International Journal of Social Education
Volume 22, Number 2, Fall 2007-2008, Pg 101-135

THE RUGG PROTOTYPE FOR DEMOCRATIC EDUCATION

RONALD W. EVANS

Harold O. Rugg was one of a small group of leaders of the Progressive Education Movement centered at Teachers College, Columbia University, and a leader among the Social Frontier group that emerged in the 1930s to argue that schools should play a stronger role in helping to reconstruct the society. He was the author of an innovative and best selling series of social studies textbooks which ultimately came under attack from "patriotic" and business groups in the prelude to the United States involvement in World War II. The story of his rise and fall encapsulates a significant and central story in the history of American education. The Rugg story reveals a great deal about the direction of schooling in American life, the many alternative roads not taken, and possibilities for the future.

As Kliebard and Wegner write, Rugg's career "virtually represents in miniature the panorama of educational ideologies that characterized twentieth century curriculum reform in America: scientific curriculum making, child-centered education, and most notably, social reconstructionism."[1] Moreover, Rugg's career and the ideas of his detractors embody elements of the entire spectrum of social studies ideologies that influenced the making of the curriculum in the twentieth century: education for social efficiency in the form of scientific curriculum making, social studies as social science inquiry, social studies as traditional history and civics, social studies as an issues-oriented and integrated field of study, and social studies as education for social reconstructionism.[2]

Rugg's story remains important today chiefly because it reminds us that social studies as a broad and integrated field of study has potential for the development of thoughtful and caring citizens, and that it is possible for a social studies reformer to influence the course of events. Rugg's work had a real impact, not only on rhetoric among theorists, but on schools. His work brought an issues-centered approach to the field to a large segment of U.S. school children during the 1930s, and thus influenced the education of a generation of U.S. citizens. His textbooks and materials sold millions of copies and ultimately inspired a controversy that changed the course of the curriculum.

Rugg's social studies program was pedagogically advanced, integrating the social sciences and history in an issues-centered program focusing on understanding and social transformation. To this day the Rugg social science materials serve as a useful prototype for a unified social studies focused on issues and societal problems and aimed at education for social justice.

Rugg envisioned an entire social studies curriculum centered around "The American Problem," and aimed at leading a thousand year march to a "cooperative commonwealth."[3] Rugg's story is a reminder of the potential power of social studies reform—his materials were pedagogically sophisticated and somewhat daring, and they asked tough questions on issues and topics that need to be addressed in a democratic society: the role of business in controlling government, the role of government in regulating business, the influence of men of wealth and property on the Constitution and our form of government, the role of government in providing for the general social welfare, immigration policy, issues related to racial diversity, the role of the United States in world affairs, and myriad others. Furthermore, Rugg's work was built on a

thoughtful rationale that combined student interest with social worth—a powerful combination that still has appeal.

In the late 1930s and early 1940s Rugg was censured by a media storm fed by conservative "patriotic" and business groups who, in an un-American fashion, did not want school children, or their parents for that matter, raising questions about the basic structures of American life and the capitalist economic system. The attack on Rugg, on his ideas, textbooks and school materials, was perhaps the first major battle of what I have termed "the war on social studies."[4] It is a "war" many progressive educators are still fighting, and, unfortunately, still losing. Rugg's story illustrates the point that being a social critic or progressive reformer can be dangerous, especially so in education. To openly declare allegiance to ideas that challenge capitalism and its most basic assumptions can, and has—on many occasions—led to serious repercussions.

Rugg's life and work have great resonance today, in the 21st century. The Rugg story raises serious questions about the rationale and purposes for schooling: What kind of citizens and citizen education do we want? How far should schools go in providing opportunities for social criticism? What kinds of activities and materials are appropriate in support of education for social justice? What are its limits, if any? And, behind all of these questions, Whose version of "the American way" should schools support?

Teaching for social justice has had many advocates over the years and seems a permanent interest group in the panoply of educational thought. The literature on social justice oriented schooling has mushroomed since the 1970s, an offshoot of critiques of society, and of schooling, developed during the 1960s and later.[5] To a greater degree than many recent advocates of

teaching for social justice, Rugg's work achieved a strong presence in schools. Thus, most importantly, the Rugg story, his life and his work, challenges us to make a difference in schools.

Framework. This article is focused primarily on the examination and discussion of Rugg's social studies ideas. Rugg's rationale for social studies is of continuing interest for several reasons. First, rationales are important, and are too often neglected.[6] Social studies professionals at all levels have an obligation to consider the foundations of social studies theory embodied in the multiple rationales and orientations to the field. In recent years, rationale deliberations have been largely pre-empted by the rush of support for history, geography, and civics as the core of social studies, driven by a neo-conservative standards and testing agenda for schooling and supported by the nexus of power and money.[7] These recent trends have undercut thoughtful deliberation on rationales. As a result, much of the current research on teaching in social studies is focused on the teaching of history. In too many instances, it assumes and benefits from a "history as core" orientation, without the thorough deliberations necessary to arrive at a well-grounded rationale for democratic education in schools. Thus, Rugg's rationale and program are important because they provide a thought-provoking alternative, and a seminal vision of education for democratic citizenship.

Second, recent literature on Rugg illustrates continuing interest in the Rugg story but focuses mainly on various aspects of the textbook controversy.[8] While this work adds to our knowledge, it is important to affirm that Rugg's success stemmed from his development of an innovative vision for social studies which was embodied in the Rugg social science program.

Third, we have a long history of contributions to the literature on issues-centered social studies from a number of scholars over many years.[9] The closely related literature on democratic education has also grown exponentially.[10] And, a younger generation of scholars is emerging

with similar interests and affinities.[11] The literature on issues-centered and democratic education, whether it is explicitly acknowledged or not, is built upon the foundation established by Harold Rugg and other great progressives during the first half of the 20th century. Revisiting Rugg's vision will underline several of the main themes of his work and highlight the fact that Rugg was instrumental, a seminal thinker in the world of social studies theory and practice. A full understanding requires that we briefly examine the origins of his ideas, his developing theory, his critique of the standard practices in schools, the key principles and explicit rationale under-girding his social science program, and the controversy he inspired.[12]

Origins

Harold Ordway Rugg was born in Fitchburg, Massachusetts on January 17, 1886. He attended Fitchburg public schools, worked in a textile mill, and, through good fortune and his own initiative, attended Dartmouth College. He studied civil engineering and worked as a railroad surveyor, then taught civil engineering for two years and became interested in how students learn. His engineering background would later influence his penchant for social engineering as embodied in his evolving ideas for education. He earned a Ph.D. in Education at the University of Illinois under the mentorship of William C. Bagley in 1915, then held a teaching post in educational psychology and statistics at the University of Chicago, engaging in what he would later describe as "an orgy of tabulation."[13]

Rugg was raised in modest circumstances in Fitchburg, always it seemed, with "not enough" of the material goods of life. As a carpenter and cabinet-maker with a fiercely independent streak, his father struggled at times to hold a job. Rugg's sense of deprivation was heightened by his observation of the wealthy among Fitchburg—their power, influence, and

luxurious lifestyle. Rugg grew up holding many conventional attitudes, sympathy for the underdog, and an exceptionally strong drive for financial and career success.

It was during his tenure at the University of Chicago that Rugg was called upon to serve on the Army's Committee on the Classification of Personnel during World War I. The Committee was charged with aptitude and intelligence testing and sorting of personnel during the Army's large-scale expansion. During his service, Rugg went through a transformation in his world-view. He embraced a progressive ideology which planted the seed for his conversion from the field of educational psychology and statistics to social studies. This dramatic transformation was precipitated through his interaction and friendship with others on the Committee, including Arthur Upham Pope, John Coss, and Walter Lippman, and by his introduction through these contacts to contemporary social critics—including Van Wyck Brooks, Waldo Frank, and Randolph Bourne who held an aesthetic orientation and who had written for *The Seven Arts*, a highly regarded literary journal.

Behind Rugg's conversion to social studies and focus on social issues was a new awareness of the displacement and human suffering caused by industrialism and its allied developments, modern warfare, and colonialism. Rather than focus on any one issue, his vision encompassed the broad nexus of forces, issues, and problems that needed to be understood, and overcome, in order to ameliorate human suffering in the world.

In January, 1920, Rugg joined the faculty at Teachers College, Columbia University, where he also served as school psychologist for the Lincoln School, one of the leading progressive private schools in the nation, founded with the intention of changing the face of American education. It was at the Lincoln School that Rugg found a laboratory for working out his ideas for the social studies curriculum with a handful of teachers and students. His contact at

Teachers College with John Dewey, William H. Kilpatrick, George S. Counts, John L. Childs, Jesse Newlon, R. Bruce Raup and others had a profound influence on his intellectual development, as did his association with the avant-garde in the New York area including creative artists such as Alfred Stieglitz and Georgia O'Keefe in Greenwich Village and his later residence in the arts community of Woodstock, New York, which inspired Rugg's interest in the arts, in imagination and creativity.

Given time to read and think as per his agreement with his new employers, Rugg set to work exploring the seminal works in history and the social sciences of the late 19th and early 20th century. He read historians such as Frederick Jackson Turner, Charles A. Beard, and James Harvey Robinson, and social scientists including Thorsten Veblen, Charles Horton Cooley, and John Maynard Keynes. As a result of these contacts and of his reading, a new understanding of the problems of modern industrial society, and "a new vista of possibilities," opened before him.

Rugg was strongly influenced by these "frontier thinkers" on the cutting edge of modern scholarship. Moreover, he was profoundly affected by the work and thought of John Dewey, by various forms of social criticism, by the social experiment of Soviet Russia, and by the movement for Technocracy, especially the thought of Howard Scott, who promoted a vision of a society of shared abundance in which the industrial economy would be run by expert technicians in order to end the hardships and class conflict associated with industrial society.

Following this period of intense study, Rugg's conversion to social studies was more or less complete. It was during and shortly after this time that Rugg developed the core of his idea for a "unified" social studies curriculum, crossing but not obliterating disciplinary boundaries, focused on issues and problems and presenting history and the social sciences through the lens of persistent societal issues.

Rugg's notion of a composite or "unified" course was not an entirely original idea, though it was a relatively new development and undoubtedly received its greatest boost from his work. In Rugg's case, it was an idea instigated, in part, by his old friend, John Coss, with whom he served on the Army's Committee on the Classification of Personnel. Though Rugg's worldview was strongly influenced by his association with other members of that Committee, and by the social criticism contained in the The Seven Arts, it was Coss who most directly influenced Rugg's vision for social studies. Coss planned to develop a unified course in Contemporary Civilizations at Columbia College upon his return to his teaching post there after World War I, and he had discussed this intention with Rugg. It seems that Rugg and Coss were walking one day in Rock Creek Park, in Washington, DC, the day after the Armistice in November, 1918, and discussing their personal post-war plans. Coss was a man on a mission. When Rugg asked, "What are you going to do?" Coss replied, "We'll, I'll tell you. I am going to put through just one job—if it's the last one I do. I am going to help make a big orientation course for the undergraduate students in Columbia College."[14]

Rugg was apparently quite impressed. "Here was a new idea," he later wrote, "to bring the social sciences into one overview 'introduction to contemporary civilization' course required of all freshmen." He viewed the central idea, "integration of the college curriculum" as a notion of "enormous importance."[15] Rugg later attributed many of the core ideas for his unified social science course to Coss and adapted them to the secondary level.[16] Moreover, the idea for a unified curriculum had some currency in progressive circles and had been tried in a number of schools. Charles Judd and some of his colleagues at the University of Chicago were working on developing such a course during the war, and Daniel Knowlton, then a teacher at the Lincoln School, was building a similar course.[17]

Rugg would later argue that the entire social studies curriculum should be organized around problems of contemporary life, an idea clearly ahead of its time, and later destined to become a central guiding principle for reflective, issues-centered social studies. Philosophically, the vision of social studies as an integrated, issues-centered field of study was directly linked to the meliorist, progressive movement in education. Proponents of this definition for social studies envisioned a unitary field of study, fusing materials from the disciplines and organizing it around societal issues or problems. Historically, this vision embodied the highest hopes of progressive reformers and pedagogues and represented the flowering of the progressive impulse for societal reform in the curriculum. Curricula devoted to the integrated study of societal issues developed within this context and became an institutional embodiment of the Protestant social gospel.[18]

A Developing Theory

Rugg's ideas on social studies began to emerge more fully in the early 1920s in monographs written by Rugg and his research associates and appeared in Rugg's publications in journals and books. Development of Rugg's social studies theory occurred in relative synchronicity with the writing and publication of the Rugg Social Science Pamphlets which would be used to implement his vision in schools. Though Rugg did not publish a single, unified statement of his theory during the early years of his career at Teachers College, his writings provide strong evidence of his developing approach. As it emerged over time, the basic skeletal frame remained relatively constant. Yet, Rugg's continuing intellectual growth, at Teachers College and in the cultural richness of New York City, led to the gradual evolution of a more fully developed rationale.

Rugg's first published articles to describe his vision for a new and innovative social studies began to appear not long after his arrival at the Lincoln School and Teachers College. In two similar articles which were published in The Historical Outlook and The Elementary School Journal, in May of 1921, Rugg critiqued the work of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship, known as the Second Committee of Eight, of the American Historical Association. Though he defended the need for national committees in developing curricula, he was extremely critical of the Eight for failing to take a "scientific approach" and for neglecting to provide the necessary national leadership. Perhaps its most serious deficiency was that it had, "failed to acquaint children with the development of current institutions and problems."[19]

Rugg proposed that future committees "sweep the board clean" and start anew, developing "carefully thought-out hypotheses of selection ... based upon the principle of social worth." He went on to suggest specific guidelines for selection of topics and materials:

> My own procedure would be to ignore the fact that we have today a curriculum in history, geography and civics; and start afresh and define clearly the scope, functions and objectives of the course by this criterion of "social worth." This criterion necessitates that to be included in the course the material must contribute:
> to a grasp of the great economic, social and political relationships or "laws";
> to an understanding of established modes of living; to an interest in and appreciation of the outstanding "problems" and "issues" of contemporary civilization.

Later, in the same article, Rugg critiqued the "encyclopedic presentation of facts, with little or no emphasis upon application of these facts to the understanding of great fundamental

relationships." He proposed that, "to develop a real power of thought" we should give students "constant practice in generalization" with the aim of helping students understand great movements and causal connections, acquiring information by "gradual accretion" and through "the making of many interconnections—not mere drill upon isolated topics, events, conditions, personages, etc."[20] These were pointed criticisms of the common curricular and classroom practice of the day that went right to the heart of its deficiency.

In his next publication, which appeared in The Historical Outlook for October, 1921, Rugg provided a more fully developed and cogent statement of his emerging theory of social studies, which he set forth in seven "hypotheses," which his newly formed research team was setting out to either confirm or refute. The hypotheses included emphasis on problem-solving, development of a unified course, student examination of evidence in various forms, current affairs as a window to relevant episodes from the past, and a spiraling or layering of complexity.[21]

The Problem with the Old Order

At the time of Rugg's arrival at Teachers College, much of the design work in curriculum building and experimentation was being conducted by members of the National Society for the Study of Education (N.S.S.E.). The Yearbook of the organization reached a fairly wide readership and gave contributors the opportunity to have an audience with some of the most influential scholars in education. Rugg was asked to direct the development of the Twenty-Second Yearbook, which was devoted entirely to the social studies field.[22] Editorship of the Yearbook provided Rugg with a prime opportunity for a national platform from which to expound his vision of social studies.

The Yearbook, titled, The Social Studies in the Elementary and Secondary School, was divided into four sections. The first described the current situation, offering a critique of current curricular practice. The second, third and fourth sections described several "new" reorganized courses, discussed how the new curricular materials were being constructed, and offered an overall appraisal of proposed reorganization schemes. Aside from serving as editor of the volume, Rugg contributed three chapters which provide a more detailed and significantly enhanced glimpse of his emerging vision for social studies.

In the first chapter of the yearbook, Rugg asked, in his title: "Do the Social Studies Prepare Pupils Adequately for Life Activities?" He answered that "they do not," and then set out to describe, and critique, the present curriculum in some detail. First, Rugg argued that the vast majority of our people rarely deliberate thoughtfully on political and social matters. He hypothesized that "critical judgement, instead of impulse, must be the basis upon which our social and political decisions are made... ," and that it was the primary responsibility of the social studies curriculum to provide students with "knowledge about the issues of contemporary life and how they came to be what they are ... translated into tendencies to act intelligently upon them ... ."[23]

"History instruction," Rugg wrote, "spans six or seven school years from fourth through twelfth grade." He summarized the present focus of historical study as "international, legalistic, and militaristic" with students expected to learn a great deal of "minutiae" of the past. The history deals, he wrote, "with the growth of our nation as a legal and political organization" but largely ignores the "social, industrial, and intellectual aspects... ."[24]

Geography from the fifth grade on exhibits a focus on "countless facts ... learned by rote" from textbooks which are "veritable encyclopedias" organized by continent and country, containing "a multiplicity of detail" and trying to "cover too much territory."[25]

While acknowledging improvements and innovations contained in the new and rapidly growing course in "Community Civics," including greater focus on community welfare and conditions in cities, Rugg lamented the fact that "few such innovations" had reached the elementary or junior high school. In those years, and in most government courses at higher levels, the schools continued to "drill students" on the Constitution, and the branches and powers of the federal government using what was frequently called a structure-of-government approach.[26]

Rugg went on, "Our social sciences are dominated by reading courses which stress the acquisition of information. The schools are following the path of least resistance ... . based upon 'no theories at all.'" "The practice implicitly assumes … that clear thinking and right conduct will issue from the mere acquiring of information."

Remarkably, Rugg's description of the standard practices in social studies of the 1920s bears an eerie resemblance to the modal practice today. Moreover, his criticisms and remedies continue to resonate, and may serve as a potential source for reflection and new directions. A statement from one of Rugg's later works summarizes the essence of his critique of the "old order" and his desire to replace it with an issues-centered focus. In his autobiographical defense of his work, <u>That Men May Understand</u>, he wrote, "To keep issues out of the school, therefore, is to keep thought out of it; it is to keep life out of it."[27]

Key Principles of Rugg Social Studies

As presented in another chapter of the NSSE Yearbook for 1923 and elsewhere, Rugg's proposed social science course for the junior high school was built upon eight "hypotheses":

> *First: Contemporary problems and their historical backgrounds can be learned more effectively through one unified social science curriculum than through the separate school subjects ... .* (The Rugg program) *is not an attempt to merge the established subjects ... .* It completely disregards current courses.
>
> *Second: Each major topic of the course must be of established social value to the rank and file of our people.* Unless a topic can be proved to contribute definitely to an understanding of current modes of living and problems and issues of contemporary life, it can find no place in such a course.
>
> *Third: An objective analysis of social needs facilitates the assignment to each of the major phases of life, its proper amount of attention in the curriculum ...* the persistent problems and issues of our generation are being determined by analytical methods.
>
> *Fourth:* Problems shall be based (not solely on the spontaneous interests of particular pupils) but on common experiences of children of that metal and social age; personal appeals where possible, e. g. "What would you do if—?"; alternative proposals where possible, to force comparison and systematizing of facts; and, intellectual opposition to obtain interest. *Each topic and sub-topic of the course shall be illustrated by detailed episodes and by a wealth of maps, graphs, and pictorial material far in excess of the present use of them...*
>
> *Fifth: The reading materials and exercises should be set so as to stimulate analysis and reasoning. (Therefore)* All units of work shall be presented definitely in

problem-solving form (as contrasted with the narrative, factual, compartment method, with questions at end of chapter which courses now employ).

Sixth: Problem-situations shall be presented first through current affairs. Only those historical backgrounds shall be developed which are crucial for clear thinking about contemporary matters. Historical backgrounds are presented through a series of "sharp contrasts." One era, one condition, one stage of a movement is to be sharply contrasted with another and especially with the current order of things. (Moreover,) history is not regarded as a "content subject;--only geography, government, economics, industry, anthropology, sociology, and psychology are that.

Seventh: Historical backgrounds will be clearer if the history of only one set of related topics is traced at one time... in the junior high school we should teach history longitudinally instead of by periods, or transversely ... we should trace directly to the present day, the development of a particular activity or group of activities.

Eighth: Problems, or exposition of the developments which contribute to them, should recur in many grades, organized on an increasingly mature level (through) ... some form of "layer" scheme ... *One problem or topic, or at most one restricted group of problems and topics, should be considered definitely and thoroughly at one time.* (an admonition to go for depth).[28]

And so, by 1923 Rugg had fleshed out the core ideas which were at the heart of his vision for social studies. It was, in essence, a progressive and issues-centered vision centered on curriculum integration. It focused on issues and "problem-situations," appeal to the interests of the child balanced with social need, and a curriculum which was to be designed in advance of

instruction. It also contained a theory on the use of historical material as background to contemporary understanding rather than as content per se. These were innovative ideas which provided a foundation for the further development of Rugg's social studies materials.

Behind Rugg's Theory: A Rationale

Rugg's final contribution to the Yearbook presented the rationale for an issues-centered curriculum and described the research and rationale building which was ongoing at Teachers College, largely performed by graduate students under his direction. Rugg began this chapter with a re-statement of his regular advocacy of an "objective" and "scientific" approach to curriculum building. "In order to determine the critical issues of the day" a multi-pronged analysis was conducted which went beyond the "activity-analysis" promoted by many curriculum theorists of the time.[29] Rugg expressed an ambivalent view of activity analysis. He intimated that it could tell the curriculum maker "a part, but only a part" of what children needed to know. His central critique was that it would focus on "life as it is to-day," assuming a static society and ignoring the rapidity of change.

He argued that social studies should prepare students to participate in life activities (a socialization function) and "equip them to be constructively critical" of contemporary society (counter-socialization). To do this, he hypothesized, we need expert opinions on which "current modes of living should be changed;" definition of contemporary problems and issues; and, the most likely emerging problems and issues with which the growing generation "will have to grapple."[30]

At the heart of his rationale Rugg posited that development of a curriculum for "a troubled society" required confronting young people with "the most critical problems of that society." Rugg viewed our society as "troubled" and "faced with big and insistent problems." He argued that society was also "dynamic" and that the curriculum must be dynamic as well. Hence, there were two fundamental mandates in creating a curriculum: first, selection of "insistent and permanent problems"; second, to continuously adapt the curriculum to "the problems which experts predict will continue to be insistent in the adult life of the growing generation." Finally, Rugg held, even at this early date, that the school is "our most important agency for the improvement of society."[31]

Rugg and his colleagues at Teachers College were engaged in developing a curriculum and materials for students and teachers which would not only address persistent issues, but "anticipate" changes and "use the curriculum to prepare children to meet them." In essence, the "problems and issues of contemporary life" would control the curriculum. In the twelfth grade, students would "study and discuss... the problems and issues of industry, politics, and social affairs." Direct study of problems and issues was the central focus for twelfth grade because "the students are as old mentally and socially" as they would become during their time in public school. Nonetheless, students at earlier grades should "experiment" and become familiar with "problems and issues" so that they would be fully prepared for a focused study in eleventh or twelfth grade. Students in earlier grades "shall have read episodes, historical narratives, studies and made maps, dealt with graphic and pictorial matter, solved problems, and debated questions" appropriate for their developmental level, so that they would be well prepared for the "problem" study in the later grade. Thus, the curriculum he envisioned was geared to the developing maturity of the student.

Rugg also emphasized the fact that he did not expect students to "solve" the problems and issues, after all, adult society had not solved them. Instead, what he expected was that students would review "the evidence which is necessary for the consideration of all aspects of a given problem." This would entail "an unpartisan, open-minded review of the evidence on both sides" of the question.

Rugg summarized the procedure:

> First, find the problems and issues of modern social life; second, find the particular questions which have to be answered in order to consider all angles of the various problems; third, select typical "episodes" which illustrate the more important points to be made, collect the facts, in narrative, descriptive, graphic, pictorial or statistical form, that are needed to discuss the questions and problems; fourth, to clarify and fix the essential matters, discover the basic generalizations that guide our thinking about society.[32]

To determine the "insistent problems" Rugg argued that no one was better equipped as the group of writers he labeled, "frontier thinkers." These frontier thinkers included scholars in a variety of fields "out on the firing line of social analysis." Rugg and his research assistants drew on the "matured statements" contained in more than 150 books of several score of these frontier thinkers. The books were selected using a four part procedure. First, drawing from Book Review Digest, they selected only those works referred to as "books of distinct merit, irrespective of economic or political faith"; second, they chose books characterized as "important" in book reviews of six weekly and several monthly journals; third, the list was supplemented by "a canvass" of several thousand books held at Columbia University Library; and, fourth, eighty

specialists were queried for "a list of ten books in his own field ... which he would use to obtain statements of problems in his field," reflecting "deep insight and balanced vision" and chosen "irrespective of economic or political faith."[33]

Thus, for the first time in a published work, Rugg stated his plan for divining the "insistent and permanent" problems of the day. Each book was to be critically analyzed "by tabulating the space (in quarter pages)" devoted to each problem the author discussed.[34] The results of these ongoing investigations, conducted by graduate students under Rugg's supervision, were to be reported in monographs at a later date.

Rugg's vision for social studies contained both social theory and psychological theory, though the social theory was dominant, even early on. The social theory held that social studies subjects in schools existed in the context of a troubled society and that by becoming aware of issues and problems student would develop a commitment to active citizenship aimed at social improvement. Social value would be the litmus test for selection and inclusion of topics in the curriculum, and social improvement was to be the teleological goal.

The psychological theory held that students were interested in present life conditions and its related issues and problems; that persistent and relatively permanent issues and problems should be at the heart of the curriculum; and, that history and much of the other social science content should be taught in such a way that these traditional sources of knowledge helped to interest and illuminate students lives in the present. And, more importantly for Rugg, it should prepare them for lives as active and concerned citizens who would help to improve conditions in a "troubled society." Thus, while the interests of the child were an important part of Rugg's theory, he clearly subordinated student interest to social need and the larger goal of social improvement.

Rugg's thinking, as expressed in the teacher guides he developed in the late 1920s to accompany his textbooks, also emphasized the importance of active learning and student participation that would go far beyond a passive "reading" curriculum. The "active" school would replace the traditional "listening" school.[35] Learning through active participation meant that the course would involve a stream of activities rather than students simply reading a textbook, answering questions at the back of the chapter, and listening to the teacher talk. Participation would involve a wide range of activities and formats including wide student research in books, magazines, and newspapers; discussion through open forums and debate; preparation of outlines, briefs, and critiques as needed; and, use of new tools of graphic and pictorial display. As Rugg put it, the materials had to be arranged in "thought provoking form." The student must not only gather and "absorb facts" but must be given constant practice in "making decisions with facts."[36]

Active learning was, in Rugg's vision, to be predicated on interest, and generated by a course that was "real and dramatic." This meant, in part, first hand experience whenever possible: observation, field excursions, and a range of experiences outside the school. Also, dramatic and vivid portrayals of social issues and problems or antecedent historical episodes would make reading as interesting as possible. In either case the teacher and textual materials were to play a lead role in developing student interest.

Rugg viewed learning as a cumulative process in which student knowledge and understanding grew incrementally. The new course in social studies would therefore be based on sequential experiences which would take account of the knowledge and understanding of students, moving from the simple to the more abstract and complex. Rugg believed that schools should provide students with a "wealth" of materials, so that students could learn from as many

sources as possible, and through multiple senses: travel, film, pictures, graphic and statistical materials.

The Rugg course also made provision for the use of drill and repetition to assist students in learning factual data. Geographic locations, reading and writing skills, map work, and knowledge of chronological sequence were all considered important, and the course provided systematic training in each of these areas.

In order to make learning most meaningful, Rugg emphasized selection of a relatively small number of problems, studied in depth, rather than the superficial treatment of many topics. Selection of topics and materials would be based on social worth. Rugg believed that an understanding of the modern world could best be achieved through a focus on "a few hundred" of the concepts of the social sciences. Finally, Rugg emphasized the concentration of student attention on one topic at a time and one particular task.[37]

That Rugg's theory would have a psychological side was not surprising, after all he had been hired at Teachers College to be Director of Psychology for the Lincoln School and to serve in a department headed by Edward L. Thorndike. During his first four years as a professor he worked primarily in this area. Also, he had gained experience and expertise in psychology during his graduate school days at the University of Illinois, and with the army's Committee on the Classification of Personnel.

Rugg's balance between student interest and social need closely fit his support for a curriculum largely designed in advance of instruction, rather than the more spontaneous approach supported by many other "child centered" progressives. As Rugg so aptly stated in a monograph published with one of his graduate assistants, "centering attention upon the interests and activities of children has always been important, nevertheless it has grave limitations... . If

growth is to be properly directed, the curriculum-maker must be oriented so as to have his eyes constantly on the society in which the child is growing."[38]

Though Rugg may have been the leading progressive thinker in social studies, his ideas regarding subject matter and curriculum planning, while innovative, were, if anything, more conservative than many in the progressive camp. His pamphlet and textbook series, with subject matter organized around contemporary problems and their historical antecedents, represented thoughtful planning in advance of instruction, a relatively conservative approach to pedagogy, more in line with Dewey than with Kilpatrick or others who tended to discount its importance.

The Rugg Social Science Materials

Development of the Rugg social science pamphlets continued during the early 1920s. Rugg contacted former students and asked them to subscribe, sight unseen, to the social science pamphlet series that he and his entourage had developed experimentally at the Lincoln school. The response was overwhelming. By June 1922, he had received orders for 4,000 copies of each. The second edition of the pamphlet series resulted in about 100,000 copies of each unit shipped to schools.[39]

The Rugg social science pamphlets were problem-centered and pedagogically advanced: virtually every topic was introduced through a contemporary issue or problem connected to students' lives; the writing was lively and engaging; open-ended discussion questions were prominently featured in "open forum" and "group discussions"; the pamphlets made frequent use of photos, drawings, and cartoons; and, provocative topics were given full coverage, including potentially controversial topics such as the influence of business on government, and the influence of men of property on the development of the U.S. Constitution.

The Rugg-developed pamphlets were revised and published in textbook form, two texts per grade (seventh, eighth and ninth) for the junior high school, beginning in August, 1929, by Ginn and Company, with publication of another volume in the series published every six months thereafter. The series became a huge financial success, and represents the zenith of issues-centered social studies materials entre into classrooms in the twentieth century.

During the 1930s, sales of Rugg's textbook series skyrocketed. For the ten-year period from 1929 to 1939, the series sold 1,317,960 copies at approximately $2.00 each, and over 2,687,000 workbooks. Rugg and his associates had created a unified social studies program and his books attracted worldwide attention and imitation. Through force of will, brilliance, hard work and fortunate timing he had clearly become the leading social studies educator in the United States.[40] At their peak, the Rugg program was being used in more than 4,000 school districts nationwide.[41]

The content organization of the Rugg textbooks was centered around guiding principles distilled from the "frontier thinkers" discussed above, including the growth of modern cultures, development of loyalties and attitudes for decision-making, and the synthesis of knowledge from history, the social sciences, and other areas of study relevant to developing a critical understanding of the modern industrial world. The methodology for introducing this content included the dramatic episode, planned recurrence of key concepts, practice in skills of generalizing, and learning by doing.

The six volumes of the junior high school program were "designed to provide a comprehensive introduction to modes of living and insistent problems of the modern world" with the purpose of "introducing young people to the chief conditions and problems which will confront them as citizens of the world," through a unified course in social studies.[42] Rugg

defended his development of a "unified" course by alluding to students need to "ultilize facts, meanings, generalizations, and historical movement" in understanding modern institutions.[43] He cited the need to tie various factors "closely together in their natural relationships" to help students understand the modern world. He wrote:

> Whenever history is needed to understand the present, history is presented. If geographic relationships are needed to throw light upon contemporary problems, those geographic relationships are incorporated. The same thing has been done with economic and social facts and principles.[44]

Though the books contained a great deal of historical narrative, not unlike many other texts, the overarching aim was to make the study of history and the social sciences relevant, interesting, and meaningful to students in service of the ultimate goal of social melioriation. In both the pamphlet series and the textbooks, material from history and the social sciences was frequently framed with issues and problems of present concern.

One example of framing history with contemporary problems or issues can be seen in Rugg's treatment of American government in the pamphlet, America's March Toward Democracy, Part I. Rugg began the text by describing "the great strands of our political history" then followed that with a look at problems in political life today which he described as "threads through the political history" that will follow. Among the problems, each illustrated by a cartoon: political parties, the history of voting, freedom of speech, public education, growth of the constitution, extension of government services, regulation of business, tariffs, methods of

taxation, control of government by business, addition of territory, and world affairs. In each case the problem was briefly introduced by central, hard-hitting, and difficult focus question. For example: "What control does the government have over business? Is this old or new? Is the Government effective in controlling business for the benefit of the masses of the people?" [45]

Another example can be seen in Rugg's introduction to the modern world, Changing Governments and Changing Cultures.[46] Much of the content is a narrative of European and world history from the Middle Ages to the modern era. However, Rugg frames the study of the past with a chapter on the present, and dramatic, world situation titled, "Storm Centers of the World … , " in which he describes global areas of conflict illustrating that "the world is still in upheaval."[47] The body of the text then traces political, social, and cultural developments over time with a focus on the struggle for democracy. The volume ends with a chapter titled, "World Conflict Versus World Organization," examining attempts at creating international cooperation and focusing on the League of Nations.[48]

Yet another example can be seen in Rugg's treatment of unemployment in the textbook, An Introduction to Problems of American Culture.[49] In a chapter titled, "Machines, Men and Their Jobs," the focus is on the problem of unemployment, its causes and possible alternative solutions. At one juncture in the narrative Rugg poses the question, "Why should there be unemployment and starvation in the richest country in the world?"[50] The chapter draws on a mix of data from the social sciences in examining this question and key policy alternatives.

Also worthy of note, the writing in both the pamphlets and the textbook series was appealing and down to earth, a major factor behind their success. For example, the narrative for one text began with an imaginary meeting of the Social Science Club of "George Washington Junior High School of Anystate, U.S.A.," in which members of the club discussed the problems

and issues to be taken up in group study.[51] The description is lively and engaging, and undoubtedly helped to interest many students in the remainder of the text.

The Rugg textbook series for the junior high school was titled Man and His Changing Society. Individual titles included: An Introduction to American Civilization; Changing Civilizations in the Modern World; A History of American Civilization; and An Introduction to the Problems of American Culture. The final volume of the first edition was published in January, 1932. Revised editions appeared from 1936-1940.

The Gathering Storm

Rugg's scholarly writing underwent a shift in the early 1930s with a more pointed advocacy of social reconstructionism and the goal of moving toward some form of "collectivism," reflecting concerns spurred by the era of the great depression. It was, in part, these writings and subsequent media coverage of his speaking engagements which attracted the attention of self-appointed censors to Rugg's work. His success as an author, combined with his affiliation with unpopular causes, made him a target for criticism. In 1934, Rugg was listed as a "Communist" in Elizabeth Dilling's *The Red Network*.[52] During 1935 Rugg spoke out against American Legion attempts to censor a classroom magazine, *Scholastic*, because of its perceived liberal bias. For the balance of the decade, in a series of major speeches, Rugg attacked patriotic societies, the Advertising Federation of America, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the New Deal itself. His comments and outspoken views critical of the American Legion and other groups had the effect of making him the chief target of their attacks.

By 1939, against the backdrop of dictatorship in Europe and the beginning of World War II, controversies over the Rugg textbooks spread like wildfire, and the American public was treated to a spectacle that received continuing national media coverage. The attacks centered in the New York metropolitan area and represented an intense campaign orchestrated by relatively few people. The bulk of the attacks came from a combine of business writers and publicists, retired military of the American Legion, professional journalists, and a few loose cannons. The flames were fanned by extensive coverage in the Hearst press. Attacks on the Rugg materials began as part of a blanket attack on American writers and texts, with Rugg gradually becoming the chief target.

Bertie C. Forbes, in his own magazine, attacked the Rugg textbooks in an article titled "Treacherous Teachings" in which he charged Rugg with being against private enterprise and urged boards of education to "cast out" the Rugg books.[53] The Advertising Federation of America, led by Alfred T. Falk, attacked the books for carrying "anti-advertising propaganda." Merwin K. Hart, a native Fascist and president of the New York State Economic Council, charged Rugg with "making a subtle sugar-coated effort to convert youth to Communism," and suggesting that capitalism "has been a failure and that socialism should be substituted in its place." [54]

Controversies over the books in a number of cities and towns followed a typical pattern: a complaint, followed by the appointment of a committee to investigate, then debate and, frequently, public hearings. In a number of well-publicized cases, Rugg appeared in person to defend the textbook series. The outcome of the controversy varied from place to place. Binghamton, New York, and Englewood, New Jersey, had major controversies covered extensively by local and national media. In a number of cities and towns, including Binghamton,

the books were removed. In Bradner, Ohio, the Superintendent ordered the books taken down to the furnace room and burned.

The next round of controversy was generated by two articles which appeared in widely read, nationally circulated magazines. The first of these was an article by Augustin G. Rudd which was published in the April, 1940, issue of *Nation's Business*, and was titled, "Our 'Reconstructed' Educational System." Rudd posited that the "entire educational system" had been "reconstructed" with textbooks and courses teaching "that our economic and political institutions are decadent."[55] He blamed the widespread teaching of "social science," ... [instead of] ... history, geography and U. S. Government" and cited the Rugg textbooks as the major culprit. He argued that Rugg "subtly but surely implied a need for a state-planned economy and socialism" and aimed "to undermine the faith of children in the American way of life."[56]

The second article, by Orlen K. Armstrong, was titled, "Treason in the Textbooks," and appeared in the *American Legion Magazine* for September, 1940, and was distributed to one million homes.[57] The American Legion had a long history of trying to persuade the nation's citizens to support its brand of true "Americanism" by distributing pamphlets, suppressing "subversive elements," and supporting textbook criticism.[58] The article contained a bitter denunciation of the writers and teachers of the "new history," and charged that Rugg sought to "cast doubt" upon the "patriotism" of the founding fathers and the constitution and "to condemn the American system" of private enterprise and inculcate "collectivism."[59] Armstrong attacked fused courses like Rugg's and described them as "propaganda for a change in our political, economic, and social order."[60]

Meanwhile the entire controversy garnered increasing national attention. According to an article in *Time* magazine, by the end of the Spring term in 1940, the Rugg textbooks had been

banned from a half-dozen school systems. Critics objected to the Rugg texts, the article reported, "for picturing the U.S. as a land of unequal opportunity, and giving a class conscious account of the framing of the U.S. Constitution."[61]

The Storm Unleashed

The next major development in the Rugg story raised the stakes considerably as it involved the activities of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), a business organization with a long history of propaganda campaigns aimed at organized labor, the New Deal, and school curricula. During the 1930s the "brass hats" of big business reclaimed leadership of the NAM and launched a campaign aimed at "business salvation," flooding the nation with propaganda aimed at manufacturing favorable public opinion. They popularized the term "free enterprise" as a replacement for "capitalism," adopting the term at their 1932 convention.[62] Involvement in the Rugg textbook controversy was part of their larger propaganda campaign. On December 11, 1940, *The New York Times* reported that the NAM announced that it would initiate a survey of textbooks then in use in the schools to see if it could find evidence of subversive teaching. Ralph Robey, an assistant professor of banking at Columbia University, and a columnist for *Newsweek*, was hired by the NAM to prepare a series of abstracts of some 800 then currently used social studies textbooks to show the author's attitudes toward government and business.

On Saturday, February 22, 1941, a headline at the top of the front page of *The New York Times* read: "UN-AMERICAN TONE SEEN IN TEXTBOOKS ON SOCIAL SCIENCES: Survey of 600 Used in Schools, Finds a Distorted Emphasis on Defects of Democracy, ONLY A

FEW CALLED RED." The article reported that a "substantial portion" of the social science textbooks used in schools "tend to criticize our form of government and the system of private enterprise."[63] The article cited the controversy over the Rugg textbooks and noted that several school systems had banned his books from the classroom.

The story, including the reference to the Rugg controversy, appeared on the front page. The abstracts provided selected and provocative quotations from the texts, which raised questions about the functioning of government, the distribution of wealth and incidence of poverty, or the interplay of power and wealth. The quotations were provided without any sense of the remainder of each text, much of which would be found utterly innocuous.

Internal memoranda from the files of the NAM suggest that many in the organization's offices were rather squeamish about the entire enterprise, and feared that it could result in negative publicity for business and the NAM. As it turned out, these worries were well founded.[64] Protests, corrections, and replies to Dr. Robey's findings came quickly. Leaders of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) made immediate contact with leaders of the NAM asking whether it "repudiates or endorses" Robey's statement.[65] The NAM President, Walter D. Fuller responded with a press release stating that Robey's criticisms were his "personal opinion only."[66] Later, after a storm of stories and editorials in the press, the NAM attempted to further distance itself from the controversy and expressed regret that "distorted" impressions of the project had been given such wide currency.[67]

The Aftermath

The defense against the attacks on the Rugg textbooks was mounted on several fronts. The Academic Freedom Committee of NCSS issued a statement supporting academic freedom,

and later prepared "a packet of reading matter on freedom of teaching in the social studies area," which included a 66-page booklet on fending off attacks on textbooks.[68] The Council of the American Historical Association asked Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger to draft a statement regarding controversial issues in textbooks. The statement, which was approved by the Council, gave strong support for the inclusion of controversial questions in "the historical account," and for encouraging a "spirit of inquiry" in young people.[69]

Rugg himself was undoubtedly the chief advocate for the defense of social studies, and the Rugg textbooks, against the attackers. And, numerous friends and colleagues rushed to his defense. One of the most active groups was the American Committee on Democracy and Intellectual Freedom organized in the late 1930s to address a range of intellectual freedom issues, and chaired by Franz Boaz at Columbia.[70] Among other groups that furnished support were the Association of Textbook Publishers, and Rugg's associates on the journal *Frontiers of Democracy*. Even John Dewey came to Rugg's defense in an opinion editorial piece which appeared in *The New York Times*.[71] Like several groups and individuals, Dewey defended Rugg on the grounds of intellectual freedom even though he didn't always agree with Rugg's ideas or actions, and clearly did not think of Rugg as a major thinker.[72]

Rugg gave an able defense of his work, and attempted to meet every attack directly, appearing in person whenever it was possible. Rugg's confrontations with his accusers followed a familiar pattern. First, he would be accused of being a Communist, then he would be criticized over his plan for a socialistic society in *The Great Technology*. When pressed, critic after critic would admit that they had not read the books. Under siege on every side, Rugg wrote an autobiographical work to tell his side of the story. *That Men May Understand* was published in April, 1941, and received generally favorable reviews.[73] *Publishers Weekly* endorsed the book

and joined Rugg in attacking his critics, accusing Dilling, Forbes, and Hart of working on "the prejudices of the American people" and calling Rugg's book "a vigorous and adequate reply to his critics."[74]

Discussion of the attacks continued in the professional literature. One article, written by a school superintendent, argued that many of the attacks were part of a deliberate effort to undermine "public confidence in the schools so that school appropriations may be reduced."[75] Another author provided a larger historical context for the attacks and suggested that they were part of a larger "War on Social Studies."[76] The real animus of the critics, he wrote, "is against the whole modern conception of the social studies as a realistic approach to life."[77] In opposition to the critics, he argued that young people have "the right to know what the world is all about and to learn what can be done about it."[78] As was clear to a number of observers at the time, many of Rugg's critics had links to Fascism, defined as dictatorship of the corporate elite. According to independent journalist George Seldes, publisher of the newsletter *In fact*, the NAM was "the center of American Fascism."[79] It was the "the peak association of big business … (and) … the most powerful private organization in the country," and it was organizing a great propaganda campaign aimed at "manufacturing public opinion" that suited its interests.[80]

As it turned out, February 22, 1941, the date of the Robey story, was a watershed in the war on social studies. Tension had been building while the movement for integrated social studies and a focus on issues and problems with a meliorist or reconstructionist purpose gathered steam. After the Robey article, the tide turned. By 1943 American Legion officers believed they had ousted the textbooks from approximately 1500 communities.[81] By the middle of the decade, the Rugg textbook series and program had fallen from prominence and had virtually disappeared.

Though he never admitted it publicly or with colleagues, the loss of his textbook series and the leadership and prestige it had given him left Rugg deeply hurt.[82] Rugg continued to teach and write but focused on scholarly work and college level textbooks, giving up his efforts to revolutionize social studies in schools.

In 1951, though, he was at the center of another controversy. Sparked by his reputation as a "radical" and following a speaking engagement at Ohio State University, he became the subject of an in depth FBI investigation focused on his supposedly socialistic comments in the speech and his many other activities over the years. Though the investigation continued until his death, Rugg was labeled “naïve” and “misguided” but he was never added to the security index.[83]

Despite the controversies and unfortunate fate which befell him, Rugg continued to maintain his beliefs, and continued to support education for social reconstruction, though his public profile was forever altered and subdued. On May 17, 1960, Rugg died of a heart attack at his home in Woodstock.

Conclusion

What can we learn from an account of Harold Rugg's story, and by examining his vision and rationale for social studies? A number of implications might be drawn from Rugg's life and his work on social studies. First, and perhaps most important, Rugg's example illustrates the importance, and the potential impact, of dreaming big and bold visions of reform, not only as a well-spring for inspiration, but as a source of ideas for practical action, praxis, with the aim of social improvement. Rugg’s social studies materials were innovative, engaging, well written, and pedagogically advanced. They went beyond narrative and description to pose challenging questions and issues by frequently framing narrative with a problem to be solved and by

inserting “open forum” discussion questions at key points in the text. Many subsequent scholars in social studies have drawn on Rugg and developed similar ideas though none have had as much impact on classrooms.[84]

Rugg had a worthy social and pedagogical vision combined with a bold personality and the courage to persist in upholding his convictions. His educational vision was pedagogically advanced, and forward-looking. He seriously questioned capitalism, its apparatus and influences. Moreover, Rugg’s basic critique is largely still relevant. We need a renewed questioning of capitalism and of the mainstream institutions in American life. It is healthy to ask such questions, and to ask school children, beginning at a fairly early age, to wrestle with these questions and the difficult issues they raise.

At its heart, the progressive approach to schooling championed by Rugg and others held that students must be challenged to confront social realities, to understand how the problems and dilemmas of the contemporary world came to be what they are, and to think about what might be done about it. In his later years, Rugg captured the essence of the matter in one of his many talks about his work on the creative process:

> One of the very essential factors in the creative process, it seems to me, is the concept of integrity. It’s involved in that very homely phrase, “I say what I think my way” … . An authoritarian world will not permit that question to be asked, “What do you think?” … Why it’s revolutionary! … So you could generalize that, … and you could put it into schools. And (it) consists of teachers honestly asking, “What do you think?”

> I think we've seen almost a vicious expression of the very opposite of this. Not what they really think, but what ought to be said to fit in with the controlling interest, with the boss, with the owner, the employer, with the party … . And you see it worse in all these fascist organizations, and you see it in complete form in any authoritarian society, whether it be the Russian one, or Hitler, or Mussolini, or the Japanese war party, or whether it be the same kind of thing in a democratic society where the powers that be control.
>
> Educationally, I would go back to what seems to be the heart of it, getting teachers to understand, that no matter what the board of education has prescribed, no matter what the superintendent and the principal, and the supervisor have said must be done, that basically, this group of children and I have got to explore life … together, honestly, and confront the problems ... in spite of the possible authoritarian (reaction) … . The teacher would have to bring them right down to this village, this town, this neighborhood, this school, this class. Our problems.[85]

Thus, Rugg's work was, in a modest way, revolutionary in character. It was a call to action, a call to confront the persistent issues at the heart of our social and economic structures that are typically left out of school. He called for students to find their own individual voices, "to say what I think, my way," as they wrestle with the social dilemmas of our times.

Second, though his textbooks and ideas were sure to inspire some criticism, Harold Rugg did not deserve his fate. Rugg was a seminal thinker who fully deserved to receive the recognition and financial fortune that sometimes accompany a brilliant idea combined with hard

work. The controversy that engulfed Rugg, and the defense offered by Rugg and those who rose to support him, suggests that some dreams are worth fighting for, even though the struggle may take its toll.

In the present era, it is especially important to keep alternative visions alive, to nurture deep dreams of justice and fair play, and to make sure that critics of a liberal or issues-centered social studies are met with a stout defense. The attacks on Rugg, and especially the sustained campaigns carried on by the American Legion and the NAM, present early examples of the power of interest group financing and organization.[86] Recently, the revival of traditional history, supported by similar forms of interest group financing, has had a significant influence on the direction of the social studies curriculum, in effect, purchasing a conservative vision for the future of schooling and society.[87] This trend runs counter to the notion of social studies focused on questions, and is leading to what Paulo Freire once called "the castration of curiosity."[88] It must be challenged, openly confronted by those supporting a progressive vision of social studies education and of democratic life.

Third, Rugg did make a few mistakes. Education for social justice can take many forms. There was some justification for the charge that Rugg presented more evidence in his textbooks and school materials on the side of the questions which he supported. So, it seems, in order to survive in schools, we must learn to include a balance of materials, sources, and interpretations, and challenge students to make up their own minds about the meaning of past and present institutions and societal dilemmas. Though this may not silence all critics, it is more easily defensible as part of the "American way," and as a clear example of John Dewey's method of intelligence applied to the social studies arena.

Moreover, we can learn a great deal about the fine line between engaging in social criticism and incurring the wrath of critics by examining the Rugg textbook controversy in some depth. Curricula cannot be neutral. However, it can strive to present multiple alternatives and to be fair to a full range of perspectives. Given current trends reflecting the conservative restoration in schools and society, we need greater emphasis on social criticism in social studies. Questions of social justice seem especially pertinent today, given the economic stratification and hegemonic power of elites in our nation and the world. In the United States, wealth is highly concentrated: the top one percent control 40 percent of the financial wealth, and the top 20 percent control 84 percent of total wealth. Moreover, numerous studies show that the distribution of wealth has been extremely concentrated throughout U.S. history.[89] Raising questions about this ongoing reality should be an important part of social studies curricula today, just as it was in the materials created by Harold Rugg.

Rugg's vision and social studies program remain a compelling prototype, a model of education for democracy. One can imagine a slightly revised version of the Rugg program, updated for the 21st century, making education in social studies more vibrant and meaningful. However, given the interest among many social studies leaders in progressive, critical and social justice approaches to education, given the context of an era of standards, centralized curriculum making, and high-stakes testing, and given the present climate of national and international crisis, it behooves us to be aware of, or be defeated by, the successes, the failures, and the mistakes—the "lessons"—of Harold Rugg.

NOTES

1. This article is drawn from a recent book. See Ronald W. Evans, This Happened in America: Harold Rugg and the Censure of Social Studies (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2007).

2. Herbert M. Kliebard and Greg Wegner, "Harold Rugg and the Reconstruction of the Social Studies Curriculum: The Treatment of the 'Great War' in His Textbook Series," in The Formation of the School Subjects: The Struggle for Creating an American Institution, ed. T. S. Popkewitz, (1987), 268-87; Ronald W. Evans, The Social Studies Wars: What Should We Teach the Children? (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004).

3. Harold O. Rugg, "The Social Studies: What I believe … ," in James A. Michener, ed., The Future of the Social Studies (Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1939), 140-41.

4. Evans, The Social Studies Wars.

5. W. Ayers, J. A. Hunt and T. Quinn, eds., Teaching for Social Justice: A Democracy and Education Reader (New York: The New Press, Teachers College Press. Distributed by W. W. Norton, 1998).

6. James P. Shaver, ed., Building Rationales for Citizenship Education (Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977); Anna S. Ochoa-Becker, "Building a Rationale for Issues-centered Education," in Handbook on Teaching Social Issues, ed. R. W. Evans and D. W. Saxe (1996), 6-13.

7. Alan Singer, "Strange Bedfellows: The Contradictory Goals of the Coalition Making War on Social Studies," The Social Studies 96 (2005), 199-205; E. Wayne Ross and Perry M. Marker, eds., "Social Studies: Wrong, Right, or Left?: A Critical Response to the Fordham Institute's Where Did Social Studies Go Wrong?" The Social Studies 96 (2005); Evans, The Social Studies Wars.

8. See, for example, E. Boesenberg and K. Poland, "Struggle at the Frontier of Curriculum: The Rugg Textbook Controversy in Binghamton, New York," Theory and Research in Social Education, 29 (2001), 640-671; Karen L. Riley and Barbara Slater-Stern, "A Bootlegged Curriculum: The American Legion Versus Harold Rugg," International Journal of Social Education, 18 (2003), 62-75.

9. Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies: Problems in Reflective Thinking and Social Understanding (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955 and 1968); Donald W. Oliver and James P. Shaver, Teaching Public Issues in the High School (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966); Fred M. Newmann and Donald W. Oliver, Clarifying Public Controversy: An Approach to Teaching Social Studies (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1970); Shirley H. Engle and Anna S. Ochoa, Education for Democratic Citizenship: Decision Making in the Social Studies (New York: Teachers College, 1988); Ronald W. Evans and David W. Saxe, eds., Handbook on Teaching Social Issues (Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies, Bulletin #93, 1996).

10. Michael W. Apple and James A. Beane, Democratic Schools (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervison and Curriculum Development, 1995); Anna S. Ochoa-Becker, Democratic Education for Social Studies: An Issues-centered Decision Making Curriculum (Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2007); Amy Gutmann, Democratic Education (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999); Ayers, Hunt, and Quint, eds., Teaching for Social Justice.

11. Edward J. Caron, "What Leads to the Fall of a Great Empire? Using Central Questions to Design Issues-based History Units," The Social Studies, 96 (2005), 51-60; Kim E. Koeppen, "It Threw Me for a Loop! Preservice Teachers' Reactions to Issues-centered Social Studies in the Primary Grades," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Orlando, 1999 (in the possession of the author).

12. Though Rugg's advocacy of education for social reconstructionism became more strident in the early 1930s, his rationale for social studies instruction and his social studies program changed little over time. It is also important to point out that his social studies vision and program developed long before his bold advocacy of social reconstructionism, a point that was largely lost on his critics.

13. Harold O. Rugg, That Men May Understand: An American in the Long Armistice (New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1941), 182.

14. Ibid, 170.

15. Ibid.

16. John Coss, "A Collegiate Survey Course in the Social Sciences," in The Social Studies in the Elementary and Secondary School, ed. H. O. Rugg (1923), 208-15; Elmer A. Winters, "Harold Rugg and Education for Social Reconstruction" (Doctoral diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1968), 20.

17. Charles H. Judd, "Introducing Social Studies into the School Curriculum," in The Social Studies in the Elementary and Secondary School, ed. H. O. Rugg (1923), 28-35.

18. David Tyack and Elizabeth E. Hansot, Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980 (New York: Basic Books, 1982).

19. Harold O. Rugg, "How Shall We Reconstruct the Social Studies Curriculum? An Open Letter to Professor Henry Johnson Commenting on Committee Procedure as Illustrated by the Report of the Joint Committee on History and Education for Citizenship," The Historical Outlook, 7 (May 1921), 185-86.

20. Ibid, 189.

21. Harold O. Rugg, "On Reconstructing the Social Studies: Comments on Mr. Schafer's Letter," Historical Outlook, 12 (October 1921), 252.

22. Harold O. Rugg, ed., The Social Studies in the Elementary and Secondary School (Twenty-Second Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, 1923).

23. Ibid, 1-2.

24. Ibid, 5.

25. Ibid, 5-6.

26. Ibid, 6-7.

27. Rugg, That Men May Understand, xv-xvi.

28. This listing of Rugg's "hypotheses" is a composite based on the two works cited below. See, Rugg, "On Reconstructing the Social Studies," 252; Harold O. Rugg, Earle U. Rugg, and Emma Schweppe, "A Proposed Social Science Course for the Junior High School," in The Social Studies in the Elementary and Secondary School, ed. H. O. Rugg (1923), 187-91.

29. Harold O. Rugg, "Problems of Contemporary Life as the Basis for Curriculum-Making in the Social Studies," in The Social Studies in the Elementary and Secondary School, ed. H. O. Rugg, (1923), 260-61.

30. Ibid, 261.

31. Ibid, 261-62.

32. Ibid, 266-67.

33. Ibid, 267.

34. Ibid, 268.

35. Harold O. Rugg, Teachers Guide to Accompany *A History of American Civilization* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1929).

36. Ibid, 5.

37. Ibid, 3-12; Winters, "Harold Rugg and Education for Social Reconstruction," 36-41.

38. Harold O. Rugg and John A. Hockett, Objective Studies in Map Locations (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925), 19-20.

39. Murry R. Nelson, "The Development of the Rugg Social Studies Materials," Theory And Research in Social Education, 5 (1977), 64-83; George A. Kay, "Harold Rugg: Social Reconstructionist and Educational Statesman" (Doctoral diss., State University of New York, Buffalo, 1969).

40. Elmer A. Winters, "Man and his Changing Society: The Textbooks of Harold Rugg," History of Education Quarterly, 7 (1967), 509-10.

41. Naida T. Bagenstos, "Social Reconstruction: The Controversy Over the Textbooks of Harold Rugg," Theory and Research in Social Education, 5 (1977), 29.

42. Harold O. Rugg, An Introduction to Problems of American Culture (Boston, MA: Ginn and Company, 1931), vi.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid, vi, vii.

45. Harold O. Rugg, Earle U. Rugg, and Emma Schweppe, The Social Science Pamphlets (New York: The Lincoln School of Teachers College, 1923), 12.

46. Harold O. Rugg, Changing Governments and Changing Cultures (Boston, MA: Ginn and Company, 1933).

47. Ibid, 5.

48. Ibid, 643.

49. Harold O. Rugg, An Introduction to Problems of American Culture (Boston, MA: Ginn and Company, 1931).

50. Ibid, 185.

51. Ibid, 3-10.

52. Elizabeth K. Dilling, The Red Network: A Who's Who of Radicalism for Patriots (Kenilworth, IL: The Author, 1934).

53. Bertie C. Forbes, "Treacherous Teaching," Forbes, August 15, 1938, p. 8.

54. Alonzo F. Myers, "Attacks on the Rugg Books," Frontiers of Democracy, 7 (October 1940), 17.

55. Augustin G. Rudd, "Our 'Reconstructed' Educational System," Nation's Business, April, 1940, p. 27.

56. Ibid, 94.

57. Orlen K. Armstrong, "Treason in the Textbooks," American Legion Magazine, September, 1940, pp. 8-9, 51, 70-72.

58. William Gellerman, The American Legion as Educator (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1938).

59. Armstrong, "Treason in the Textbooks," 51, 70

60. Ibid, 9.

61. "Book Burnings," September 9, 1940, Time, pp. 64-65.

62. George Seldes, Never Tire of Protesting (New York: Lyle Stuart, Inc., 1968), 112-13.

63. Benjamin Fine, "Un-American Tone Seen in Textbooks on Social Sciences," New York Times, February 22, 1941, pp. 1,6 (Late City Edition).

64. See especially, C. E. Harrison, inter-office memo to W. B. Weisenburger, July 25, 1940; C. E. Harrison to H. W. Prentis, January 10, 1941, and attached inter-office memo.; C. E.

Harrison to W. B. Weisenburger, January 10, 1941; C. E. Harrison to H. W. Prentis, March 19, 1941, all contained in "Robey Textbook Survey" folder, National Industrial Information Committee, Subject Files, box 847, series 111, National Association of Manufacturers Papers, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware.

65. Erling M. Hunt, "Dr. Robey Versus the NAM?" Social Education, 5 (1941), 288-92.

66. Walter D. Fuller, Telegram to Wilbur Murra, February 24, 1941, file 1, box 2, series 7, Committee Records, Academic Freedom Correspondence, National Council for the Social Studies Archives, Gottesman Library, Teachers College, Columbia University.

67. Erling M. Hunt, "The NAM Restates Its Policy," Social Education, 5 (1941), 328.

68. Merle Curti to Wilbur Murra, October 14, 1941, file 1, box 2, series 7, Committee Records, Academic Freedom Correspondence, NCSS Archives.

69. American Historical Association, "Freedom of Textbooks," Social Education, 5 (1941), 487-88.

70. ACDIF Press Release, "A Committee of Ten Outstanding Social Scientists … ," Sunday, February 23, 1941, American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, New York, "ACDIF" folder, box "a-bend," B61p, sub collection 2, Franz Boas Professional Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

71. John Dewey, "Investigating Education," New York Times, May 6, 1940, p. 16.

72. John Dewey to Sidney Hook, April 25, 1944, "Correspondence with Sidney Hook" folder, box 10, series 1, accession #13116, John Dewey Papers, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.

73. Harold O. Rugg, That Men May Understand. Portions of Rugg's autobiographical book were adapted from a paper he wrote in explanation and defense for his administrators at Teachers College, Columbia University. See Harold O. Rugg, "Confidential Analysis of the Current (1939-1940) Attacks on the Rugg Social Science Series, Prepared by Harold Rugg in May-June 1940," "Harold Rugg" folder, box 58, William F. Russell Papers, Gottesman Library, Teachers College, Columbia University.

74. F. G. Melcher, "Editorial: Rugg Deserves Freedom of Education," Publishers Weekly, April 12, 1941, p. 1533.

75. C. M. Dannelly, "Facing a Major Threat," The School Executive , 60 (1941), 32.

76. Kenneth M. Gould, "The War on Social Studies," Common Ground, Autumn, 1941, pp. 83-91.

77. Ibid, 90.

78. Ibid, 91.

79. George Seldes, Facts and Fascism (New York: In Fact, 1943), 80, 100.

80. George Seldes, One Thousand Americans (New York: Boni & Gaer, 1947), 43, 61.

81. R. Worth Shumaker to John E. Thomas, August 4, 1943, Legion dead-letter files, cited in Orville E. Jones, "Activities of the American Legion in Textbook Analysis and Criticism 1938-1951" (Doctoral Diss., University of Oklahoma, Norman, 1957), 82.

82. Interview with Alf Evers, Woodstock, New York, June 14, 2003, conducted by the author; Interview with Katherine Alling, Harold Rugg's step-daughter, January 20, 2005, conducted by the author; and Katherine Alling to Ronald W. Evans, January 26, 2005.

83. See especially, "Campus Probe in Order," Columbus Dispatch, July 23, 1951, "Rugg" folder, box 69, faculty files, Public Relations Office Archives, Gottesman Library, Teachers College, Columbia University; "Ohio State Trustees Assail Rugg Speech," New York Times, September 5, 1951, p. 29; Rugg FBI Memorandum, Office Memorandum, SAC, Cincinnati, to

Director, FBI (J.Edgar Hoover), October 1, 1951, Rugg FBI files, obtained from Federal Bureau of Investigation under Freedom of Information Act in 2003, Washington, DC (material de-classified, November 6, 2003); Murry R. Nelson and H. Wells Singleton, "FBI Surveillance of Three Progressive Educators: Curricular Aspects," Paper presented at the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, Annual Conference, Denver, 1977.

84. Hunt and Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies; Oliver and Shaver, Teaching Public Issues; Engle and Ochoa, Education for Democratic Citizenship; Evans and Saxe, Handbook on Teaching Social Issues.

85. Harold O. Rugg Speaking at New York Geriatric Society, Cold Spring, New York, June 15, 1956, Cold Spring Tapes, tape # 2, side 1 (tape obtained from George S. Kay, in the possession of the author).

86. Evans, This Happened in America.

87. Evans, The Social Studies Wars; Singer, "Strange Bedfellows"; Vincent Stehle, "Righting Philanthropy," The Nation, June 30, 1997, pp. 15-20; Steven Selden, "The Neo-conservative Assault on the Undergraduate Curriculum," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, April, 2004 (in the possession of the author).

88. Maria A. Freire and Donaldo Macedo, eds., The Paulo Freire Reader (New York: Continuum, 1998), 222.

89. G. William Domhoff, "Wealth, Income, and Power," http://sociology.ucsc.edu/whorulesamerica/power/wealth.html (2006), accessed January 15, 2007.