustenance of Massachusetts." During the second half of this period the maritime enterprise of the Commonwealth was spreading out to include ship-building, shipping, seaborne commerce, fishing, and whaling. Morison shows history and geography constantly reacting on each other, and examines the social and political implications of maritime activity. He is skillful at turning a phrase ("the sea is no wet-nurse to democracy") and an artist at painting a scene with words.

Roland Oliver and J. D. Fage, A Short History of Africa. Penguin Books, 1962. With the 20th century, its wars and revolutions, the vision of a Europe-centered world has disappeared. Africa, once seen as a dark continent "lit only by flashes of foreign penetration," is now recognized as having a rich, varied, and quite separate history. The authors have made good use of a variety of disciplines to pull all this together into a short narrative.

David M. Potter, People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character. Chicago Press, 1954. The author makes use of the behavioral sciences as well as history to bring a fresh understanding to the study of American national character, analyzing the influence of a single historical factor--an economy of abundance--on the shaping of that character.

Richard W. Southern, The Making of the Middle Ages. Yale Press, 1961. For the formative period from 970 to 1215--when the important changes in Western Europe were without dramatic events or clearly decisive moments--the author concentrates on the main personalities and influences of the age. In Southern's words, "the stabilization of the boundaries of Europe, the slow recovery of political order and the unprecedented acceleration of economic activity" made possible such significant changes in thought and feeling as the reconquest of Greek thought.

Jonathan Spence, Emperor of China: Self-Portrait of K'ang-hsi. Random, 1975. The author has reconstructed an autobiographical memoir out of the Emperor's own recorded words. Under such topics as ruling, thinking, growing old, and sons, Spence has filled in the life (1654-1722) of the second Manchu Emperor, a contemporary of Louis XIV and Peter the Great.

Kenneth M. Stampp, The Peculiar Institution, Slavery in the Ante-Bellum South. Vintage, V253, 1956. Starting with the premise that slaves were "merely ordinary human beings," the author calmly addresses such questions as what slavery was like, why it existed, and what it did to the slaves, their owners, the South, and the country at large. Much of the book's value rests on the historian's paradox: "knowledge of the past is a key to an understanding of the present." Yet the author goes on to prove that the historian's "knowledge of the present is clearly a key to an understanding of the past."

Richard H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism; A Historical Study. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1926. This book examines the interaction of economic practices and religion from the Middle Ages to the 17th century. Persuaded that Christianity had lost its proper concern for the whole range of social and economic life, the author shows how the autonomy of economics replaced the organic social theory of the Christian church.

Keith Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic. Scribner, 1971. Because science has increased our understanding of our environment during the past 200 years, it is hard to realize how much the 16th- and 17th-century residents of England needed magic of every sort. Only with the help of magical beliefs--magic itself, astrology, and witchcraft--were they able to protect themselves against the uncertainties of their world. While tracing the evolution of these beliefs, the author shows them at work on the lives of ordinary people.

John William Ward, Andrew Jackson, Symbol for an Age. Oxford University Press, 1955. This is a study of both Jackson and his times. Three abstractions--nature, providence, and will--were realized in Andrew Jackson, but abstractions, in the author's words, "are not generally effective instruments of persuasion." Symbols, however, can make abstract ideals concrete, and Andrew Jackson embodied the spirit of his age.

Edmund Wilson, To The Finland Station; A Study in the Writing and Acting of History. Doubleday, Anchor, 1953. The title of this book is taken from Lenin's April 1917 train trip across Germany to Moscow's Finland Station to join the

Russian Revolution. The book traces the origin and nature of the ideas Lenin brought with him. Premised on Vico's belief in the organic growth of human society, it chronicles the growth of the revolutionary tradition in Europe and its metamorphosis into socialism.

C. Vann Woodward, The Strange Case of Jim Crow. Oxford University Press, 3rd edition, 1974. The author shows that in the history of race relations in America, segregation appeared in the North while slavery still existed in the South. It moved South only after 1865, and spread there after the collapse of the First Reconstruction in 1877. Eventually Jim Crow (as the institutionalization of segregation was called) spread throughout both the South and the North. Only in May 1954 did the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. the Topeka Board of Education reverse this trend and usher in today's Second Reconstruction.

Appendix D
The Historical Novel

A glance at the paperback shelves of any bookstore is enough to demonstrate the continuing popularity of the historical novel. Although this fact does not reflect an increased interest in history, it does support the Commission's contention that history as story has wide appeal. Human history is the story of people, and if these people are interesting, beautiful, or in danger, a historical novel can be given shape. How much the result remains history, however, is still in question; the line between romantic history and historical romance is a fine one.

Over a century and a half ago, thanks to Sir Walter Scott, the historical novel came into being. Steeped in the clans and covenanters of his native Scotland, Scott made good stories out of the remarkable adventures of ordinary people and showed how people very much like ourselves conducted their lives under very different conditions. Too many of his successors do violence to the historical capacities of their readers either by misrepresenting the details of daily life in an earlier period or by infusing their characters with today's concerns and assumptions. In fairness to the authors of historical fiction, it must be admitted that today even educated readers know so little history that they find it difficult to meet the author half way in any excursion into the past.

Any excursion into the past through a good historical novel can stimulate a taste for history and generally heighten the reader's understanding and human sympathy. At its best, the historical novel is a stimulus to its readers' imagination and critical faculties; at its worse, it is little more than entertainment or escape. The ideal fusion of history and fiction was best described by historian Herbert Butterfield: "History is put to fiction as a poem is put to music." The novelist is peculiarly able to "feel with people unlike himself and look at the world with their eyes."

Historical Novels Recommended

To select a representative sampling of good historical novels out of the hundreds available is risky business. To ensure diversity, each member of the Commission was asked to nominate a favorite, and here they are:

John Buchan, Prester John. Houghton Mifflin, 1910. The story of a young Scotsman who becomes a storekeeper in South Africa, only to become involved with the mysterious spirit of Prester John's legendary empire. (Africa, 19th century)

Isabel Colegate, The Shooting Party. Viking Press, 1980. Upper-class England just before World War I. (England, early 20th century)

Charles Dickens, Tale of Two Cities. Oxford University, 1903. France of the Ancien Regime and the Revolution. (France and England, 18th century)

Walter Edmonds, Drums Along the Mohawk. Little, Brown & Co., 1936. A pioneer family of the Mohawk Valley during the American Revolution. (America, 18th century)

Howard Fast, April Morning. Crown Publishers, Inc., 1961. A story of Lexington, Concord, and the beginning of the French Revolution. (America, 18th century)

Leon Feuchtwangler, Proud Destiny. Viking Press, 1947. France of the Ancien Regime, the court of Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, and Benjamin Franklin in Paris. (France, 18th century)

Anatole France, The Gods Are Athirst. Folcroft, 1980. Revolutionary Paris during the Reign of Terror. (France, 18th century)

Kenneth Roberts, Arundel. Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1930. A chronicle of the Province of Maine and of the secret expedition against Quebec. (Colonial America, 18th century)

Wallace Stegner, Angle of Repose. Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1971. Four generations (1870-1970) in the life of an American family that helped to shape the West. (America, 19th and 20th centuries)

Gore Vidal, Burr. Random House, 1973. Burr--traitor or patriot?--is asked and answered in a "suave, satiric telescoping" of early American history. (Colonial America, 18th century)

Robert Penn Warren, All the King's Men. Random House, 1960. The rise and fall of Louisiana politician Huey Long. (America, the 1930s)

80

ENDNOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Hazel W. Hertzberg, "The Teaching of History," The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States, Michael Kammen, editor Chapter 20 (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 474-488.

2. Clifton Fadiman and James Howard, Empty Pages: A Search for Writing Competence in School and Society (Belmont, CA: Fearon Pitman Publishers, 1979).

CHAPTER I

1. Meg Greenfield, "Lest We Forget," Newsweek, February 2, 1976, p. 76.

2. David Hackett Fischer, "The Year's Books (Part II)," The New Republic (December 3, 1977), p. 21.

3. The Case for Basic Education, James D. Koerner, editor (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1959), p. 8.

4. Ibid., p. 2.

5. Jacques Barzun, Clio and the Doctors (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959), p. 97.

6. Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies. National Council for the Social Studies, 1977, p. 69.

7. Ibid., p. 2.

8. Wayne L. Herman, Jr., "A National Developmental Study of Scope and Sequence in Social Studies Education," University of Maryland, 1981, passim.

9. Robert R. Spillane, Speech before the New York State Social Studies Supervisory Association, April 9, 1981.

10. Martha Doerr Toppin, "I Know Who's Going With Me! Reflections on the Fellowship of History," Social Education, October 1980, p. 460.

CHAPTER II

1. William R. Taylor, "A Primer for the New History," Principal, October 1977, p. 78.

2. Edward B. Fiske, "Times Test of College Freshman Shows Knowledge of American History Limited," The New York Times, May 2, 1976, p. 1.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., May 3, 1976, p. 43.

5. Barr, Barth, and Shermis, Defining the Social Studies, p. 60.

6. Illinois State Journal-Register, March 21, 1980.

7. Fiske, The New York Times, May 2, 1976, p. 65.

8. Charles G. Sellers, "Is History on the Way Out of the Schools, and Do Historians Care?" Social Education, May 1969, p. 515.

9. Ibid.

10. Frances FitzGerald, America Revised (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown & Co., 1979), p. 165.

11. Charles G. Sellers, "Is History on the Way Out of the Schools, and Do Historians Care?" Social Education, May 1969, p. 516.

12. Dorothy G. Singer and Jerome L. Singer, "Television: A Member of the Family," Principal, January/February 1977, p. 50.

13. Neil Postman, Teaching as a Conserving Activity (New York: Delacorte Press, 1979), p. 50.

14. Ibid., p. 70.

15. Jo-Ann Price, "Languages Get a New Accent at Dartmouth," The New York Times, January 8, 1978, p. 3ED.

16. Mark Twain, A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1889), p. 47.

17. James Howard, "The ITV Show," Basic Education, March 1980, p. 13.

18. The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States, Michael Kammen, editor (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1980), p. 20.

19. Ibid., p. 29.

20. A random selection of titles in Harvard University Press's "History Matters," 1980, is illustrative: Bastardy and Its Comparative History: Studies in the History of Illegitimacy and Marital Nonconformism; The Dangerous Class: Crime and Poverty in Columbus, Ohio, 1860-1885; The Life Insurance Enterprise, 1885-1910.

21. Eugene Genovese, "Teaching History Through Biography - Dumas Malone and Thomas Jefferson," Humanities, January/February 1980, p. 5.

22. Sellers, "Is History on the Way Out?" p. 510.

23. Ibid., p. 513.

24. Edwin Fenton, The New Social Studies (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976), p. 450.

25. William Carroll et. al., The Teaching of History in the Public Schools of Iowa (privately mimeographed, 1979), Section II, pp. 22-26. The study is excerpted from the Organization of American Historians Newsletter, January 1980.

26. Alston Chase, "The Humanities as Group Memory," Minnesota Humanities Commission with support of the Northwest Area Foundation, 1979, p. 15.

CHAPTER III

1. Felix Gilbert, History, Choice and Commitment (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 453.

2. Warren L. Hickman, "The Erosion of History," Social Education, January 1979, p. 18. The phrase is taken from a letter of the sponsor of the 1978 American Historical Association Conference on the Teaching of History.

3. David L. Lewis, The Public Image of Henry Ford (Detroit, MI: Wayne St. University Press, 1976), p. 247.

4. Historian at Work, Peter Gay and Gerald J. Cavanaugh, editors. (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), Vol. I, p. xi.

5. Stephen Crites, "The Narrative Quality of Experience," Journal of The American Academy of Religion, October 1971, p. 291.

6. Ibid.

7. Carl Becker, Modern History (New York: Silver, Burdett and Co., 1931), pp. v-vi.

8. "The Ballad for Americans," Earl Robinson, composer, Robbins Music Co., 1940.

CHAPTER IV

1. Malcolm W. Browne, "Is Problem-Solving America's Lost Art?" The New York Times, July 29, 1980. p. C1.

2. James Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1963). This remains a landmark study.

3. Peter Greer, Education's Stepchild, Inservice Training, Occasional Paper No. 28 (Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, 1979), p. 9.

4. Ibid., p. 4.

5. Ibid., p. 5.

6. Donnell B. Portzline, "A Critique of NDEA, Title XI, Institutes in Geography and History," Social Education, November 1966, p. 551.

7. Hertzberg, The Past Before Us: Contemporary Historical Writing in the United States, p. 474.

CHAPTER V

1. Erwin Chargaff, "Knowledge Without Wisdom," Harper's, May 1980, p. 48.

2. The account is taken from a working paper prepared for the Commission.

3. Ibid.

4. Although we recognize the developmental considerations that have given rise to the junior high school (grades 7-9) and, more recently, the middle school (grades 5-8), we have made only the general distinction between elementary (grades K-6) and secondary school (grades 7-12).

5. Becker, Modern History, p. v.

6. History teachers are often unreasonable in their expectations because they simply do not appreciate how much time and effort youngsters who are still learning to read and write need to follow or construct discourse. This is one reason it is important that their teaching of history include reading comprehension and that they themselves write the assignments they give their students.

7. The term "advanced placement" is borrowed from a program of The College Board, which gives students the opportunity to omit some courses ordinarily required of freshmen in college and matriculate with "advanced placement" in sophomore or upper division courses. Not all high schools take part in the Advanced Placement Program, but many make provision for their most able history students in "honors sections" and similar programs.

8. For a critique of the report of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, see Basic Education, January 1980, p. 7.

9. The quotation is taken from a working paper prepared for the Commission by Nancy Roelker.

10. Harold G. Shane, Curriculum Change Toward the 21st Century. (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1977), p. 56.

INDEX