

**Moral Education: Soldiers, War, and the U.S. Military in U.S. History Textbooks  
(1964-2000)**

vorgelegt von

M. A.

Anna Teresa Borrero

an der Fakultät I Geistes- und Bildungswissenschaften

der Technischen Universität Berlin

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

Doktor der Philosophie

- Dr. phil. –

genehmigte Dissertation

Promotionsausschuss:

Vorsitzende: Prof. Dr. Petra Lucht, TU Berlin

Gutachterin: Prof. Dr. Stefanie Schüler-Springorum, TU Berlin

Gutachterin: Prof. Dr. Ute Frevert, MPIB Berlin

Gutachter: Prof. Dr. Paul Nolte, FU Berlin

Tag der wissenschaftlichen Aussprache: 11. Februar 2021

Berlin 2021



# **Moral Education: Soldiers, War, and the U.S. Military in U.S. History Textbooks (1964-2000)**

Anna Teresa Borrero

## **ABSTRACT**

This study concerns itself with the *moral economy of history education*, or a system of dissemination of values and moral sentiments within a national community through the teaching of history in schools. This system prescribes which emotions are the most appropriate to feel regarding certain events and actors in history. This research delves specifically into history textbooks in the United States, exploring how the representations of the U.S. military, soldiers, and the United States at war inside their pages convey certain messages and discard others. The examined textbooks were published between the escalation of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam in 1964 and the turn of the twenty-first century. Unlike other educational histories of the American social studies, this study dives deeper into the textbooks to zoom in on their *affective* aspects, specifically which values and emotions they endorse and reject through various narratives of war. The analysis reveals the existence of several distinct moral economies over time, as numerous culture wars and political battles shifted the balance of power over historical narratives. The textbooks are examined on three levels: (1) the historical context of their production and the shifts in influence of various cultural/political movements and interest groups on their content, (2) the treatment and omissions of certain actors and events in their passages, and (3) the affective qualities of the text and images they used and the feelings they were to induce. An examination of newspaper coverage on the observance of Veterans Day in the United States supplements the textbook analysis to illuminate the shift in the image of the military and the significance of veterans' issues in a larger moral regime.

**Keywords:** education, patriotism, military history, textbooks

# **Moralische Bildung: Soldaten, Krieg, und das US-Militär in US-amerikanischen Geschichtsunterrichtsbüchern (1964-2000)**

Anna Teresa Borrero

## **ABSTRACT**

Diese Studie beschäftigt sich mit der *moralischen Ökonomie des Geschichtsunterrichtes* oder dem System der Verbreitung von Werten und moralischen Gesinnungen innerhalb einer nationalen Gemeinschaft durch das Lehren von Geschichte in Schulen. Dieses System schreibt vor, welche Emotionen angemessen sind, um etwas über bestimmte Ereignisse und Akteure in der Geschichte zu fühlen. Diese Forschungsarbeit geht besonders auf Geschichtsbücher in den USA ein, erkundet wie die Darstellung des Militärs, der Soldaten und der Vereinigten Staaten in Krieg zwischen den Zeilen bestimmte Nachrichten vermittelt und andere löscht. Die untersuchten Bücher wurden zwischen der Eskalation der militärischen Intervention der USA in Vietnam im Jahr 1964 und dem Wechsel ins 21. Jahrhundert veröffentlicht. Anders als andere pädagogische Geschichten der amerikanischen Sozialkunde, taucht diese Studie tiefer in die Geschichtsunterrichtsbücher ein, um ihre *affektiven* Aspekte zu untersuchen, insbesondere welche Werte und Emotionen sie durch unterschiedliche Kriegsdarstellungen unterstützen und ablehnen. Die Analyse offenbart die Existenz von einigen bestimmten moralischen Ökonomien im Laufe der Zeit, da zahlreiche Kultur-Kriege und politische Kämpfe das Machtgleichgewicht über die historischen Erzählungen verschoben haben. Die Geschichtsunterrichtsbücher werden auf drei Ebenen untersucht: (1) der historische Kontext ihrer Produktion und die Veränderungen im Einfluss auf verschiedene kulturelle/politische Bewegungen und Interessengruppen auf ihren Inhalt, (2) die Behandlung und Auslassungen bestimmter Akteure und Ereignisse in ihren Abschnitten, und (3) die affektiven Qualitäten der eingesetzten Texte und Bilder und welche Gefühle sie hervorrufen sollen. Eine Untersuchung der Zeitungsberichterstattung über die Einhaltung des Veterans Day in den USA ergänzt die Analyse der Unterrichtsbücher, um die Verschiebung des Bildes des Militärs und die Bedeutung der Probleme der Veteranen in einem größeren, moralischen Regime zu erhellen.

**Schlagworte:** Bildung, Patriotismus, Militärgeschichte, Lehrbücher, Geschichtsunterricht

## Table of Contents

|                                                                                                                                      |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>List of Abbreviations .....</b>                                                                                                   | <b>i</b>  |
| <br><b>Introduction: The Moral Economy of History Education .....</b>                                                                | <b>1</b>  |
| I. Textbooks as Truth.....                                                                                                           | 4         |
| II. Textbooks as “Sites of Contestation” or Reflection of a “World Culture” .....                                                    | 6         |
| III. Methodology .....                                                                                                               | 9         |
| <br><b>Chapter 1: Teaching “Brotherly Love” Before and During Vietnam: Social Inquiry and Alternative Moralities.....</b>            | <b>17</b> |
| 1.1 From Competition to Understanding? The Bumpy Road to Humanistic Education .....                                                  | 20        |
| 1.1.1 Sputnik I and the Race to Superior Education.....                                                                              | 21        |
| 1.1.2 “We Aren’t Ready for the Space Age”: Cultural Relativism, Social Inquiry, and the NSS .....                                    | 29        |
| Objectives and materials .....                                                                                                       | 32        |
| Learning about values.....                                                                                                           | 36        |
| Social inquiry.....                                                                                                                  | 39        |
| Defending the moral economy.....                                                                                                     | 40        |
| 1.1.3 “The Whole World is Watching”: Academia and the Vietnam War.....                                                               | 43        |
| 1.2 Dismantling Borders, Revising History: Social Inquiry in Practice.....                                                           | 52        |
| 1.3 Hearing the Other: Compassion and Empathy in War Narratives.....                                                                 | 60        |
| 1.4 Veterans Day: The “Forgotten Holiday” .....                                                                                      | 66        |
| 1.4.1 A Celebration of Armistice to a Tribute to Bloodshed.....                                                                      | 67        |
| 1.4.2 Who Are the Veterans?.....                                                                                                     | 68        |
| 1.5 Conclusion: Humanism or “Unconscionable Arrogance”? .....                                                                        | 73        |
| <br><b>Chapter 2: Late Cold War Anxiety and “New Stirrings of Patriotism”: Absolute Morality and the Benevolent Superpower .....</b> | <b>79</b> |
| 2.1 “America is No Longer Beautiful in Our Textbooks”: Revolt and Conservative Resurgence.....                                       | 82        |
| 2.1.1 People versus Textbook: Parents Seize the Reigns .....                                                                         | 83        |
| 2.1.2 The Great Coalition: Big Business Backs Christian Fundamentalists.....                                                         | 98        |
| 2.1.3 Good, Evil, and the U.S. Military.....                                                                                         | 101       |
| 2.1.4 The Social Studies Reflects .....                                                                                              | 109       |
| 2.2 The Benevolent Superpower Strikes Back .....                                                                                     | 115       |
| 2.3 Pride and Cold War Anxiety: Us versus Them .....                                                                                 | 125       |

|                                                                                                                    |                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| 2.3.1 Who are “They”?                                                                                              | 126            |
| 2.3.2 Who are “We”?                                                                                                | 127            |
| 2.4 Heroization: “Separating the War from the Warriors”                                                            | 132            |
| 2.5 Conclusion: An Identity is Born                                                                                | 135            |
| <br><b>Chapter 3: War for the Thrill of It: Post-Cold War Confidence and the Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism</b> | <br><b>141</b> |
| 3.1 Americanism versus Multiculturalism: Road to Homogenization                                                    | 145            |
| 3.1.1 The History War                                                                                              | 148            |
| 3.1.2 What Happens in Texas Doesn’t Stay in Texas                                                                  | 154            |
| 3.2 McCarthy Who? Emphasis and Omissions in Trouble-Free Texts                                                     | 156            |
| 3.2.1 No Details, No Problems                                                                                      | 156            |
| 3.2.2 Critical Analysis and Vietnam: Social Inquiry’s Brief Comeback                                               | 158            |
| 3.3 Showdown in the Gulf: War as Entertainment                                                                     | 163            |
| 3.3.1 Aggression and Selective Inclusion                                                                           | 163            |
| 3.3.2 Exclusion: New Enemies                                                                                       | 166            |
| 3.4 The Ordinary Heroes: More Soldiers Win Appreciation                                                            | 168            |
| 3.5 Conclusion: Americanism Prevails                                                                               | 172            |
| <br><b>Conclusion: Conflict, Dialogue, and Change</b>                                                              | <br><b>175</b> |
| <br><b>List of Examined Textbooks</b>                                                                              | <br><b>185</b> |
| <br><b>Bibliography</b>                                                                                            | <br><b>191</b> |

## List of Abbreviations

---

|       |                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CBE   | Council for Basic Education                                                                                                                              |
| CFR   | United States Code of Federal Regulations                                                                                                                |
| CIA   | Central Intelligence Agency                                                                                                                              |
| CS4   | Council of State Social Studies Supervisors                                                                                                              |
| CUNY  | City University of New York                                                                                                                              |
| DAR   | Daughters of the American Revolution                                                                                                                     |
| DNC   | Democratic National Convention                                                                                                                           |
| EDC   | Education Development Center                                                                                                                             |
| ERA   | Education Research Analysts                                                                                                                              |
| FBI   | Federal Bureau of Investigation                                                                                                                          |
| GBEC  | Georgia Basic Education Council                                                                                                                          |
| HUAC  | House Un-American Activities Committee                                                                                                                   |
| IGY   | International Geophysical Year                                                                                                                           |
| MACOS | Man: A Course of Study                                                                                                                                   |
| MIT   | Massachusetts Institute for Technology                                                                                                                   |
| NAEP  | National Assessment of Educational Progress                                                                                                              |
| NAM   | National Association of Manufacturers                                                                                                                    |
| NBC   | National Broadcasting Company                                                                                                                            |
| NCHS  | National Center for History in the Schools at University of California, Los Angeles                                                                      |
| NCSS  | National Council for the Social Studies                                                                                                                  |
| NCSS  | (In footnotes): Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin, National Council for the Social Studies Manuscript Collections |

|       |                                                      |
|-------|------------------------------------------------------|
| NDEA  | National Defense Education Act                       |
| NEA   | National Education Association                       |
| NEGP  | National Education Goals Panel                       |
| NEH   | National Endowment for the Humanities                |
| NESIC | National Education Standards and Improvement Council |
| NHS   | National History Standards                           |
| NSA   | National Security Administration                     |
| NSF   | National Science Foundation                          |
| NSS   | New Social Studies                                   |
| OAH   | Organization of American Historians                  |
| OCF   | Officers' Christian Fellowship                       |
| PAC   | Political Action Committee                           |
| PSAC  | President's Science Advisory Committee               |
| PTA   | Parent-teachers association                          |
| PTSD  | Post-traumatic stress disorder                       |
| RNC   | Republican National Convention                       |
| ROTC  | Reserve Officers' Training Corps                     |
| SBOE  | Texas State Board of Education                       |
| SDS   | Students for a Democratic Society                    |
| SIT   | Social Identity Theory                               |
| SMC   | Student Mobilization Committee                       |
| TAC   | Texas Administrative Code                            |
| TEA   | Texas Education Agency                               |
| TEC   | Texas Education Code                                 |
| TEKS  | Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills                 |

|      |                                       |
|------|---------------------------------------|
| UCB  | University of California, Berkeley    |
| UCLA | University of California, Los Angeles |
| UMT  | Universal military training           |
| VFW  | Veterans of Foreign Wars              |
| VVAW | Vietnam Veterans against the War      |



## Introduction

### The Moral Economy of History Education

*Memory is, by definition, a term which directs our attention not to the past but to the past-present relation. It is because 'the past' has this living active existence in the present that it matters so much politically.* – Popular Memory Group<sup>1</sup>

---

In 1962, East Texan couple Norma and Mel Gabler, parents of three sons, testified before the Texas State Textbook Committee in Dallas with complaints against the history, social sciences, and economics textbooks used in their sons' high school. Mel Gabler ended their fervent charge with a self-drafted "Bill of Grievances" on behalf of all American parents concerned for the wellbeing of their children:

The public school system of this country has... [become] a propaganda agency to support the projects, campaigns, crusades, ideas, and personal philosophies of a self-appointed group of educators that now asserts the right to dominate and control that system... It is a violation of our constitutional rights to make the public school system an instrument for the dissemination of the propaganda of any partisan or political group or other special interests in the community. The parents of the children of America have a right to a public school system where the instruction is based upon the truth. They have the right to oppose any and all school programs and activities where propaganda is substituted for the truth.<sup>2</sup>

Naturally, this 'truth' differed starkly from the 'truths' that were propagated by those who had endorsed and written the textbook content in question. What accounted for such a stark discrepancy between these versions of the so-called truth? Who and what determined which truths were to be published in textbooks and which were not? And how did emotions work to stabilize these truths?

---

<sup>1</sup> Popular Memory Group, "Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method," in Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (eds.), *Oral History Reader*, (New York: Routledge, [1980] 1998), p. 79.

<sup>2</sup> Mel Gabler, 24 January 1962, quoted in James C. Hefley, *Textbooks on Trial: The Informative Report of Mel and Norma Gabler's Ongoing Battle to Oust Objectionable Textbooks from Public Schools – and to Urge Publishers to Produce Better Ones*, (Wheaton, I.L.: Victor Books, 1976), p. 24. All hearings were recorded for study by the Texas State Textbook Committee; For purposes of simplification, this dissertation will employ the term "American," rather than "U.S. American," to refer to the citizens, cultures, and society of the United States.

This dissertation concerns itself with these questions in the context of U.S. history textbooks in the United States, applying the notion of *moral economies*. Originally coined by Edward P. Thompson in his 1971 study of peasant food riots in eighteenth century England as the “traditional view of social norms and obligations, of the proper economic functions of several parties in the community,” the term ‘moral economy’ has since been broadened to rise above the strictly economic, most notably – for the purposes of this research – by Didier Fassin.<sup>3</sup> Fassin loosely described a “moral economy” as the “values and norms...which define our moral world,” or “the production, dissemination, circulation and use of moral sentiments, emotions and values, and norms and obligations in social space.”<sup>4</sup> While Thompson’s popular history entertained a bottom-up approach to the concept of moral economies, using it to describe the unofficial social order and expectations of the peasant crowd regarding the natural procedure of market behavior and the state’s role in economic affairs, Fassin’s use of the term to understand humanitarian morals and conceptualizations of morality in Western society and contemporary politics views the moral economy as a type of “regime” that shapes and structures society and its interaction with the political economy.<sup>5</sup> This study employs the concept of moral economies in a similar fashion to Fassin’s application, although this history will reveal the moral economy of *history education* to have been imposed, at times, from the top down, and at others, from the bottom up.

The fluxes in the moral economy, or the processes of negotiating and constructing collective – especially *national* – memory in the teaching of history to induce certain emotions and values in young citizens and condemn others, will serve as the primary focus of this dissertation. By national memory, I do not refer to a form of social memory that *all* citizens jointly create and share. On the contrary, I share Sherrie Tucker’s conceptualization of national memory as a “style of commemoration of *imagined* coherence,” by a certain dominant group in society, “that is stirring enough to bring the nation to the nation-state.”<sup>6</sup> This coherence is, indeed, imagined, because it is inherently exclusive. Not dissimilar to this understanding is

---

<sup>3</sup> Edward P. Thompson, “The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth-Century,” *Past and Present*, 50(1), 1971, p. 79.

<sup>4</sup> Didier Fassin, “Compassion and Repression: The Moral Economy of Immigration Policies and France,” *Cultural Anthropology*, 20(3), August 2005, p. 365; Didier Fassin, “Moral Economies Revisited,” *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 64(6), 2009, p. 1257.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1257. See also Didier Fassin, *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), esp. pp. 1-18.

<sup>6</sup> Sherrie Tucker, *Dance Floor Democracy: The Social Geography of Memory at the Hollywood Canteen*, (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2014), p. xv, emphasis added. Tucker, in her observation of the encounter between democracy and swing at the Hollywood Canteen during World War II, argued that “stories of uncomplicated American goodness during World War II have played, and continue to play, an important role in the construction of national memory and recruiting national identity” (p. xx).

Michael Kammen's indictment that *collective* memory is a "code phrase for what is remembered by the dominant civic culture."<sup>7</sup> This study will examine national memory as a form of collective memory, determined by specific groups of society – essentially, that which was considered important enough to be documented, remembered, and passed on.

As this study will show, there have existed various moral economies in American history education over time, and points of conflict between contesting moral economies tended to result in educational reform and the amending of textbooks some years later. Each period of reform yielded a revised official understanding of morality – and in turn, of war. Naturally, the moral economy of history education does not only dictate how one should feel about soldiers and war. However, observing the treatment of such an emotional, salient, and controversial topic offers nevertheless a revealing picture of the parameters of the moral economy, in general. These moral economies of history education are not independent of, but rather have been nourished by, cultural discourses that advantage certain value systems over others, which then work to govern the moral judgments of society's members, a system Lynn Morgan and Elizabeth Roberts have refined to denote as the "moral regime." Morgan and Roberts describe moral regimes as "privileged standards of morality that are used to govern intimate behaviors, ethical judgments, and their public manifestations."<sup>8</sup> Morgan and Roberts incorporate another important concept into the moral regime, namely the "regime of truth" of Michel Foucault's earlier work. Each society has a different "regime of truth" in place, Foucault argued in 1975, which is the "discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true."<sup>9</sup> Each society holds its regime of truth, yet there is reason to believe that in certain societies, there exist several, as proposed by Lorna Weir in her expansion of Foucault's concept to suggest that modern societies are "composed of multiple truth formulae, not simply scientific and quasi-scientific truth."<sup>10</sup> The same must be true in highly polarized societies. The actors responsible for the shift in power of various moral economies of history education arguably lived under the influence of different regimes of truth. While in academia, for example, truth may be found through scientific

---

<sup>7</sup> Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1991), p. 10.

<sup>8</sup> Lynn M. Morgan and Elizabeth F. S. Roberts, "Reproductive Governance in Latin America," *Anthropology & Medicine*, 19(2), 2012, p. 242.

<sup>9</sup> Michel Foucault, "Truth and Power," in Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, trans. and ed. by Colin Gordon, (New York: Pantheon, 1980), p. 131.

<sup>10</sup> Lorna Weir, "The Concept of Truth Regime," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 33(2), 2008, p. 368.

investigation and critical thinking – or even in the rejection of the existence of objective truths – we will see later on that other influential groups in U.S. society derived *opposing* truths primarily from their faith and considered scientific approaches to truth blasphemous.

## I. TEXTBOOKS AS “TRUTH”

This dissertation regards textbooks as tools with which we can determine the prescriptions of the moral economy of history education. This is because they are an essential component of the methods of dissemination of knowledge and emotions that *enforce* the moral economy. They communicate what society considers to be ‘true’ and are distributed and consumed in schools, which are the official sites of the transmission of knowledge. As this research will demonstrate, decades of strife and conflict over the moral leanings of the most appropriate moral economy for students of history often revolved around the creation of textbook content, as all parties recognized its importance for the promotion of values, morals, and emotions.

Studies in the 1970s confirmed that public school teachers in the United States historically relied heavily on school textbooks to guide their curriculum.<sup>11</sup> The Texas Education Agency (TEA) even estimated in 1969 that students in Texas spent about 75 percent of “classroom time” and 90 percent of “homework time” using the textbook.<sup>12</sup> This was especially the case for social studies instruction. In 1976, a study on the programs of the National Science Foundation (NSF) evaluated the status of social studies education in the United States and found that the “dominant instruction tool continue[d] to be the conventional textbook” and that teachers tended “not only to rely on, but to believe in, the textbook as the source of knowledge.”<sup>13</sup> Ten years later, the Educational Excellence Network and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in 1987, administered a national evaluation of history and literature to nearly 8,000 students and their teachers, revealing that the vast majority of students claimed their social studies curriculum to draw extensively upon working daily with

---

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, Frances Fitzgerald, *America Revised: What History Textbooks Have Taught Our Children about Their Country, And How And Why Those Textbooks Have Changed in Different Decades*, (New York: Random House, 1979); Paul Goldstein, *Changing the American Schoolbook*, (Lexington, M.A.: Lexington, 1978); Michael W. Kirst and Decker F. Walker, “An Analysis of Curriculum Policy-Making,” *Review of Research in Education*, 41(5), 1971, pp. 479-509.

<sup>12</sup> Governor’s Committee on Public Education, *Public Education in Texas: Research Report*, vol. 2, (Austin: Texas Education Agency, 1969), p. 135.

<sup>13</sup> James P. Shaver, O.L. Davis, and Suzanne W. Helburn, “The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions from Three NSF Studies,” *Social Education*, February 1979, p. 151.

the textbook.<sup>14</sup> Kathleen A. Hinchman's qualitative examination of teachers' use of textbooks in U.S. public schools in 1992 revealed the social studies teachers in her study to structure their history instruction primarily around the assigned textbook or multiple textbooks, sometimes supplementing it with outside sources.<sup>15</sup> The textbook has thus evidently played a significant role in the history instruction of many classrooms throughout the United States, at least until the emergence of digital instructional materials around the turn of the twenty-first century.

The textbook industry in the United States is an entirely private enterprise, and competing publishers have historically granted their utmost attention to the preferences and ideological leanings of their biggest clients. Educational theorist, Michael W. Apple, denoted this business practice as a "necessity;" simply making the "approved" list of the largest state clients would determine whether or not the textbook would make any profit at all.<sup>16</sup> As we shall see, the ideological leanings and historical approaches of most publisher submissions to state school boards have shifted with changing politics and local demands. For this reason, this study focuses principally on the mark left on history textbook content by various cultural and political movements and pressure groups rather than on the influence of individual publishers. Apple shows that several political, cultural, and economic conditions in late nineteenth century American society prompted Southern elites to push for a more centralized, regulatory model of textbook adoption in their states that would unite Southerners in a "dislike and distrust of things northern."<sup>17</sup> The result was a characteristically strong influence on textbook content from the South, as large, Southern states, such as Texas and Florida, generally employed a statewide adoption procedure, by which all schools chose their instructional materials from state approved lists, while Northern giants, such as New York, tended to constitute "non-adoption states," where textbook adoption was left up to the local school districts, themselves. The specifics of the textbook publishing market will be visited in Chapters 2 and 3.

How have textbooks gained their authority through the claim to objectivity, while on the other hand propagating affectively charged material? This dissertation refrains from

---

<sup>14</sup> Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn Jr., *What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1987).

<sup>15</sup> Kathleen A. Hinchman, "How Teachers Use the Textbook: Lessons from Three Secondary School Classrooms," in Ernest K. Dishner, Thomas W. Bean, John E. Readence, and David W. Moore (eds.), *Reading in the Content Areas: Improving Classroom Instruction*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (Dubuque, I.A.: Kendall/Hunt, 1992), pp. 282-293.

<sup>16</sup> Michael W. Apple, "Textbook Publishing: The Political and Economic Influences," *Theory into Practice*, 28(4), autumn 1989, p. 286.

<sup>17</sup> Michael W. Apple, "Regulating the Text: The Socio-Historical Roots of State Control," in Philip G. Altbach, Gail P. Kelly, Hugh G. Petrie, and Louis Weis (eds.), *Textbooks in American Society: Politics, Policy, and Pedagogy*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), p. 15.

engaging in a purely curricular or educational history of social studies textbooks and the teaching of history in the United States, as has been achieved in the past by Apple, Frances Fitzgerald, Ronald W. Evans, and others.<sup>18</sup> Instead it dives deeper into the affective qualities of these textbooks by examining the emotions to which their passages pertain and the values these passages promote and observing claims of objectiveness. Shifts in textbook narratives and representations of war and the U.S. military reflect a search for national identity and truth within society and the guiding moral regime. These conceptions of national identity were often dependent upon constructions of the Other. For the purposes of this paper, the Other, written with a capital “O,” denotes an all-encompassing ‘other’ identity, or that which hypothetically stands in contradistinction to American national identity in any given context. This concept converses with Benedict Anderson’s “imagined communities,” or the socially constructed group memberships to which people assign themselves. As in the case of the nation, which Anderson defines as “an imagined political community” of members who “will never know” each other personally, and yet still perceive a sense of sameness among them, the Other and the perception of difference between this Other and oneself is equally imagined.<sup>19</sup>

## II. TEXTBOOKS AS “SITES OF CONTESTATION” OR REFLECTIONS OF A “WORLD CULTURE”

In 2014, two sociologists, Richard Lachmann and Lacy Mitchell, conducted an intricate textbook analysis of U.S. history textbooks published between the years 1970 and 2009. Their interpretation of the mostly quantitative data they collected is presented in their study as evidence for the theory that textbooks represent “sites of contestation or expressions of a world culture of individualism rather than purveyors of a hidden curriculum of nationalistic militarism.”<sup>20</sup> The authors studied the depiction of World War II and the Vietnam War in over one hundred high school history textbooks. They found their sample to demonstrate, firstly, an increased focus on the individual suffering of soldiers over time in war passages – depicting ever gorier and more gruesome images and stories of combat as opposed to the impersonal presentation of battle facts – and secondly, an increased amount of attention to the antiwar

---

<sup>18</sup> See, for example, Fitzgerald, 1979; Ronald W. Evans, *The Hope for American School Reform: The Cold War Pursuit of Inquiry Learning in the Social Studies*, (New York: Springer, 2010); Michael W. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum*, (New York: Psychology Press, 1979).

<sup>19</sup> Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised ed., (New York: Verso, [1983] 1991), p. 6.

<sup>20</sup> Richard Lachmann and Lacy Mitchell, “The Changing Face of War in Textbooks: Depictions of World War II and Vietnam, 1970-2009,” *American Sociological Association*, 87(3), 2014, p. 188.

movement of the Vietnam era, which they measured using a numerical count of specific “antiwar words” in the texts, interpreting this as evidence for strengthened approval of the antiwar movement and a more skeptical stance toward the patriotic militarism it challenged.<sup>21</sup> Lachmann and Mitchell also interpret the progressively individualistic style of reconstructing war over time as evidence of a weakened sense of militarism and nationalism in U.S. history books. Their study raises, however, several unanswered questions and presupposes a few difficult assumptions.

The first problematic assumption is the assertion that individualism and nationalism are mutually exclusive concepts. The authors claim that “respect for individualism... can be at odds with glorification of military service and sacrifice,” for which individuals risk their lives for the purposes of a greater national security.<sup>22</sup> This proposition, however, fails to account for the fact that, in some cases – particularly in highly individualistic societies – the nation’s military may be considered the very *symbol* of the individual freedoms for which it allegedly protects in armed conflicts with other states, especially with those considered violators of these individual rights. This has been repeatedly insinuated by U.S. politicians who have justified American military invasions overseas. In his proclamation of “Human Rights Week” in 2001, for example, President George W. Bush clearly identified the War on Terror as an effort to protect individual freedoms worldwide:

The terrible tragedies of September 11 served as a grievous reminder that the enemies of freedom do not respect or value individual human rights. Their brutal attacks were an attack on these very rights. When our essential rights are attacked, they must and will be defended. Americans stand united with those who love democracy, justice, and individual liberty... The heinous acts of terrorism committed on September 11 were an attack against civilization itself, and they have caused the world to join together in a coalition that is now waging war on terrorism and defending international human rights... Civilized people everywhere have recognized that terrorists threaten every nation that loves liberty and cherishes the protection of individual rights.<sup>23</sup>

In this view of terrorism and the driving ideological forces behind it, the U.S. military was deemed the very defender and representative of “individual liberty” overseas. Indeed, even

---

<sup>21</sup> Frequency graphs of “antiwar words” for World War II and Vietnam sections in *ibid.*, pp. 194, 195, respectively.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 190.

<sup>23</sup> George W. Bush to Office of the Press Secretary, Proclamation “Human Rights Day, Bill of Rights Day, and Human Rights Week, 2001,” 9 December 2001, (<https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/12/text/20011209.html>; accessed 8 August 2018).

when defending U.S. engagement in Vietnam in 1956, then Senator John F. Kennedy stressed the strategic importance of Vietnam as the “democratic experiment” and “cornerstone of the Free World” in Southeast Asia – the antithesis to Chinese totalitarianism, thus offering the key to its defeat.<sup>24</sup> Twentieth century American war discourse has thus notoriously emphasized that brave and heroic individuals must sacrifice their lives to *protect* individualism from extinction or violent takeover by cultural or political opposites. Therefore to claim that an ideology such as militarism conflicts with individualistic views would be deceptive. Another problematic assumption made by Lachmann and Mitchell in the interpretation of their results is that the increased depiction of soldiers’ suffering signifies an overall negative depiction of U.S. involvement in war. While graphic images of suffering unquestionably arouse empathy in readers, this empathy could easily correspond to a sense of pride and admiration for the soldiers portrayed. When suffering and sacrifice is seen not as senseless, but is rather vindicated through heroism and valor, its depiction – including perhaps very graphic illustrations – is less likely to stimulate skepticism of war and militarism than it is to provoke pride in it.

Finally, Lachmann and Mitchell’s study suffers from a few discernible methodological limitations. Firstly, a quantitative count of “antiwar words” to measure attention paid to the antiwar movement of the Vietnam era is undeniably insufficient for determining exactly *how* this movement was treated. For example, as the results of my study will show, many textbooks printed after 1980 dedicated a generous amount of page space to the antiwar protests – associating their participants, however, directly with drug abuse, barbarism, anarchy, and violence. Furthermore, in focusing only on World War II and the Vietnam War, Lachmann and Mitchell’s analysis neglects narratives related to U.S. operations in the Middle East. Consideration of the Persian Gulf War of 1991 in newer publications could have afforded more insight into the emotional language and images used in war narratives that are fresher in American national memory than those of World War II battles against enemies who are today considered cultural and economic allies (i.e. Germany, Japan).

A qualitative approach applied to an examination of the same subject –war narratives in U.S. history textbooks – reveals results that run contrary to some of Lachmann and Mitchell’s conclusions. While the authors interpret their results as evidence for the theory that textbooks represent the rise of a “world culture of individualism,” this study demonstrates that over the

---

<sup>24</sup> John F. Kennedy, “Remarks at the Conference on Vietnam Luncheon in the Hotel Willard, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1956,” Papers of John F. Kennedy, Pre-Presidential Papers, Senate Files, Series 12, speeches and the press, folder: “America’s Stake in Vietnam, American Friends of Vietnam,” box 895, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum, (<https://www.jfklibrary.org/asset-viewer/archives/JFKSEN/0895/JFKSEN-0895-014>; accessed 8 August 2018).

observed time period, there were a few different moral economies in place that determined and shifted how war was to be told and which emotions were promoted when discussing it.<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, while Lachmann and Mitchell conclude that their textbooks' descriptions of war came to mention casualties more frequently and "became more negative over time" (measured using a count of specific "death words" and a calculation of the proportion of "hellish" to "glorious" descriptions of war), my research, based on affective readings of the texts, revealed many textbooks of the Vietnam era to be the *most* critical toward the U.S. military's engagements and to engage the most thoroughly with the horrendous consequences of war, especially for civilians (Chapter 1).<sup>26</sup> After the begin of the conservative resurgence in the 1970s, on the other hand, textbooks generally tended to represent U.S. involvement in war and military destruction as morally justified and less destructive (Chapter 2) and even, to some extent, entertaining (Chapter 3). The results of this study more strongly support evidence for the theory that textbooks of the Vietnam era, rather than their newer counterparts, more closely represented "sites of contestation," before transforming to resemble tools to "promote national cohesion and civic pride" after the 1970s.

### III. METHODOLOGY

The current project is concerned with asking precisely *which* values were negotiated to create the affective educational discourses that embody the moral economy of history education, in particular those involving the U.S. military, its service members, and American involvement in war. The scope of this study begins with the escalation of American involvement in the conflict in Vietnam with President Lyndon B. Johnson's decision to order air strikes against North Vietnamese naval bases in 1964, thus 'Americanizing' the war. The next two years would witness a deployment of hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops to Southeast Asia, the first talks of a draft lottery, and the first acts of resistance to the draft and protests against the war effort. This marks thus the point in time in which the conflict in Vietnam became salient for all spheres of U.S. society as a relevant and emotional topic. The investigation ends at the turn of the twenty-first century, before George W. Bush assumed the presidency and the declared a "war

---

<sup>25</sup> Lachmann and Mitchell, 2014, p. 201.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., p. 200; This research defines the so-called "Vietnam era," based on the classification of Vietnam War veterans by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs, as "beginning on February 28, 1961, and ending on May 7, 1975." 38 United States Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §3.2.

on terrorism” in September 2001.<sup>27</sup> The rhetoric used to describe terrorism and conflict during Bush’s presidency and the highly emotional response to the attacks of 11 September 2001 have arguably formed a new moral economy in their own right, one that is perhaps still in place today, thus exceeding the scope of this research for the time being.

This research analyzes U.S. history textbooks on three levels: (1) the historical context of the cultural and political forces competing to influence textbook content (or the formation process of the moral economy of history education), (2) the treatment of specific historical events and actors and the omission of others in the textbooks themselves (or the effect of the moral economy on textbook content), and (3) the emotional aspects of the texts, namely the values, understandings of morality, and representations of war and suffering put forth, as well as the manner in which conflicts and hero struggles are retold (or the moral sentiments prescribed by the moral economy). Emotions here are regarded not only as characteristics or ordinances of the moral economy, but also as the stabilizers that work to keep a moral economy of history education in place. Furthermore, they also serve as *mobilizers* for those actors who opposed the moral economy in question to act to revise or abolish it to establish an entirely new one. The fourth level of analysis, which relates not to textbooks but to war discourse, in general, illuminates the general discussion of soldiers and veterans in newspapers by examining the shifting significance of Veterans Day, the largest official celebration of U.S. service members in the United States.<sup>28</sup> This layer affords an insight into the moral regime that determines how veterans are to be discussed and commemorated. We see that at times, changes in educational discourse paralleled a larger discourse on the topic of war in American politics and society. Nevertheless, we observe throughout the second half of the twentieth century that the moral economy of history education also retained its own dynamic. Those players dedicated to attacking or preserving it, while acting within a certain value framework determined by their perception of morality and truth, assumed education in particular to hold great significance for the reinforcement of their value system and thus chose to work specifically in this field to influence the supremacy of certain values and emotions in the classroom.

---

<sup>27</sup> George W. Bush, “Remarks on Arrival at the White House and an Exchange with Reporters,” 16 September 2001, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George W. Bush, 2001*, book 2: *July 1 to December 31*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002), p. 1116.

<sup>28</sup> This analysis is based on data collected from three widely circulated, metropolitan newspapers, as well as three smaller, local newspapers from politically conservative and rural regions. The former are publications based in the East Coast’s largest city, the West Coast’s largest city, and the nation’s capital: *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, and *Washington Post*, respectively. Their readership spans nationwide. The *Ogden Standard-Examiner* from Ogden, Utah, *Abilene Reporter-News* from Abilene, Texas, and *Daily Press* from Newport, Virginia were examined as the smaller, local, and rural newspapers.

Textbooks represent furthermore emotional experiences themselves, which are actively received and assessed by a diverse audience. When examining instructional materials it is essential to distinguish between the values and understandings of morality they uphold and what the reader – in this case, the history student – actually takes from the text. Research on reception analysis and on children’s literature has illuminated that there always remains the possibility that a target audience does not receive a text as the authors may have intended.<sup>29</sup> For this reason, such literature should be observed not only as the claim of specific groups to official knowledge but also as an active experience and site of exchange. As Marxist writer and philosopher, Antonio Gramsci, recognized in the early 1920s, a child can never be a “mechanical receiver” of instruction, even if schools prefer them to be, because a child’s consciousness “reflects the sector of civil society in which the child participates, and the social relations which are formed within his family, his neighborhood, his village, etc.”<sup>30</sup> Thus as emotional experiences for each reader, textbooks could potentially affect one reader differently than the other. Especially in the case of national histories candy-coated to appear coherent and non-controversial, certain readers who feel excluded by such narratives may experience a different emotional reaction to the text than those readers who feel addressed in them. As this research will concentrate primarily on the moral economy of history education as a dynamic force for which textbooks are circulated and utilized as tools, and to some extent the reception of elites and parents to these textbooks, less focus is awarded to the study of student reception, which in and of itself offers plentiful research possibilities for future projects.

On the one hand, this research is a study of moral socialization through public school education and contributes to a dialogue on the transmission of knowledge and emotions in the classroom and to textbook research. On the other hand, these emotions are culturally and historically variable; thus this particular study is also, in a sense, a study of American patriotism. As Kammen argued in his extensive cultural history of American tradition in 1991, there exist several unique peculiarities of American patriotism, arising from the characteristically “selective nature of memory” in the United States, “where patriotism and nationalism are

---

<sup>29</sup> For research on diverse forms of media designed for active consumption by children, see, for example Jean Anyon, “Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Legitimizing Knowledge,” *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 6, 1978, pp. 40-55; Brandon M. Butler, Yonghee Suh, and Wendy Scott, “Knowledge Transmission versus Social Transformation: A Critical Analysis of Purpose in Elementary Social Studies Methods Textbooks,” *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 43(1), 2015, pp. 102-134; Aimée Dorr, *Television and Children: A Special Medium for a Special Audience*, (New York: Sage, 1986); Ute Frevert et. al., *Learning How to Feel: Children’s Literature and Emotional Socialization, 1870-1970*, (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 2014).

<sup>30</sup> Antonio Gramsci, “On Education,” Antonio Gramsci, *Selection from the Prison Notebooks*, trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, (New York: International Publishers, 1971), p. 35.

presumed to coincide with Americanism.”<sup>31</sup> Kammen showed this selectivity of American national memory to exhibit a particular slant throughout history, selecting tradition in which “cases of failure or defeat not only are made honorable, but in many instances become more memorable than conventional victories,” claiming memories are “arous[ed] and arrang[ed]... to suit our psychic needs.”<sup>32</sup> In this process of selection, he stressed, war has played a central role in the “stimulating, defining, justifying, periodizing, and eventually filtering American memories and traditions.”<sup>33</sup> We will learn that the Cold War in many ways determined the psychic needs of many Americans. Similarly central to Kammen’s justification for a study of American patriotism is a comparison with other industrialized nations of Europe. While in the latter, a sense of national identity and an established history generally *preceded* the development of an operable political structure, in the United States, the order of these developments occurred reversely, causing the “dynamics of tradition” to have worked in more “distinctive manner” with less continuities over time.<sup>34</sup>

This study will zoom in on how war and its representation in textbooks relate to American national memory and identity. Furthermore, it will demonstrate that the twentieth century American case is particularly interesting when it comes to examining these shifts in narratives, as the actors involved in taking down moral economies and establishing new ones were not only restricted to elites. Although the moral economy of history education is inseparable from the moral regime, it does not always necessitate an imposition of values and historical narratives from the political elite to the masses, and the actors influencing the moral economy are not always government officials with a political agenda. In the examined time period, we observe that, at times, it was the so-called ‘ordinary people’ – taxpayers and parents of schoolchildren in rural areas, rather than scholars commissioned by the government – who wished to indoctrinate children with patriotism, obedience, and absolute values to uphold certain desirable power structures in society.

The results of this research are based upon the study of seventy U.S. history textbooks for U.S. high schools published between the years 1964 and 2000.<sup>35</sup> Specifically, the textbooks were examined with regard to all passages on war and highly salient issues in U.S. foreign policy beginning with World War II until each publication’s most recently discussed time

---

<sup>31</sup> Kammen, 1991, p. 5.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., pp. 8-9.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>35</sup> In the case of publications with several volumes, only textbooks of ‘contemporary’ U.S. history (from the end of the Civil War in 1865 until the present day) were chosen for the sample.

period. As the textbook industry in the United States is a private enterprise and textbooks sales of individual publications are nondisclosed to the public, one way to determine which textbooks were the most widely circulated was to refer to the publishing companies. Today, the history textbook publishing market in the United States is dominated by three large publishers: Pearson, Mc-Graw Hill, and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. These companies represent large conglomerates that have acquired several smaller companies, especially throughout the 1980s and 1990s: McGraw-Hill acquired Macmillan and Glencoe in 1989 and 1993, respectively, Pearson acquired Prentice Hall, Allyn & Bacon, and Scott Foresman & Co. all in 1998, while Houghton Mifflin Harcourt is a conglomerate resulting from a series of merges and acquisitions of Houghton McDougal, Holt McDougal, McDougal Littell, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, and Holt, Rinehart & Winston over the 1990s and early 2000s. The majority of the textbooks analyzed for this study were published by one of these conglomerates or a company that later merged into one.

This dissertation is comprised of three main chapters. The titles of these chapters refer to distinct moral economies of history education and the corresponding period of international conflict in U.S. history and foreign policy. These periods should not be understood, however, as the *only* years during which the proponents of the moral economy in question concerned themselves with educational issues. As we shall see, the various actors involved in the shaping and establishment of the distinct moral economies discussed here were, for the most part, alive and actively engaging with textbooks and the teaching of history *throughout* the entirety of the examined time period. The moral economy named in each title is the one which most *strongly* influenced the nature of textbook narratives during that period – essentially, the one dubbed temporarily victorious in a continuous battle over the power to write and re-write history. This constant struggle between a plurality of moral economies is the very impetus that spurs the events of the presented history. Without the occurrence of conflict and change, this project would not have been possible.

Chapter 1 begins with the ‘Space Age,’ an era that unraveled a new level in the story of the Cold War, as fears of American underachievement led to unprecedented federal interventions into the educational sphere, enabling the birth of the New Social Studies (NSS) movement in the 1960s. Led by prominent historians and social scientists of Northeastern elite universities, the NSS sought to introduce a focus on mutual understanding, intercultural competence, and international cooperation as the most impertinent values for the social studies, especially given Cold War tensions with the Soviet Union. Many textbooks developed under

the NSS – employing the social inquiry method of historical investigation – now encouraged the practice of critical thinking and placed great emphasis on the ‘sameness’ between the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations and cultures around the world. Reconstructions of war challenged American ‘greatness’ by including graphic details of suffering and destruction caused by the U.S. military overseas, as well as personal accounts of victims of American violence. A media analysis of news coverage on the observance of Veteran’s Day illustrates that the topic of Veteran’s Day lost significant relevance during the 1960s and 1970s, as the military struggled with its status in society.

Chapter 2 begins with the story of the birth of a grassroots movement in the 1960s. One East Texan couple, appalled by the supposed anti-American slant of their sons’ social inquiry textbooks, sought to have the books banned from the state’s approved list. Norma and Mel Gabler successfully prevented the adoption of several textbooks in Texas and inspired conservative grassroots movements around the country to take action and have ‘anti-American’ textbooks banned in their own states throughout the 1970s. The pressure exerted by the state of Texas, the largest client of school textbooks, together with the joint efforts of big business and political conservatives, succeeded in demanding publishers to alter textbook content and to halt the distribution of NSS materials and the use of social inquiry in the classroom. The textbook analysis reveals that textbooks of the late 1970s and 1980s depicted a starkly different image of the United States and its military than those of the 1960s: gradually omitting passages on the suffering of America’s military enemies, emphasizing stories of victory, and whitewashing military failures, the military came to be glorified as the United States became a benevolent superpower on paper. Chapters 1 and 2 illustrate that the American approach to teaching military history in the social studies was not uniform throughout the Cold War period. An observation of Veteran’s Day news pieces illustrates that the occasion regained astounding importance by the early 1980s and that the term “hero” was increasingly used to describe all service members, dead or alive – of all past conflicts – paralleling the increased heroization of the soldier image in textbook narratives.

Chapter 3 begins with the end of the Cold War and the decision of President George H. W. Bush to intervene in the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait in 1991, leading to a victory in the first large-scale military operation involving hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops since Vietnam. As Bush’s new educational objectives led to efforts to nationalize and homogenize standard history curricula, heated controversy on the role of multiculturalist vis-à-vis ‘Americanist’ versions of history arose, as conservatives worked vehemently to take down the

first proposed National History Standards (NHS) in 1994 for their allegedly biased and pessimistic depiction of American history and national identity. In Texas, textbook adoption guidelines were strengthened in 1995 to approve only textbooks that presented positive aspects of American history, further pressuring publishers to produce patriotic materials to make the approved lists of the state and its allies, which together composed the largest proportion of their clientele. These developments on the national and local level, along with the military and political victories of the early 1990s, allowed for publishers to recount military conflicts (especially the Persian Gulf War) in an exciting, action-filled, and culturally insensitive manner – representing war as a form of entertainment for the American people. This chapter covers the only portion of the examined time period that does not occur during the Cold War and thus offers insight into the continuation of the so-called conservative resurgence that began in the 1970s by examining how the end of the Cold War allowed for a new tone to dominate textbook passages. A small number of textbooks attempted to oppose the current moral economy and present students with a more critical version of U.S. history, borrowing in many ways the methodology of the NSS in the 1960s, suggesting the existence of competing moral economies. Newspaper articles on Veterans Day reveal that the discussion on the role of multiculturalist approaches to history and war stories was not restricted to the academic realm, but was rather a heated topic within the military itself.

While I argue that the moral economy of history education has undergone several transformations in the second half of the twentieth century, this does not imply that there existed no controversies over teaching and textbooks *before* the examined time period. Howard K. Beale, for example, conducted a study in 1936 on state interference with teaching and academic freedom in the United States during and following World War I.<sup>36</sup> In 2003, Joseph Moreau, in his comprehensive study on controversies over the teaching of history, demonstrated that heated debates over textbooks dated back to the antebellum period in the 1840s, as the ideological leanings of textbooks produced in New England disquieted white Southerners with opposing perspectives. Over the next century and a half, several political, cultural – even religious – debates on the representation of certain actors, ideas, and events in textbooks would erupt.<sup>37</sup> It

---

<sup>36</sup> See Howard K. Beale, *Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of Restraints upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools*, report of the Commission on the Social Studies, American Historical Association, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936).

<sup>37</sup> See Joseph Moreau, *Schoolbook Nation: Conflicts over American History Textbooks from the Civil War to the Present*, (Ann Arbor, M.I.: Michigan University Press, 2003). One of the most notable textbook controversies of the twentieth century involved “progressive” textbooks, particularly those of educational reformer, Harold Rugg, who authored textbooks that were accused of being “viciously un-American” by conservative ultra-patriots throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Bertie C. Forbes, “Treacherous Teachings,” *Forbes*, 15 August 1939, p. 8. For a historical analysis on the Rugg controversy as part of an overall change in stance toward public school

is reasonable to assume that there have existed several, dynamic moral economies of history education since the emergence of history as a subject in public schools in the 1820s – and that many aspects of the ‘metropolitan versus rural’ – or more generally, ‘North versus South’ – conflict to teaching history in the United States, which will be discussed in this dissertation, have existed for a longer period of time and have perhaps never been truly solved.

---

education in the United States, see Charles Dorn, “Treason in the Textbooks: Reinterpreting the Harold Rugg Textbook Controversy in the Context of Wartime Schooling,” *Paedagogica Historica*, 44(4), 2007, pp. 458-479.

## Teaching “Brotherly Love” Before and During Vietnam: Social Inquiry and Alternative Moralities

*It is often said that one aim of history is to teach patriotism. It might better be said that history should aim to clarify and purify the sentiment of patriotism... To cultivate fair-mindedness and honesty, to see clearly both sides of an historical controversy, is... the true standard of historical study.* – Charles McMurry<sup>38</sup>

---

In January 1963, ten months before he was assassinated, U.S. President John F. Kennedy delivered his televised message on education to Congress from the White House. He optimistically deemed his era a “new age of science and space.” In view of the highly competitive mood of the so-called space race between the Soviet Union and the United States, he believed improvements in the field of education to be “essential” to assigning meaning to the country’s “national purpose and power.” It would require “skilled manpower and brainpower to match the power of totalitarian discipline,” he continued, and “a scientific effort which demonstrates the superiority of freedom.” Kennedy considered one of society’s failures to be the scarcity of doctorates in engineering, science, and mathematics. The situation was urgent, but hopeful. He named three national objectives for the federal government to achieve a “new standard of excellence in education,” with respect to the improvement of instruction, access to education, and professional opportunities.<sup>39</sup> These objectives complemented and built on the actions taken by Kennedy’s predecessor, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, to increase the federal government’s involvement “in specific areas of national concern” – most notably education.<sup>40</sup> The sum of these measures would provide the funds to introduce a plethora of new projects, curricula, and instructional materials into schools around the country throughout the 1960s.

---

<sup>38</sup> Charles McMurry, *Special Method in History: A Complete Outline of a Course Study in History for the Grades below the High School*, (New York: Macmillan, 1903), pp. 7-8.

<sup>39</sup> John F. Kennedy, “Special Message to the Congress on Education,” 29 January 1963, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: John F. Kennedy, January 20 to November 22, 1963*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 106.

<sup>40</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Special Message to the Congress on Education,” 28 January 1958, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1958*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959), p. 127.

The commitment of American scholars and educationists delegated to improve the state of education during this period and the effects of these efforts on the discussion of war, nation, and national identity are the subject of this chapter. This historical account, however, will focus not on the reforms and advancements in the fields of the natural sciences – what Kennedy personally found so particularly pertinent to the survival of American academic competitiveness – but on the radical innovations in the field of history, taught as a component of the comprehensive school subject of the social studies. The account will focus specifically on a new moral economy of history education as observable in U.S. history textbooks. Given the entanglement between politics and the teaching of history, these developments were heavily influenced by the highly emotional and salient events of the Vietnam War and other catalysts of civil unrest and social revolution in the 1960s. The story that guides this dissertation begins thus with a period of sweeping change – cultural and political – that ultimately led to the choppy, yet ambitious, implementation of new teaching techniques, materials, and approaches to history. This period of change and its short-lived results on textbooks were significant, as they represented the starting point for the drastic backlash and counter-reforms that would come about in subsequent decades, creating a discourse that still arguably influences history education in the United States today. The moral economy of the 1960s and 1970s expanded and pluralized the moral universalism that had been entertained in the teaching of historical events during and post-World War II. It came to embrace and endorse the concepts of moral and cultural relativism – albeit, as we shall see, as a value in and of itself – and historical revisionism, inviting students and teachers to question the dominant narratives that were once a source of comfort in a time of rampant, undisputable conflict and change.<sup>41</sup> It called for the demise of blindly optimistic fairytales in U.S. history and shone light on the wrongdoings of some of the nation’s most conventional heroes – particularly its leaders and military.

This chapter will begin unraveling the story of the events that influenced the formation of this new moral economy of history education based especially on ‘objective’ historical investigation. As Cold War paranoia led to accusations of anti-Americanism and sympathy for communists against those in the field of education in the 1950s, the National Council for the

---

<sup>41</sup> Moral relativism deems that “moral judgments... make sense only in relation to and with reference to one or another such agreement or understanding,” as defined by moral philosopher, Gilbert Harman. See Gilbert Harman, “Moral Relativism Defended,” *The Philosophical Review*, 84(1), January 1975, p. 3. It is essentially the rejection of objective ‘rights’ and ‘wrongs.’ *Cultural* relativism is a related concept that holds the “beliefs, values, and practices” of individuals “should be understood based on that person’s own culture, rather than be judged against the criteria of another,” according to the Union of International Associations. See Union of International Associations, “Cultural Relativism,” *Encyclopedia of World Problems and Human Potential*, (<http://encyclopedia.uia.org/en/problem/140048>: accessed 5 September 2019).

Social Studies (NCSS), the largest association of social studies educators in the United States, spent laborious efforts defending the academic freedom of schools and social studies teachers.<sup>42</sup> Despite widespread fear and mistrust of fellow citizens, as soon as federal funds were awarded to new social studies programs, the reformers in charge used their expertise as historians and social scientists to take the wheel and drive education toward a student-centered and feeling-oriented humanism and historical revisionism with the promotion of intergroup cooperation and understanding as a main objective.<sup>43</sup> The resulting programs and curricula that came into being during this time were known collectively as the New Social Studies (NSS) and were directed primarily by historians from Ivy League and other Northeastern universities. The second section of this chapter will dive into the textbooks developed during this period and scrutinize their narratives with a particular focus on the reconstruction of salient periods of overseas conflict and foreign affairs. Although they were circulated for only a limited amount of years, many of the examined textbooks represented a breakthrough in the retelling of American history, as they raised silenced questions regarding certain actors in contemporary history and the validity of their judgments. While these textbooks were some of the first of their kind to provide alternative and multiple interpretations of certain events and thus revise their history, they did not always remain completely unbiased. The third section examines the affective qualities of these textbooks. The NSS placed great importance on student expression of feelings and opinions in and outside of the classroom. This section will consider exactly which morals and emotions were endorsed in textbook exercises and chapter text. Here, a particular focus is placed on the attempt to arouse empathy and compassion for others, or what Didier Fassin would call “moral sentiments.” Fassin defined “moral sentiments” as the “emotions that direct our attention to the suffering of others and make us want to remedy them” during processes of reasoning in which “empathy precedes the sense of good.” Compassion, he argues, “represents the most complete manifestation of this paradoxical combination of heart and reason: the sympathy felt for the misfortune of one’s neighbor generates the moral indignation that can prompt action to end

---

<sup>42</sup> A great deal of sources examined for the first section of this chapter originated from the NCSS Archive at the Dolph Briscoe Center for American History at the University of Texas in Austin (denoted in footnotes hereinafter simply as “NCSS.”) The collection contains not only documents published by the organization itself but unravels all sides of the history of the social studies, as told by NSS programs and pamphlets, articles written by critics, media publications on debates involving the social studies, and so forth.

<sup>43</sup> The term historical revisionism in this paper will be used to describe the attempt to “revise and update historical narrative,” allowing for “different (and often subjugated) perspectives to be heard and considered),” as historian, Barbara Krasner, described it. See Barbara Krasner, “Introduction,” in Barbara Krasner (ed.), *Historical Revisionism*, (New York: Greenhaven, 2020), p. 15. For the purposes of this research, this revisionism applies specifically to the alteration of the teaching of U.S. history and the challenging of dominant narratives that favored certain groups and cultures over others.

it.”<sup>44</sup> Fassin spoke of a “new moral economy” in contemporary politics based on a humanitarian attitude toward the unfortunate that evolved in the last decades of the twentieth century. In this new moral economy, particular attention was “focused on [the] suffering and misfortune” of others – both victims at “home (the poor, the immigrants, the homeless)” and abroad, “the victims of famine, epidemics, or war.”<sup>45</sup> This section will demonstrate that a fixation on the suffering of others, especially of America’s enemies of war, was crucial for the upholding of the moral economy of American history education, *in connection with* its historical context. The exhibition of suffering in textbooks, both textual and visual, on the topic of the United States at war was one of the main strategies textbook authors and curriculum developers employed to demonstrate the commitment to validating multiple perspectives and alternative moralities, fostering both intercultural understanding and critical thinking skills. The fourth section will illuminate war discourse outside of the educational domain by revisiting newspaper articles on the celebration of Veteran’s Day, the largest national celebration of members of the U.S. military. These news stories refute the common assumption that soldiers in the United States were *always* heroes. Amid an eventful period of widespread civil unrest and domestic mistrust in American institutions, Veterans Day came to be known as the ‘forgotten holiday.’ The subsequent chapters of this dissertation will illustrate why the U.S. military came to regain its esteem in textbooks and society in the post-Vietnam era.

## 1.1 FROM COMPETITION TO UNDERSTANDING? THE BUMPY ROAD TO HUMANISTIC EDUCATION

This section will scrutinize the series of events, friction, and debates that spurred the revolutionary changes in American textbooks witnessed by the 1960s and a large part of the 1970s. Being an integral part of education of the Vietnam era as they may, the first portion of this section will illustrate that these radical changes were in actuality the unforeseen results of anxiety surrounding the Cold War, the threat of nuclear destruction, and the cultural struggle against communism in the 1950s. The NSS was born as a “carryover” project that spawned from federal actions to increase skilled manpower in the sciences and mathematics.<sup>46</sup> It also represented a remarkable and heretofore unprecedented influence on public school teaching

---

<sup>44</sup> Fassin, Didier, *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), p. 1.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., pp. 1, 7.

<sup>46</sup> Ronald W. Evans, “National Security Trumps Social Progress: The Era of the New Social Studies in Retrospect,” in Barbara Slater Stern (ed.), *The New Social Studies: People, Projects, and Perspectives*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 2.

from scholars in the academic arena. As federal funds began pouring into the development of new, competitive social studies curricula in the 1960s, the result was a humanistic curriculum based on relativism and historical investigation through the social inquiry method that *challenged* the very moral presumptions that led to its development in the first place. The Vietnam War and other social battles in the 1960s inevitably accelerated this process as a general mistrust in the military and authorities reached a historic peak.

### 1.1.1 Sputnik I and the Race to Superior Education

“What concerns me most about the Russian school program,” uttered U.S. Navy Rear Admiral Hyman G. Rickover to his audience at the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation in East Orange, New Jersey in November 1956, “is not the coercive element which speeds totalitarian programs, but the solid evidence that Russia has found a way to inspire in her children the desire to put forth their utmost mental efforts; and that she has done this through what we think of as ‘capitalist’ incentives.” He claimed there were several explanations for this strength – some economic, some cultural:

A Russian child works hard and examinations are tough. But ahead looms a professional career which is highly attractive, combining excellent salary with much honor, prestige, and respect. Teachers, for example, are well paid and highly regarded. Children are imbued with a love of intellectual adventure through books in which the hero is a scientist or engineer who does valiant deeds that will benefit the country – not, as in so many of our books and even more on radio and television, a cowboy or space cadet. I doubt whether you could find a counterpart in Russia of the one hundred American high school pupils who were recently queried on why they did not take mathematics and science courses. Their answers reflected disdain for scientists who were described as ‘squares,’ ‘long-hairs,’ and ‘little men with beards’ working in musty laboratories.<sup>47</sup>

Rickover’s words typified the widespread fears of many in the late 1950s that the United States was lagging behind the Soviet Union in the fields of engineering, mathematics, and sciences. When the Soviets successfully launched Sputnik I, the world’s first manmade satellite, into outer space less than one year later on 4 October 1957, these fears were confirmed for many.

---

<sup>47</sup> Hyman G. Rickover, “The Education of Our Talented Children,” speech before Thomas Alva Edison Foundation in East Orange, N.J., 20 November 1956, transcript, folder “Speech, Hyman G. Rickover, ‘The Education of Our Talented Children’ 11/20/56,” box 198, NCSS, pp. 21-22.

While American scientists celebrated the launch, like Joseph Kaplan from the U.S. National Committee for the International Geophysical Year (IGY), who openly dubbed the satellite “fantastic,” or Detlev W. Bronk of the U.S. National Academy of the Sciences, who called it a “brilliant contribution... to the furtherance of science,” other Americans felt less jubilant.<sup>48</sup> The American news media accusatively painted the launch as a crisis – a daunting and blatant wakeup call for the United States. The morning after the shocking launch, on 5 October, the *Daily News* used almost an entire page to print the words “SIGHT RED BABY MOON OVER U.S.” on its cover, continuing to point out that the American plan to launch an artificial satellite into space had already been announced in 1955, when the Americans falsely predicted that “it would be done within two years,” pronouncing thus a pressing “race between the Soviets and the U.S.”<sup>49</sup> *TIME* frightfully proclaimed both “a bright new chapter in mankind’s conquest of the natural environment and a grim new chapter in the cold war.”<sup>50</sup> In 1959, Rickover, an engineer officer himself, published *Education and Freedom*, in which he warned of “bad news... trickling from behind the iron curtain – bad news of astonishing scientific and engineering achievements.” Even more frightening, Rickover grieved, the United States was “losing momentum at the very moment when Russia was increasing hers.”<sup>51</sup> This fact “pierced the thick armor encasing [the] complacent faith in America’s present and future technological supremacy.”<sup>52</sup>

The U.S. government, on the other hand, inclined to publicly downplay both the significance of the launch for the advancement of science and the importance of launching a satellite for American technological goals, in general. Rear Admiral Rawson Bennett, Chief Naval of Operations, boldly told the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) one day after the launch that Sputnik I was simply a “hunk of iron almost anybody could launch.”<sup>53</sup> On 10 October 1957, the *New York Times* reported that President Eisenhower “sought to calm fears in the free world” at a news conference in Washington.<sup>54</sup> He claimed the satellite did not “by one

---

<sup>48</sup> Joseph Kaplan, quoted in “Device is 8 Times Heavier than One Planned by U.S.,” *New York Times*, 5 October 1957, p. 1; Detlev W. Bronk, quoted in Robert A. Divine, *The Sputnik Challenge, Eisenhower’s Response to the Soviet Satellite*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. xiv.

<sup>49</sup> “Sight Red Baby Moon Over U.S.,” *Daily News*, 5 October 1957, p. 4.

<sup>50</sup> “Red Moon Over the U.S.,” *TIME*, 70(16), 14 October 1957, p. 27.

<sup>51</sup> Hyman G. Rickover, *Education and Freedom*, (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1959), p. 35.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 157.

<sup>53</sup> Rawson Bennett, quoted in “Satellite Belittled: Admiral Says Almost Anybody Could Launch ‘Hunk of Iron,’” *New York Times*, 5 October 1957, p. 2.

<sup>54</sup> W. H. Lawrence, “President Voices Concern on U.S. Missiles Program, But Not on the Satellite: Disclaims a Race – Views Feat of Soviet as Political and Not Military Victory,” *New York Times*, 10 October 1957, p. 1.

iota” increase his fears over national security.<sup>55</sup> He further disclaimed the notion of a competition by accentuating that the United States had never considered the act of launching satellites to be a race, and that the satellite program in the United States had always assumed a low priority.

Despite his alleged indifference toward the Soviet satellite and lack of fear regarding the nation’s technological superiority, Eisenhower admitted in his message to Congress on education in January 1958 that “American education faces new responsibilities in the cause of freedom.” Without any mention of the Soviet Union or Sputnik I, Eisenhower charged that due to the “growing importance of science and technology, we must necessarily give special – but by no means exclusive – attention to education in science and engineering,” and called for the federal government to assume “an emergency role” in enforcing this support. These “emergency federal actions” would include the provision of grants and scholarships to State education boards and the funding of “a major expansion of the education activities... carried on by the National Science Foundation [NSF], and the establishment of new programs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.”<sup>56</sup> These “education activities” were “designed to foster science education” and “help supply additional highly competent scientists and engineers vitally needed by the country.” Other than the importance of “knowledge of foreign languages,” Eisenhower left other fields of study unmentioned.<sup>57</sup> Nearly one year after the launch of Sputnik I, on 2 September 1958, the president signed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) into law – the most extensive educational reform bill in the history of a nation that had, until now, historically refused to trust the idea of centralized education. Now, fears for national security triumphed against the suspicion of government control. The NDEA provided over one billion dollars for fellowships to professors, an increase in programs in science, math, and foreign languages, the construction of new schools, and the execution of standardized testing to sift out young talents at an early age. The intense Cold War mood that enabled and justified the provision of these funds also legitimized the federal government’s agenda and its desired curriculum as official knowledge to be passed on to young minds in the ‘hard sciences.’

Although the first educational reforms neglected the social studies, national debate on communists in the public schools did not. In 1947, President Harry S. Truman had implemented

---

<sup>55</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower, quoted in *ibid*, p. 1.

<sup>56</sup> The NSF was established by Congress in 1950 “to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; [and] to secure the national defense.” See “National Science Foundation Act of 1950,” Public Law 81-507, 81<sup>st</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> session, 10 May 1950, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950).

<sup>57</sup> Eisenhower, 1958.

the Loyalty Program under “Executive Order 9835,” which required individuals suspected of cooperating with “totalitarian, fascist, communist or subversive” groups to profess and sign on their “complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States” under oath and be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).<sup>58</sup> When the outspoken and paranoid Senator Joseph McCarthy delivered his infamous “enemies from within” speech in Wheeling, West Virginia in 1950, claiming he owned “a list of 57... names” of “known” members of the Communist Party who held seats and influenced policy in the Department of State, he provoked even more skepticism toward public servants.<sup>59</sup> The deliverance of this speech would come to mark the beginning of what was later referred to as the ‘McCarthy Era,’ characterized by the rampant paranoia and invasive politics in accordance with McCarthy’s ceaseless accusations against members of government until his death in 1957. These accusations logically affected schoolteachers, as well: if American communists could make it as far as the State Department and the U.S. military, they could easily have been lurking among the public schools.

Throughout the 1950s, several cases arose around the country in which public school teachers – accused of spreading communist beliefs by members of their community, other teachers, or even the administration – refused to sign the loyalty oaths to which they were ordered. Famous cases of teacher dismissals and academic freedom cases spanned every region of the United States, involving schools in Pasadena, California; New Orleans, Louisiana; Steele, North Dakota; and Oglesby, Illinois. These cases provoked fervent debate on the efficiency of public education versus private schools and, in some cases, led to decreases in district funding for individual schools.<sup>60</sup> Nevertheless, many teachers steadfastly defended their teaching methods and material. Educators in one high school in Washington D.C., where employees were investigated by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), protested, claiming that “as loyal teachers, we believe that the American way of life, faithfully practiced, is its own safeguard... Rigid censorship will ultimately defeat the purpose of good educational methods, namely the objective examination of both sides of the question, with freedom to arrive

---

<sup>58</sup> Harry S. Truman, “Executive Order 9825,” 21 March 1947, Harry S. Truman Library and Museum of the National Archives, (<https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/executive-orders/9825/executive-order-9825>: accessed 20 July 2020).

<sup>59</sup> Joseph McCarthy, speech on Communists in the State Department in Wheeling, W.V., 9 February 1950, Digital History Project, University of Houston, ([http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp\\_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&psid=3633](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&psid=3633): accessed 20 July 2020).

<sup>60</sup> Democracy’s Defense through Education, “Profession Takes Firm Stand against Groups Unfairly Attacking Public Education,” *Defense Bulletin*, 39, October 1951, folder “NCSS – Attacks on Education National Commission for Defense of Democracy through Education Bulletins 1950 – March-May 1957,” box 343, NCSS.

at conclusions.”<sup>61</sup> University professors in the humanities and social sciences were equally pressured to conform to regulations. In 1950, the University of California dismissed twenty-six “nonsigners” of loyalty oaths who refused to sign “on grounds of principle,” and dropped forty-eight courses from its curriculum on charges of controversial content. The *Washington Post* mourned the “California Tragedy” and rebuked the institution’s “stubborn insistence upon an affirmation valueless in itself and violative of deeply felt rights of conscience.”<sup>62</sup> Not only was the government active in the investigation and persecution of communist ‘activity,’ but several professional organizations and private foundations similarly emerged to take down “progressive education” and “communist influence” in schools throughout the 1950s, as well, including the American Education Association, the National Association of Pro-America, Friends of the Public Schools of America, Guardians of American Education, and the Conference of American Small Business Organizations.<sup>63</sup>

But the contagious mistrust and suspicion in society that Chief Justice William J. Brennan Jr. boldly described as “reminiscent of the Salem witch hunts” in an address in 1954 did not die with Joseph McCarthy in 1957.<sup>64</sup> In 1958, Professor of English, E. Merrill Root, published *Brainwashing in the High Schools*. In *Brainwashing*, Root argued that faulty and leftist history education was to blame for the United States “losing the cold war,” more specifically, “our naïveté, our lack of political and intellectual sophistication, our lack of realistic thinking, our spongy education on the nature of collectivism and the true nature of American principles as set up by the Founding Fathers.”<sup>65</sup> It was thus children’s ignorance about their nation’s virtues and values that caused them to sympathize with communist ideals – to become brainwashed. Given the constant insecurity many Americans experienced during the Cold War, Root managed to easily convince a considerable audience that American students were, indeed, being indoctrinated with Marxist perspectives. One year after *Brainwashing* was published, the non-profit traditionalist group, Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR),

---

<sup>61</sup> Quoted in Democracy’s Defense through Education, “Defending the Cause of Education against Unjust Attack,” *Defense Bulletin*, 38, February 1951, folder “NCSS – Attacks,” p. 8.

<sup>62</sup> “California Tragedy,” *Washington Post*, 1 October 1950, reprinted in Democracy’s Defense through Education, “Free Men Cannot Be Taught Properly by Slaves. Courageous Citizens Cannot Be Well Educated by Scared Hired Men,” 36, November 1950, folder “NCSS – Attacks,” p. 8.

<sup>63</sup> Milo McDonald, quoted in National Education Association, “Danger: They’re After Our Schools!” folder “National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education – Pamphlets & Articles 1950-1953,” box 343, NCSS, p. 3.

<sup>64</sup> William J. Brennan Jr., speech to the Irish Charitable Society in Boston, 17 March 1954, reprinted in *Nomination of William Joseph Brennan Jr.: Hearings before the Senate Commission on the Judiciary*, 85<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 26 and 27 February 1957, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957), p. 12.

<sup>65</sup> E. Merrill Root, *Brainwashing in the High Schools: An Examination of Eleven American History Textbooks*, (New York: Devin-Adair, 1958), pp. 3, 8.

established a committee to investigate textbooks and published a list of 170 objectionable school textbooks – a list which, like Root’s book, came to gain particular influence in the South.<sup>66</sup> American education was in trouble, and all eyes were on public schools. Educators and academics, not only in the sciences, needed to prove the worth of their fields and their teaching to the public.

In September 1959, the NSF, together with the Air Research and Development Command of the U.S. Air Force and other private and non-profit research organizations, allocated millions of dollars to unite experts in the sciences and mathematics with academics and research scientists in other fields, such as biologists, psychologists, and a few historians – noticeably no schoolteachers – in a spacious mansion of the Massachusetts Institute for Technology (MIT) on Cape Cod. These scholars would discuss and evaluate the new reform movement and enrich its approaches with perspectives from psychology over a ten-day meeting known as the Woods Hole Conference. The conference was organized by fifty-four-year-old Jerrold Zacharias, MIT physicist, chair of the President’s Science Advisory Committee (PSAC) under Kennedy, and enthusiastic proponent of interdisciplinary cooperation. Zacharias, who was described as “an attractive gray-haired man... with a youthful manner” and “a remarkable drive and energy,” developed the blueprint for a comprehensive educational reform across *all* the major disciplines in 1957.<sup>67</sup> Zacharias possessed substantial experience with working closely with the government and military on projects involving nuclear power, such as Project Lexington and the Manhattan Project, and was committed to using his knowledge to advance the cause of the survival of democracy. It is thus reasonable that historian of the social studies, Ronald W. Evans, claimed that the meeting at Woods Hole was the “direct reaction to Sputnik and the complaints of critics such as Vice Admiral Hyman Rickover.”<sup>68</sup> The Woods Hole Conference was one of the first instances in which federal funding was granted for educational leaders to discuss reforms in the social sciences and humanities, and it was far from the last investment in those fields.

Among the psychologists at the conference table sat forty-three-year old conference director and Harvard specialist in cognitive and educational psychology, Jerome S. Bruner,

---

<sup>66</sup> Two of the most notable Southern women who were inspired by the DAR’s list were the influential anti-textbook protestors that sparked the textbook debate analyzed in Chapter 2, namely Norma Gabler from Texas and Alice Moore from West Virginia.

<sup>67</sup> Jack S. Goldstein, *A Different Sort of Time: The Life of Jerrold R. Zacharias, Scientist, Engineer, Educator*, (Cambridge, M.A.: MIT Press), 1992, pp. xv, xvii.

<sup>68</sup> Ronald W. Evans, *The Hope for American School Reform: The Cold War Pursuit of Inquiry Learning in Social Studies*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), p. 74.

known – according to his biographer – for his “infectious enthusiasm for ideas... on cutting-issues in psychology [and] education.”<sup>69</sup> Bruner’s book on the outcomes of the conference, what historian and NSS pioneer, Edwin Fenton, would call the “most influential volume ever written about curriculum development,” served as the basis for what came to be known as the New Social Studies.<sup>70</sup> In this work, *Process of Education*, Bruner stressed that curriculum content in any field should be selected primarily based on its potential for continuous, long-term learning and thus that which should be taught should be “worth an adult’s knowing” and assist a student in becoming what he considered to be “a better adult.”<sup>71</sup> Bruner was unmistakably clear about *who* exactly should decide which skill sets helped children to “better” themselves, namely “the ablest scholars and scientists,” or, “those with a high degree of vision and competence in each of these fields.”<sup>72</sup> He, moreover, argued that the “basic or underlying principles” of a discipline can be taught to a child at *any* stage of development, granted it be presented with the proper structure.<sup>73</sup> This “teaching and learning of structure,” which became a primary topic at the conference, was to replace the simple “mastery of facts and techniques” that had dominated teaching strategies until now.<sup>74</sup>

Nevertheless, analytical thinking was not the only valid step to solving a problem, he argued. Bruner stressed the essential role that so-called “intuitive” thinking played for proper analysis: “the intuitive thinker may even invent or discover problems that the analyst would not... Unfortunately, the formalism of school learning has somehow devalued intuition.”<sup>75</sup> Bruner’s ideas took inspiration from the ‘child-centered’ approaches to teaching by psychologist and educational reformer, John Dewey, and the Progressive reform movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which placed great significance on the role of children’s experience in learning and the stimulation of scientific thinking and problem-solving

---

<sup>69</sup> David Olson, *Jerome Bruner: The Cognitive Revolution in Educational Theory*, (New York: Continuum International, 2007), p. viii.

<sup>70</sup> Edwin Fenton, “Structure as an Objective in the Social Studies,” in Edwin Fenton (ed.), *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), p. 81.

<sup>71</sup> Jerome S. Bruner, “The Importance of Structure,” *The Process of Education*, (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1960), reprinted in Fenton (ed.), 1966, p. 91.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 87, 83.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83.

<sup>74</sup> Jerome S. Bruner, *The Process of Education*, (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 12.

<sup>75</sup> Bruner, [1960] 1966, p. 93.

through natural curiosity.<sup>76</sup> This integration of ‘intuition’ into learning how to think would prove to be a fundamental principle guiding the feeling-oriented teaching of the NSS.

Yet despite their expertise, the post-Sputnik reformers demonstrated signs of bias. Firstly, the reformers particularly emphasized the provision of optimal education to markedly talented students. Despite the leading motif of the Woods Hole Conference that any child can be taught any subject at any age, the reformers found it essential to employ the use of standardized examinations that would single out talented students so that schools could present them with extra challenges that would “tempt [them] into next stages of development.”<sup>77</sup> The attention granted to the motivation of gifted students reflected Admiral Rickover’s fears, who in his 1956 speech in East Orange had lamented that American high schools “excel in turning out pleasant and attractive youngsters, but their heterogeneous character makes them poor institutions for training the talented.”<sup>78</sup> This emphasis would lead to a plethora of material designed for talented learners and an apparent lack of attention paid to the education of disadvantaged students or slow learners. Secondly, the reformers – paying little attention to the schools and school districts themselves – tended to consider their ideas the inherently superior approach to education: one which could only prevail against the obstacles placed in its way by government, society, and culture that would “invariably impinge upon the pace and direction of change,” such as the tabooization of evolutionary theory among religious groups. The scholar-dominated group concluded in its protocol that “to proceed in planning curricula on the assumption that intelligent cooperation can overcome” these constraints was a more important priority than dwelling on or yielding to them.<sup>79</sup> First and foremost, drastic change needed to be implemented before discussing the possible social implications, they believed.

Among the thirty-four participants present at the Woods Hole Conference, an overwhelming majority came from Northeastern universities, many Ivy League. Harvard represented the largest group with four participants, Yale the second largest with three. Thirty of thirty-four held a doctorate degree. The only female participant, Dr. Bärbel Inhelder, was a Swiss psychologist from the Institut Rousseau in Geneva. Of the thirty-two who worked at higher education institutions, *none* were active at a Southern university.<sup>80</sup> Thus this group of

---

<sup>76</sup> See, for example, John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, (New York: Macmillan, 1916), esp. pp. 119-132, 133-145, 146-157.

<sup>77</sup> Bruner, [1960] 1966, p. 88.

<sup>78</sup> Rickover, 1956, p. 22.

<sup>79</sup> Quoted in Evans, *Hope for American School Reform*, 2010, p. 82.

<sup>80</sup> While two participants – a biologist and a cinematographer – came from the Missourian institutes of Washington University in St. Louis and the University of Kansas City, respectively, of which both cities were

highly educated intellectuals, almost exclusively male and White, convened in a mansion in the Northeast to conceptualize the foundations of a new moral economy that would guide the educational reforms and the development of materials that would affect public-school classrooms throughout the nation for at least another decade. Regrettably for the reformers, their somewhat presumptuous attitude toward certain values systems in U.S. society, particularly those prevalent in many Southern states and rural communities, along with their incessant concentration on the development of curricula and textbooks for ‘talented’ children, would come to pose consequences that would eventually lead to the sweeping collapse of the reform movement and the outbreak of fiery culture wars in the mid-1970s.

### **1.1.2 “We Aren’t Ready for the Space Age”: Cultural Relativism, Social Inquiry, and the NSS**

Although it was neither the designer of reforms nor of new curricula, the NCSS was arguably one of the most influential actors in defending the social studies and its teachers from vicious attacks during the McCarthy Era. In retrospect, Dan Roselle, editor of the organization’s official journal, *Social Education*, shared in an interview in 1993 that the NCSS “did a beautiful job” protecting academic freedom and the First Amendment rights of teachers during the early Cold War period.<sup>81</sup> The organization treated the issue as a battle between censors and the very essence of education as a whole, evident in a comment made by editor of *Social Education* in the late 1950s, Lewis Paul Todd, that “the battle for the free world is being fought this very minute in the schools of the United States and may very well be won or lost in America’s classrooms.”<sup>82</sup> The NCSS distributed a plethora of material informing members about their rights and in the mid-1950s formed the Academic Freedom Committee specifically to help teachers defend themselves against accusations. The organization took these accusations of their critics seriously, circulating “a suggested procedure for handling complaints concerning social studies materials” to its members, in which it advised that “all criticisms or challenges of materials should be received courteously. The critics should be thanked for their interest in the

---

located South of the Mason-Dixon line, neither of these cities were truly considered to culturally belong to ‘the South’ in the twentieth century.

<sup>81</sup> Dan Roselle, quoted in Dale Greenawald, “Maturation and Change, 1947-1968,” *Social Education*, 59(7), 1995, p. 426.

<sup>82</sup> Lewis Paul Todd, “Editor’s Page,” *Social Education*, 22(2), February 1959, p. 53.

education of the community's children," followed by a "Request for Reconsideration of Social Studies Materials" form that teachers could hand out to those with textbook complaints.<sup>83</sup>

The NCSS additionally launched an array of awareness programs for teachers throughout the 1950s and 1960s that focused on cultivating the freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom, arguing that "students need[ed] to have opportunities to study controversial issues in an atmosphere free from indoctrination and emotional partisanship."<sup>84</sup> The NCSS saw these attacks as the result of pervasive emotional distress in a time of uncertainty. One member, Eugene McCreary, stressed that Americans were everything from "anxious and insecure," to "frustrated," to "puzzled and confused," as the Cold War "occupie[d] more and more of the emotional life of many people." Not only emotionally disturbed, Americans felt "helpless and inadequate – powerless" about the political situation. It was precisely for this reason, he argued, that society needed to "ensure that the new generation will be better prepared to settle matters," and to do so diplomatically.<sup>85</sup>

By the 1960s, educational experts in all fields were committed to designing a curriculum for students that would prepare them for the issues and conflicts of their day. In June 1962, Zacharias put together another fully funded, two-week gathering of academics and – this time – a few teachers in the Endicott House, an estate in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The conference allegedly ran in Zacharias' "usual enigmatic summer study style," only now, with the explicit intention of discussing the expansion of reform in the social studies.<sup>86</sup> A long and furious debate among the attendees represented by vociferous opposing viewpoints arose quickly, predominantly concerning the discipline of history. While many of the historians present felt offended by the critical views of sociologists like Robert Feldmesser, who decried the dominance of history in the social studies and claimed "we shall make no progress in transforming the social studies into social science until we slaughter the sacred cow of history," a few historians – most notably forty-year-old Edwin Fenton of the Carnegie Institute of Technology – agreed.<sup>87</sup> Although most of the critics of history felt that the subject *as such* was

---

<sup>83</sup> "Social Studies Materials in the Free Marketplace of Ideas – A Policy Statement of the National Council for the Social Studies on the Handling of Challenges to Instructional Materials," 1967, folder "NCSS – Academic Freedom Committee, Nov. 1 & 24, 1966-1967," box 109, NCSS.

<sup>84</sup> "Policy of Studying Controversial Issues in the Classroom," 17 October 1957, folder "NCSS Cont. Issues Proj. – 5/23/61," box 538, NCSS, p. 2.

<sup>85</sup> Eugene McCreary, "The Crisis Threatening American Education," *Social Education*, 26(4), 1962, pp. 177-178.

<sup>86</sup> Goldstein, 1992, p. 196.

<sup>87</sup> Robert Feldmesser, quoted in Peter B. Dow, *Schoolhouse Politics: Lessons from the Sputnik Era*, (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 42.

not the problem, it was clear the traditional teaching of history based on the dictation and memorization of facts must be put to an end. It was time for a new approach, but funds and resources were scarce and leading advocates of the reforms, like the NCSS, suffered substantial “financial growth pains” before finally being awarded support for its efforts.<sup>88</sup>

In 1961, Kennedy’s first year of office, Eisenhower’s NDEA was renewed by Congress, including amendments that extended federal support to finance foreign language programs – once again neglecting the social studies.<sup>89</sup> The NCSS responded by testifying before committees in both houses of Congress and prompting their members to write their grievances about the omission to their local representatives. Merrill F. Hartshorn, executive secretary of the NCSS, maintained in her speech before the House of Representatives that the very heat of the Cold War *required* a “sustained and vigorous attention” be granted “to the fundamental role of the social studies in the education of American youth.” Only “an informed body of citizens, loyal to our traditions, who possess the ability to think clearly, and who can choose wise courses of action on the issues confronting our nation,” she argued, could end the Cold War. This would not be achieved through competitiveness, but through diplomacy: “It must be obvious that man’s conquest of nature will become meaningless, even less than meaningless, unless he first of all learns to conquer himself and learns to live with his fellow man in a just and decent world.”<sup>90</sup> She boldly insisted that science and mathematics were *not* the most pertinent school subjects: “The most serious issues of our time lie within the field of human affairs. For the solutions to these problems, we must look to the social sciences and to the humanities.”<sup>91</sup> Pleading for the cultivation of international cooperation through humanistic education, Todd similarly charged that the “harsh truth is that we aren’t ready for the space age. We haven’t yet learned to live together here on planet Earth, and until we do learn to live together our reach upward toward the heavens will continue to be something less than the magnificent adventure it should be.”<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Greenawald, 1995, p. 417.

<sup>89</sup> For a history of the internationalization of American education through the NDEA, see Nancy L. Ruther, *Barely There, Powerfully Present: Thirty Years of U.S. Policy on International High Education*, (New York: Routledge, 2002), esp. pp. 59-70. For a historical analysis of the NDEA, its renewals, and its effects on education from a political, ideological, and educational standpoint, see Wayne J. Urban, *More than Science and Sputnik: The National Defense Act of 1958*, (Tuscaloosa, A.L.: University of Alabama Press, 2010), esp. pp. 172-201.

<sup>90</sup> Merrill F. Hartshorn, speech reprinted in “Statement on HR 6774,” *Social Education*, 25(6), 1961, pp. 296-297.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 256.

<sup>92</sup> Todd, 1959, p. 53.

The incessant cries of historians and social scientists were finally heard when the U.S. Office of Education announced the launch of “Project Social Studies” in October 1962, a program intended to “improve research, instruction, teacher education, and the dissemination of information in this field.”<sup>93</sup> This program would allocate funds “for basic and applied research... for developmental activities such as conferences and seminars, for curriculum development programs and... for demonstration of new material on techniques in the social studies.”<sup>94</sup> Curriculum development would take place at so-called Curriculum Study Centers at Harvard University, the University of Minnesota, and the Carnegie Institute of Technology. The latter was directed by Fenton himself and was established to evaluate and develop “reading materials for able students of history and social sciences in grades 9 to 12.”<sup>95</sup> The NSF and federal funds even allowed for the creation of projects aimed at optimizing social studies curricula and instruction at the elementary school level. When the NDEA was once again up for renewal in 1964, financial support was extended once more to include “funds for materials and teacher training in history, geography, and civics” and the establishment of the Council of State Social Studies Supervisors (CS4), an associated group of state coordinators and specialists within the NCSS. The funding of the creation of CS4 enabled the number of state social studies specialists in the NCSS to increase from “seven or eight” in 1960 to nearly thirty in 1965.<sup>96</sup> Throughout the 1960s, millions of dollars from the NSF poured into the creation of over fifty national projects in the social studies. Using the term for the first time, Fenton and fellow historian, John M. Good, claimed that the freshly developed curriculum of the “new social studies” – which will be examined in the next paragraphs – would “promise to revolutionize teaching about man and society,” with new materials and styles of teaching.<sup>97</sup> The hopeful and ambitious Fenton would prove to be one of the most active contributors to the curriculum development of the NSS and the promotion of inductive teaching, or social inquiry. His engagement would be so significant that his own history textbooks came to be the object of the heated controversy analyzed in Chapter 2.

**Objectives and materials.** Much of the initial hesitation to finance the social studies came from a common uncertainty about what exactly the term ‘social studies’ encompassed,

---

<sup>93</sup> “Announcement for Project Social Studies,” *Social Education*, 26, 1962, p. 300.

<sup>94</sup> Francis A. J. Ianni “The Curriculum Research and Development Program of the U.S. Office of Education: Project English, Project Social Studies and Beyond,” in Robert William Heath (ed.), *New Curricula*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 201.

<sup>95</sup> Gerald R. Smith, “Project Social Studies,” *Social Education*, 27(7), 1963, p. 357.

<sup>96</sup> Greenawald, 1995, p. 421.

<sup>97</sup> Edwin Fenton and John M. Good, “Project Social Studies: A Progress Report,” *Social Education*, 29(4), 1965, p. 206.

even among educators in the field themselves. Was it one comprehensive subject or a conglomeration of several related – or unrelated – areas? The use of the term became prevalent in the beginning of the twentieth century during the Progressive school reforms, most notably when the then Bureau of Education and the National Education Association (NEA) organized a Committee on Social Studies in 1916 to determine a standardized role and definition for several school subjects that did not conform to the conventional array of fields like science, mathematics, and English. In the search to establish a curriculum that was categorized thematically and associated with those skills deemed necessary for the future of society, this hopeful group of mostly professors and schoolteachers saw these ‘remainder,’ non-standard subjects to present a “remarkable opportunity to improve the citizenship of the land.”<sup>98</sup> This unofficial objective came to guide social studies teaching for most of the twentieth century. The committee ambiguously defined the discipline as comprising of those subjects “relate[d] directly to the organization and development of human society, and to man as a member of social groups.” To rear “good citizens,” social studies teachers were to cultivate “a loyalty and a sense of obligation [to one’s] city, State, and Nation as political units,” but also “a sense of membership in the ‘world community.’”<sup>99</sup>

The broadness of such a definition led the social studies to suffer an austere lack of direction and progress in curriculum development. Todd even admitted in 1950 that those in the field were “the victims of a great and growing confusion.” Particularly disturbing, he felt, was the ambiguous role of history and its relation to the other fields “in a social studies program that has become as broad as life itself.”<sup>100</sup> The reform movement of the 1960s sought to reverse this lack of direction and to challenge the traditional understanding of the social studies as citizen education. Some reformers similarly challenged the traditional notion of a “good citizen,” in general. The non-profit Council on Civic Education proposed a new definition that appealed to a modest form of patriotism and cooperative thinking, namely a person who “takes pride in the achievements of the United States, and at the same time appreciates the contributions to civilization of other peoples throughout the world,” who “has compassion for other human beings, and is sensitive to their needs, feelings, and aspirations,” and who “understands that the continuation of human existence depends upon the reduction of national

---

<sup>98</sup> National Education Association, *The Social Studies in Secondary Education: A Report of the Committee on Social Studies on the Reorganization of Secondary Education*, Bulletin 28, (Washington: Bureau of Education, 1916), p. 6.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>100</sup> Lewis Paul Todd, “Editor’s Page,” *Social Education*, 14(5), 1950, p. 195.

rivalries, and works for international cooperation and order.”<sup>101</sup> Reformer and Endicott participant, Charles R. Keller of the John Hays Fellows Program for fellowships in the humanities, addressed this “good citizen” objective in a speech before the Kentucky Council for the Social Studies in October 1962: “It seems to me that we will not begin to have the revolution that we need until we rid ourselves of the idea that history and the social sciences have the job of making good citizens. Do any of us really know how to make good citizens?”<sup>102</sup>

Mobilization around social studies reform was further catalyzed by Keller’s 1961 article in the *Saturday Review*, “Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies.” He bemoaned that the social studies, in its current state, was the only subject in which the objectives were so vague (“the creation of good students”) as to be subordinate to all other types of education, including the socialization of values by “the family, the churches, society, and the individuals themselves.”<sup>103</sup> The reformers set out to establish new objectives, in part by marrying the disciplines and utilizing an interdisciplinary approach to social problems, while seeing that each, “for convenience,” still enjoyed its own segment of the curriculum.<sup>104</sup> On the topic of teaching, the movement strove toward encouraging students to *actively* “learn how to think and understand,” thus “develop[ing] attitudes for themselves” instead of absorbing those of the teacher.<sup>105</sup> The teacher’s role in learning was to be reduced accordingly from that of an authoritarian source of knowledge to something of a mere guide to stimulate questions and curiosity. Joseph R. Strayer, historian at Princeton, expected the social studies, however, to *indeed* “inculcate certain attitudes and skills,” particularly methodological, such as “respect for evidence even when it goes against prejudices and preconceptions, tolerance for differing points of view, appreciation of human dignity, a sense of civic responsibility and devotion to the welfare of the country.”<sup>106</sup> In order to pursue such ambitions, however, the reformers would need to revamp the conventional tools used to aid teaching.

---

<sup>101</sup> Council on Civic Education, *A Program for the Development of a Breakthrough in Civic Education in Our Schools*, (New York: Author, 1966), folder “Civic Ed. – Council on Civic Ed. Miscellaneous – Draft Gov’t Guidelines for Ed. Labs, Budget 1956-6, Chapter Draft, n. D.,” box 202, NCSS, pp. 8, 12, 13.

<sup>102</sup> Charles R. Keller, “Still Needed: A Revolution in the Social Studies Or Is This Where I Come In?” speech before Kentucky Council for the Social Studies in Louisville, K.Y., 27 October 1962, transcript, folder “Secondary Soc. St. Classes – Teachers’ Guide 1968,” box 109, NCSS.

<sup>103</sup> Charles R. Keller, “Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies,” *Saturday Review*, 16, September 1961, p. 60.

<sup>104</sup> Educational Services Incorporated, *Basic Generalizations for a Program of Curriculum Development in Social Studies*, (Cambridge, M.A.: Author, 1963), p. 6.

<sup>105</sup> Keller, 1962.

<sup>106</sup> Joseph R. Strayer, “History,” in Bernard Berelson (ed.), *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences*, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the NCSS, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962), pp. 22-23.

The reformers were aware that one ubiquitous component in particular needed to be urgently addressed: the textbook. Keller complained that the social studies relied upon “unimaginative, unenthusiastic, pedantic teaching” straight from the textbook, which itself was dull in its purely narrative character. He argued that textbooks should be supplemented with primary sources – “good readings – stirring, exciting books, documents, and source materials.”<sup>107</sup> The curriculum needed to focus on functionality, in this case “on learning and discovery... and on analysis, critical thinking, and interpretation,” he claimed, hoping that “students will not just learn facts but will become acquainted with concepts and skilled in ways of thinking which will help them to analyze and come to grips with the new, complex, and difficult situations they will constantly be facing.” This “conceptual rather than the fact-by-fact approach” should be able to “capture student interest through exciting action in exciting places.” Essentially, the reformed social studies should strive, most importantly, for students to “learn how historians and social scientists go about their work.”<sup>108</sup> Fenton, too, lamented that “almost no one praises present textbooks; almost everyone uses them.” He argued that they were full of inadequacies and unusable “generalizations.”<sup>109</sup> Furthermore, the texts – through their emphasis on the memorization of facts – failed to provoke discussions of values and controversy in the classroom. Historian at University of California, Berkeley (UCB), forty-three-year-old Charles G. Sellers, agreed that the real fallacy in question was the attempt of the teacher to simply “take a textbook and to transfer its contents... into the minds of his students” and indoctrinate them with moral values and judgments by incorporating “the dominant social values of our society” into the material.<sup>110</sup>

The reformers considered the development of new textbooks to be of great importance for the NSS, yet they denounced the use of it as the one and only source of information. Fenton stated that a course “textbook should be the basic guide to what is taught only if the text can present material for most objectives more effectively than any other material can.”<sup>111</sup> He advocated the supplementation of textbook materials with – if not the complete integration of – other sources, since “for some objectives, films, filmstrips, recordings, charts, pictures, and actual objects are far more appropriate than the printed word.”<sup>112</sup> Fenton had been

---

<sup>107</sup> Keller, 1961, pp. 60, 62.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., p. 62.

<sup>109</sup> Edwin Fenton, *The New Social Studies*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), p. 71.

<sup>110</sup> Charles G. Sellers, “The Role of the College Historian,” in Erling M. Hunt, Charles G. Sellers, Harold E. Taussig, and Arthur Bestor (eds.), *The Role of History in Today's Schools*, (Washington: Council for Basic Education, 1966), p. 16.

<sup>111</sup> Fenton, 1967, p. 69.

<sup>112</sup> Ibid., p. 71.

experimenting with the use of primary sources in his classes since the late 1950s and summarized his approach in his 1964 book, *32 Problems in World History*, in which he presented diverse primary text sources representing conflicting viewpoints on various historical topics and a few study questions on each, without any additional information or interpretation.<sup>113</sup> By the early 1960s, the teaching of historical investigation with primary sources as supplementary material was being experimented in several public school classrooms.

**Learning about values.** In the 1960s, Fenton dedicated much of his time to helping the NSS take shape. In 1966, he published *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*, in which he defined the NSS as a project involving “knowledge objectives” on the one hand, and “affective objectives” involving “attitudes and values,” on the other.<sup>114</sup> The social studies would develop to include a deeply emotional and interactive dimension between the student and the social world, which would “emphasize a feeling, an emotion, or a degree of acceptance or rejection.” To stimulate these feelings, students were to first “examine his values, to organize them into a value system, and to develop a personal philosophy.”<sup>115</sup> Here, for the first time since Progressive education, expressing and discussing emotion became a valid and acceptable practice not only in the household and in religious spaces but also in the classroom.

While great significance was allotted to the process of ‘values clarification,’ or the reflection upon one’s own values, these values were also to be treated on equal footing with any and every other value system. Fenton asserted that when students learn that one system is ‘right’ or ‘better,’ it inclines them “to believe that people in foreign lands who hold other value systems are necessarily wrong and ought for their own good to be corrected. How frightening!”<sup>116</sup> For him, the simple fact of vast diversity in American society was reason enough to treat various value systems as equals. Subsequent to the Endicott House meeting in 1962, a group of scholars organized – once again – by Zacharias convened at the Cambridge Common to further refine the positions of the social studies. Among these counted the strongly relativist principles that “there is nothing good across the board, no value to be maximized at

---

<sup>113</sup> See Edwin Fenton, *32 Problems in World History: Source Readings and Interpretations*, (Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1964). Although Fenton included a few study questions to keep in mind while reading and interpreting the primary sources, he clarified in the book’s instructions that the sources should not be read to be able to answer the questions, nor should students write out the answers on paper. Rather, the students were to use them to review what they already know about the topic from other sources, to then read the accounts and compare the new knowledge with their prior knowledge – when necessary, expanding, or revising the latter.

<sup>114</sup> Edwin Fenton, “Preface,” in Fenton (ed.), 1966, p. v.

<sup>115</sup> Edwin Fenton, “Teaching about Values in the Public Schools,” in Fenton (ed.), 1966, p. 40.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., p. 44.

the expense of every other,” and “there are human beings on both sides of every issue. So if we must fight, let the victors be generous.”<sup>117</sup>

Thus while anti-communist conservatives had preached the teaching of citizenship, patriotism, and the superiority of capitalism as the purpose of education, the academics who took the reins over the curriculum were convinced otherwise. They felt that Cold War friction would be solved only if man would “cooperate with his fellow men” and learn “a direct morality of cooperation and brotherly love,” as preached by curriculum developers like thirty-seven-year-old anthropologist, Donald W. Oliver of the Harvard Social Studies Project, who incorporated “principles of group understanding and group dynamics” into its programs.<sup>118</sup> These principles included objectively comparing and contrasting different cultures and economic systems, chiefly those of the United States and the Soviet Union. George L. Bach, economist at the Carnegie-Mellon Business School, urged that “every informed American should have at least a general impression of how other major economic systems operate, especially communism.” But such an analysis should indicate *both* the differences and similarities between them, Bach noted, arguing that economies are “neither purely private enterprise nor Communist, neither purely controlled by individual spending nor centrally directed.”<sup>119</sup> Michael B. Petrovich, historian at the University of Wisconsin, revealed in 1962 that “there is much wisdom to be gained from the realization that the one institution most Americans think divides us most from Russia, or China – Communism – is an ideology imported from the West.”<sup>120</sup>

This moral economy based on human sameness also simultaneously strove to celebrate cultural *differences*, and the fact that each area of the world “is a self-consistent and intelligible whole with a rationale of its own.”<sup>121</sup> The practicality and necessity of learning about the characteristics of non-Western worlds had nothing to do with the “know-your-enemy philosophy” that sparked research on the Soviet Union in the 1950s: “Such approaches lead to dogmatism that divides the world into the ‘good’ and the ‘bad,’ truth and error,” Petrovich argued in 1962.<sup>122</sup> “It is indoctrination,” that prevents “the student from searching all the facts,

---

<sup>117</sup> Educational Services Incorporated, 1963, pp. 14-15.

<sup>118</sup> Donald W. Oliver, “The Selection of Content in the Social Sciences,” *Harvard Educational Review*, 28(1), winter 1957, pp. 271-300, reprinted in Fenton (ed.), 1966, p. 99.

<sup>119</sup> George L. Bach, “What Economics Should We Teach?” *Challenge, The Magazine of Economic Affairs*, Institute of Economic Affairs at New York University, March 1964, reprinted in Fenton (ed.), 1966, p. 338.

<sup>120</sup> Michael B. Petrovich, “Teaching about Russia and Eastern Europe,” in Berelson (ed.), 1962, p. 253.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 251.

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 247.

from delving into the rationale of an opposing point of view, from testing one's own values, and from earning an opinion."<sup>123</sup> Instead, according to Petrovich, the United States needed to overcome its own arrogance to understand and accept that "there are other ways of life besides our own and that the differences among them are not only, or even primarily, to be ascribed to simply different stages of material development."<sup>124</sup> Simply learning the raw facts of another region would not suffice. In the same year, Hyman Kublin, historian at Brooklyn College, in his plea for a more accurate teaching about the Asian continent in schools, claimed that "only by learning about the great historical events and the outstanding historical personalities, about the essence of social and religious value systems, about the structure and functioning of the social and economic systems, and about the routines of daily living, now and yesterday" can a student of the social studies "acquire a knowledge of Asia worth having."<sup>125</sup> Learning about a culture from this angle was expected to debunk the "illusions and biases" and the "uncritical and deplorable thoughts" of other peoples that students may have acquired outside – and perhaps even inside – the classroom, possibly "held by the teacher himself."<sup>126</sup> Thus these thoughts, the "product of ethnocentrism and sheer ignorance," could be cured by the acquisition of knowledge, the reformers believed:

Unwarranted clichés about the character of ethnic groups will most likely not be expunged by mere exhortation. What is rather called for is the development of processes of critical thinking and of control over the basic concepts of anthropology that make possible intellectually defensible generalizations about national character.<sup>127</sup>

Yet despite the high priority granted to moral and cultural relativism, the reform movement itself was less than unideological. Fenton confessed later on in an interview in 1977 that the goal of the reforms had been not only to improve the quality of learning but also to "humanize the school."<sup>128</sup> The NCSS stood behind these goals and assisted reforms by endorsing new projects and distributing newly developed instructional materials to their members. Peace and international cooperation were, however, all but new topics on the agenda of the NCSS. In fact, Greenawald's scrupulous analysis of *Social Education* articles found "peace education" and "issues of international education" to be the matters most heavily discussed within the

---

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., pp. 247-248.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid., p. 249.

<sup>125</sup> Hyman Kublin, "Teaching about Asia," in Berelson (ed.), 1962, p. 198.

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., pp. 202, 204.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., p. 205.

<sup>128</sup> Edwin Fenton, quoted in Ronald S. Brandt, "On Moral/Civic Education: An Interview with Edwin Fenton," *Educational Leadership*, April 1977, p. 493.

organization between 1947 and 1968.<sup>129</sup> In 1958, the NCSS published a policy statement in which it identified the need for Americans to “learn to avoid the provincialism of evaluating other peoples solely on the basis of our own values and experiences.”<sup>130</sup> Many of the organization’s projects paralleled developments and objectives in the NSS, such as the Controversial Issues Project and the Global Education Project, both of which aimed at embedding relativism and intergroup understanding into school curricula.

**Social inquiry.** The main feature of the ‘new’ historians’ toolbox to cultivate an openly relativist educational culture was inductive learning or the so-called *inquiry method*. The inquiry method as an approach to teaching, what he then called “discovery learning,” was stressed by Bruner during the Woods Hole Conference in 1959. Bruner described it as a method of problem solving in which a student analyzes new facts and data and combined these analyses with prior knowledge, experiences, and intuition to make sense of them “in such a way that one is enabled to go beyond the evidence so reassembled to additional new insights.”<sup>131</sup> In the context of the social studies, this approach was popularized under the name of ‘social inquiry.’ Director of the Center for Education in the Social Sciences and historian, John D. Haas and Richard van Scotter, respectively, defined social inquiry in the NSS generally as “social sciencing,” or simply as “critical thinking.”<sup>132</sup> Harvard’s Oliver described such critical thinking as “learning to cut apart the claims we read and hear every day to see what’s inside.”<sup>133</sup> Fenton considered critical thinking one of the indispensable “procedural values” that teachers needed to teach their students. Thus in an educational environment in which one was expected to identify one’s emotions and intuition, an argument and the defense of one’s views could nonetheless not *only* stem from emotion:

If a student insists that his prejudices should not be challenged and defends them with an emotional appeal, he should be *forced* to subject them to the test of evidence and to defend them in the face of the full array of scholarly argument... In history and the social sciences they must be willing to look at evidence for their position and to accept the method by which social scientists and historians arrive at conclusions.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup> Greenawald, 1995, p. 416.

<sup>130</sup> Stanley P. Wronski, “A Statement on the Social Studies,” *Social Education*, 22(2), 1958, p. 66.

<sup>131</sup> Jerome S. Bruner, “The Act of Discovery,” *Harvard Educational Review*, 31(1), 1961, p. 22.

<sup>132</sup> John D. Haas and Richard van Scotter, “An Inquiry Model for the Social Studies,” *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 59(389), March 1975, p. 74.

<sup>133</sup> Donald W. Oliver, *Learning to Think Critically*, paper prepared by the Harvard Social Studies Project for the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, (Salt Lake City: Utah State Board of Education, 1967), p. 2

<sup>134</sup> Edwin Fenton, “Teaching about Values in the Public Schools,” in Fenton (ed.), 1966, p. 42.

Primary sources were considered to aid in the encouragement of critical thinking. On the one hand, first-hand accounts of individuals who experienced a certain event could help raise questions regarding another conflicting narrative – perhaps even the most prevalent, widely believed version of the same event, provided by the government, military, or another authority. On the other hand, they were to be read critically themselves. Fenton and Sellers were both accredited with popularizing social inquiry in their history textbooks and deemed two of the method's pioneers. Sellers described his texts as “composed mainly of the historical documents that enable students to come to sophisticated conclusions themselves.”<sup>135</sup> The focus of history and the social studies thus transformed from “*what* the student learns to *how* the student learns.”<sup>136</sup> In this process of learning, it was the responsibility of teachers to “see that varying viewpoints are fairly represented in the classroom,” and to “hold paramount the commitment not to indoctrinate,” significantly reducing their own power over the selection and transmission of official knowledge.”<sup>137</sup>

**Defending the moral economy.** Interestingly, while advocates of reform pushed for an innovative moral economy built upon the concepts of relativism and critical thinking, which drastically differed from the fact-by-fact approach to history infused with Cold War patriotism, they did so, in part, by utilizing the patriotic rhetoric of their ideological counterparts. Against accusations of glorifying and sympathizing with the enemy, they argued that the NSS programs *were*, in fact, patriotic, as the critical discussion of various viewpoints inherently *belonged* to American democracy. “Americanism means free and honest examination of facts and objective consideration of alternatives,” wrote *Social Education* in 1962, “Americanism means free and respectful discussions of differences and the ability to compromise.”<sup>138</sup> They referred to a “free marketplace of ideas,” a notion based on the economic concept of free competition that had been embedded in the language of the Supreme Court on First Amendment matters since the beginning of the twentieth century.<sup>139</sup> In 1967, the NCSS used the allegory of a competitive

---

<sup>135</sup> Charles G. Sellers, *Memoirs of Charles G. Sellers Jr.*, vol. 2, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017), (<https://nature.berkeley.edu/~c-merchant/Sellers/memoirs.html>: accessed 24 September 2018), p. 12.

<sup>136</sup> Haas and van Scotter, 1975, p. 79.

<sup>137</sup> “Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher, A Policy Statement of the Academic Freedom Committee of the National Council for the Social Studies,” 1967, folder “NCSS – Academic Freedom & the Social Studies Teacher 1967-68,” box 109, NCSS, p. 5.

<sup>138</sup> McCreary, 1962, p. 179.

<sup>139</sup> The “marketplace of ideas” accredited to the liberal political theories of John Milton and John Stuart Mill in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, respectively, first entered Supreme Court rhetoric in 1919 when Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes argued that defendant, Jacob Abrams, had the constitutional right to publish and distribute pamphlets denouncing a U.S. war effort against Soviet Russia, protected by the First Amendment. He

market economy in response to anti-communist attacks and bans of school textbooks, arguing that students needed the “opportunity to consider and evaluate differing points of view in the classroom” without intervention or censorship.<sup>140</sup> The organization’s Academic Freedom Committee similarly contended in a policy statement that not only was a plurality of ideas just, it was what made American democracy possible: “Democracy is a way of life that prizes alternatives. Alternatives mean that people must make choices... The democratic way of life depends for its very existence upon the free contest and examination of ideas.”<sup>141</sup> This plurality of ideas included alternative moralities that stood in contrast to that with which an individual was familiar. As the Board of Education in Fresno, California, a leading public-school district in the promotion of controversial discussions in the classroom, patriotically argued in its 1961 “policy of discussing controversial issues” that the “free discussion of controversial issues” has historically belonged to “freedom of speech and free access to information,” which counted “among [America’s] most cherished traditions.”<sup>142</sup>

The reformers nevertheless recognized the limitations of patriotic rhetoric and the consequences that the existence of ‘traditional values’ in U.S. society posed for the promulgation of their moral economy. “Unless parents and school officials give us the right to teach the validity of certain procedural values,” including and especially critical thinking, Fenton acknowledged, “we cannot teach our disciplines.”<sup>143</sup> The role of parents, churches, and local communities was recognized as significant in the early socialization of an individual. Supporters of the reforms were, however, adamant in their rejection of a dominance of one value system, especially religious, in the classroom and the disciplines. Educational reformer and president of Harvard, James B. Conant, had notoriously spoken out against the supremacy of Christian morality and values in American education in his Baccalaureate sermon to the Class of 1950:

In a culture of many religions in which religious tolerance is the overriding doctrine, there can be no one official philosophy; we cannot give any detailed interpretation of American democracy in religious terms to which all can readily subscribe. The secular institutions of

---

claimed that truth will surface only in the context of a free competition of ideas. For more on the significance of Holmes’ dissent for First Amendment rulings in the U.S. Supreme Court, see W. Wat Hopkins, “The Supreme Court Defines the Marketplace of Ideas,” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 73(1), spring 1996, pp. 40-52.

<sup>140</sup> “Social Studies Materials in the Free Marketplace of Ideas,” 1967, p. 1.

<sup>141</sup> “Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher,” 1967, p. 1.

<sup>142</sup> Fresno Unified School District Board of Education, “Policy of Studying Controversial Issues,” 23 May 1961, folder “NCSS Cont. Issues Proj. – 5/23/61.”

<sup>143</sup> Fenton, “Teaching about Values in the Public Schools,” 1966, p. 42.

American society draw their content of moral and spiritual nourishment from the common denominator of all religious faiths... No single religion can claim in terms of the behavior of its adherents in this world, at least, any monopoly of virtue.<sup>144</sup>

The moral economy that guided the reform movement of the 1960s upheld this view. Curriculum developers even spoke of aiding children in *liberating* themselves from their early socialized values. Oliver from the Harvard Social Studies Project argued in the *Harvard Educational Review* in 1966 that a deep “understanding of one’s own feelings and values and the feelings and values of other individuals and groups” and an identification of potential sources of moral conflict within oneself and in society required that “the individual student be liberated from his own narrow value system to the point where he can see the relationship between his personal value judgments and those of other groups within society.”<sup>145</sup> Oliver deemed such an approach to moral conflict as more “‘rational’ than blind adherence to some ideology” learned in one’s early years.<sup>146</sup> Some scholars regarded the cultural and religious values of the household to be an outright interference to progress. One school district in California even bemoaned “parents’ failure or refusal to discuss” controversial issues with their children at home, claiming that this reluctance caused these students a disadvantage in class. And yet, despite their strict regulations on conversations at the dinner table, many parents took part in hypocritical behavior, the report reproached: “Some parents may disregard, evade or ridicule law enforcement and government, but they expect children to obey implicitly and the school to uphold tradition.”<sup>147</sup>

Frustration with the influence of family values sometimes manifested itself in the devaluing of these beliefs as those of ‘plain’ or ‘ordinary folks.’ Dr. Richard P. Klahn, principal of a high school in Wisconsin, complained, for example, that “the voice of pressure groups and plain citizens (interested in their particular ‘area of concern’)” added nothing constructive but only confusion to the debate on social studies reform.<sup>148</sup> The placement of “area of concern” in quotation marks subtly implied a dismissal of these complaints. In other cases, scholars labeled the skepticism of ‘plain folks’ as downright propaganda. One workshop at University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), designed to prepare students to examine various newspapers

---

<sup>144</sup> James B. Conant, Baccalaureate Sermon to the Harvard Class of 1950, 18 June 1950, Cambridge, M.A., reprinted in *Democracy’s Defense through Education*, 1950, p. 6.

<sup>145</sup> Oliver, [1957] 1966, p. 107.

<sup>146</sup> Ibid., p. 108.

<sup>147</sup> “The Teacher and Controversial Issues,” January 1952, (Whittier, C.A.: Whittier Union High School District, 1952), folder “NCSS Cont. Issues Proj. 5/24-5/61,” box 538, NCSS, pp. 4-5.

<sup>148</sup> Richard P. Klahn, “Curriculum Development in the Social Studies – A Position,” NASSP Convention in Pittsburgh, 12 February 1963, folder “Council on Basic Education – Speeches & Articles,” box 47, NCSS.

for traces of propaganda, listed the “attempts to convince [one’s] audience that he and his ideas are good because they are ‘of the people,’ the ‘plain folks,’” as one of the “seven common devices used by propagandist[s].” The project outline then –mocking a rural dialect – provided an example of such rhetoric: “These professor-theories don’t click with the likes of us.”<sup>149</sup> Part of this strict rejection of the views of ‘ordinary folks’ stemmed from a solid belief that scholarly experts were the most qualified individuals to decide on curriculum objectives and acceptable approaches to morality in the classroom, and teachers the most qualified to transfer these ideas, regardless of parent objection. As the NCSS Academic Freedom Committee noted in 1968, it was the educator’s “greater knowledge” that “impose[d] on him the twofold duty of advancing new and useful ideas and of helping to discard these which are outworn.”<sup>150</sup> Thus we observe among the advocates of reform a rather contradictory attitude toward the family and traditional values. On the one hand, these values were respected as an important aspect of a child’s early socialization, which the teacher was forced to accommodate and present as equal to other value systems. On the other, they were dismissed as a nuisance to be overcome and overruled by a new moral economy based – somewhat paradoxically – on the validity of all, and even conflicting, perspectives.

### **1.1.3 “The Whole World is Watching”: Academia and the Vietnam War**

Aside from the saga of debate regarding textbooks and educational reform, the 1960s witnessed a series of highly pressing, emotional, and political conflicts. Rampant civil unrest, protests, battles for civil rights and equality, and warfare all enabled sweeping changes to occur in U.S. society, including in the educational sphere. Each struggle seemed to signify a certain societal sickness: advocates of change were convinced that the roots of this sickness were the chains of traditionalism, racism, and American Cold War aggression, while opponents believed they were the corroded values of American youth corrupted by liberal education. Arguably none of these conflicts affected the moral economy of history education with respect to the representation and discussion of the United States and its military in foreign affairs more than the Vietnam War. This subsection will discuss the interplay between the conflict in Southeast Asia and academia, as actors involved in each affected outcomes in the other. It will become clear that several of the values held and propagated by the NSS reformers were aptly represented among student

---

<sup>149</sup> Reinette Porter, “The Newspaper in the Classroom – A Detailed Unit on Propaganda,” course outline, University of California, Los Angeles, 1962, folder “Newspapers UCLA Workshop, Secondary Soc. St. Classes – Teacher’s Guide 7/29-8/10/62,” box 109, NCSS, p. 4.

<sup>150</sup> “Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher,” 1967, p. 2.

protestors and enjoyed considerable power and influence in the debate on Vietnam. These included a thorough questioning, even a rejection, of the merits of American patriotism and a sympathy for alternative viewpoints.

On 7 August 1964, the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was passed by Congress as a response to a televised request by President Lyndon B. Johnson, to authorize U.S. military presence in Indochina, a region torn apart by tense civil strife following the prolonged conflict between French colonialists and Vietnamese nationalists that ended in French surrender in the first Indochina War in 1954. Johnson decided this intervention was his nation's duty as the global "guardians at the gate," because there was allegedly "no one else" that could offer the free world the same power and protection against communism, which was stirring with the rising success of the communist, Chinese-backed coalition, Vietminh, led by a determined Ho Chi Minh in North Vietnam.<sup>151</sup> Johnson had little idea of what the repercussions of his decision to intensify military involvement in the South Vietnamese war effort would be in the domestic arena. His announcement of U.S. airstrikes against North Vietnam shook 'doves,' or antiwar critics, around the country. For fear of a bitter storm of critique, Johnson initially concealed the extent of American involvement and several details of combat from the public – increasing the use of covert operations and surveillance while denying any intention to start a "ground war."<sup>152</sup>

Such policies and behavior assisted in the formation of an undeniable credibility gap among the American youth, especially those of draft-age, who felt betrayed by the Democratic president and appalled that a nation as militarily powerful as the United States would use such force against a small and weak third-world nation. Although many of the most vociferous critics of Johnson's policies dwelled on the nation's university campuses, Johnson initially showed little consideration for student activists. In 1965, he even confided in George Ball from the State Department that the real opinions to worry about were those of critics on the right who

---

<sup>151</sup> Lyndon B. Johnson, "The President's News Conference of July 28, 1965," *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965*, book 2: *June 1 to December 31*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 127; American manpower commitment would rise from 16,000 non-combat military advisors on the premises in 1963 to over half a million – mostly combat – troops by 1969. For a comprehensive guide to military statistics and Cold War government documents, see Sven F. Kraemer, *Inside the Cold War from Marx to Reagan: An Unprecedented Guide to the Roots, History, Strategies, and Key Documents of the Cold War*, (Washington: American Foreign Policy Council, 2015), esp. pp. 69-98.

<sup>152</sup> Lyndon B. Johnson, quoted in Steven M. Gillon, *The Democrats' Dilemma: Walter F. Mondale and the Liberal Legacy*, [The Contemporary American History Series], (New York: Columbia University Press, 1992), p. 90; For more about Johnson's concealment of the events of the war, see also James Deakin, "The U.S. Presidency: War's Worst Casualty," in *Hearings Before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate*, 94<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 15, 25, and 30 April 1975, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975), pp. 177-181; Gary R. Hess, *Presidential Decision for War: Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, and Iraq*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2009), esp. pp. 75-112.

complained of a too soft approach to the war: “Don’t pay attention to what those little shits on the campuses do. The great beast is the reactionary elements in the country. Those are the people that we have to fear.”<sup>153</sup> Both Johnson’s and Nixon’s terms, however, would witness persistent and augmenting waves of massive ‘teach-ins,’ ‘sit-ins,’ demonstrations, and symbolic burnings of draft cards and U.S. dollars – both peaceful and violent – uniting millions of students, academics, and other opponents of the war in what political reporter of the domestic politics of Vietnam, Theodore H. White, would label the “intellectual rash” that ceaselessly haunted the Democratic Party throughout the late 1960s.<sup>154</sup> Privately to an advisor, Johnson called his intellectual critics “traitors” and “sonsofbitches,” asking him, “don’t they know I’m the only President they’ve got and a war is on?”<sup>155</sup> Yet the appreciation and respect for which he had hoped only diminished as the events of the war unraveled. On 31 March 1968, a tormented Johnson announced that he would not seek reelection in November. Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, who became the renowned, student-backed, antiwar candidate for the Democratic nomination, congratulated the president’s decision, claiming that his campaign would hardly have been able to “stand up against five million college kids just shouting for peace. There was too much will-power there.”<sup>156</sup> Unlike Johnson, who tried to appease the nation’s centrists and his conservative critics, McCarthy believed that the power to win the election rested within approval from the universities.

When the Democratic National Convention (DNC) convened in Chicago to decide on the party’s new nominee for the 1968 election, police and National Guardsmen clashed with 10,000 protestors who sought to show their opposition to the Democrats’ handling of the war, ending in a violent confrontation on 28 August and several hundred arrests and injuries. Daniel Walker, who was present as an observer at the protests, described the crowd as a diverse group of “hippies... Yippies... youngsters working for a political candidate, professional people with dissenting political views, anarchists and determined revolutionaries, motorcycle gangs, black activists, young thugs... demonstrators waving the Viet Cong flag and the red flag of revolution... and... the simply curious who came to watch.”<sup>157</sup> On 7 September, Chicago’s

---

<sup>153</sup> Lyndon B. Johnson, quoted in Clark Clifford, *Counsel to the President: A Memoir*, (New York: Random House, 1991), p. 417.

<sup>154</sup> Theodore H. White, *The Making of the President – 1968*, (New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1969), p. 216.

<sup>155</sup> Lyndon B. Johnson, quoted in Robert Dallek, *Flawed Giant: Lyndon Johnson and His Times, 1961-1973*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 241.

<sup>156</sup> Eugene J. McCarthy, quoted in White, 1969, p. 125.

<sup>157</sup> Daniel Walker, *Report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), reprinted in Robert W. Winslow (ed.), *The Emergence of Deviant Minorities: Social Problems and Social Change*, (San Ramon, C.A.: Consensus Publishers, 1972), pp. 116-117.

Mayor, Richard Daley, called the president and briefed him of images of DNC protestors “lowering the American flag and burning it.”<sup>158</sup> Students and young academics were highly represented among the protestors. Rennard “Rennie” Davis, a graduate of Oberlin College in Ohio and one of the organizers of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (the “Mobe”) in Chicago, revealed the symbolic intentions of the protestors in his testimony before the HUAC in December 1968:

Our hope was that we would bring to that hearing Vietnam veterans, welfare recipients, university people, young people facing the draft, and others who in some sense represented the victims of the Johnson policies and that, while Johnson or Humphrey were being nominated inside, tens of thousands of people on the outside world would conduct this gigantic citizens’ hearing. At the same time they were to symbolically bury the coffins that stood for death of the Democratic Party.<sup>159</sup>

It is not surprising that White dubbed the year 1968 as the “year of torment” for the Democrats, and claimed that the student activists were their largest threat.<sup>160</sup>

When Republican candidate, Richard Nixon, defeated incumbent vice president, Hubert H. Humphrey, he received similar wrath from the antiwar protestors regarding his policies, despite his initial promises of “an honorable end to the war” during his election campaign.<sup>161</sup> When Nixon – in spite of waning public approval of the war – ordered the invasion of Cambodia in the spring of 1970, students felt another wave of betrayal of “bitterness and anguish” over the decision and proceeded to organize massive protests and classroom walkouts on almost 900 campuses nationwide.<sup>162</sup> On 2 May, students at Kent State University in Ohio burned down the university’s Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC). Two days later, a fatal clash between National Guardsmen and 500 Kent State protestors, some of which had allegedly thrown rocks,

---

<sup>158</sup> Lyndon B. Johnson and Richard Daley, sound recording, telephone conversation #13409, 7 September 1968, Recordings and Transcripts of Telephone Conversations and Meetings, Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library, (<http://www.discoverlbj.org/item/tel-13409>: accessed 28 May 2020).

<sup>159</sup> Rennard Cordon Davis, testimony before the HUAC, 3 December 1968, *Subversive Involvement in Disruption of 1968 Democratic Party National Convention*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968) p. 2639.

<sup>160</sup> White, 1969, p. 63.

<sup>161</sup> Richard Nixon, “Vietnam,” television campaign advertisement, Nixon-Agnew Campaign Committee, 1968, Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum, ([www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968/vietnam](http://www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968/vietnam): accessed 1 June 2020).

<sup>162</sup> Joseph Lelyveld, “Protests on Cambodia and Kent State are Joined by Many Local Schools,” *New York Times*, 6 May 1970, p. 20. For an analysis of Gallup Poll approval of the Vietnam War over time, see Hazel Erskine, “The Polls: Is War a Mistake?” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 34(1), spring 1970, pp. 134-150. In August 1965, 24 percent of Americans agreed that “the U.S. made a mistake sending troops to fight in Vietnam,” while 61 percent disagreed (p. 141). By December 1969, 52 percent agreed that “Anti-war demonstrators are right in saying the war is morally indefensible and it was a big mistake for the U.S. to be there,” while 37 percent disagreed (p. 150).

resulted in Guardsmen shooting and killing four students and wounding several others as protestors again jeered, “the whole world is watching” – and indeed, it was, through millions of television sets. Nixon responded to the burning down of the Kent State ROTC by calling the students “bums” who failed to appreciate that they were “the luckiest people in the world, going to the greatest universities” to Pentagon employees.<sup>163</sup> After the shootings, what came to be known as the ‘Kent State Massacre,’ Nixon’s response on 8 May continued to demonstrate little sympathy for the protestors: “I do know that when you do have a situation of a crowd throwing rocks, and the National Guard is called in, that there is always the chance that it will escalate into the kind of tragedy that happened at Kent State.”<sup>164</sup> On that same day, 100,000 and 150,000 protestors gathered in Washington D.C. and San Francisco, respectively, enraged over both the invasion of Cambodia and the Kent State killings.<sup>165</sup> The *New York Times* reported that the massive student strikes and protests that erupted in wake of the shootings “were either endorsed or sympathetically tolerated by school officials” of universities and even some high schools, “with rare exceptions.” The article then continued to list several institutions nationwide that had suspended classes for the week, postponed exams, or, in the case of Rutgers University in New Jersey, even terminated the ROTC courses scheduled for the following semester.<sup>166</sup> Student protestors, as members of academia, learned from their professors and mentors that it was precisely their duty to politically participate in a democracy and demonstrate their opposition to war – now “educated, they could not be blind,” wrote White on the movement.<sup>167</sup> He claimed that it was now the members of their faculty – the scientists and historians – as opposed to the government officials, who served as “vehicles of the truth” for student activists.<sup>168</sup>

This was evident in the commitment of some protestors to historical revisionism of the Cold War and even sympathy for the communist position. In January 1968, White attended a “Mobe” conference in preparation for the demonstrations in Chicago. He recalled banners hanging from the walls of the University of Chicago chapel that read “VICTORY TO THE

---

<sup>163</sup> Richard Nixon, quoted in Juan de Onis, “Nixon Puts ‘Bums’ Label on Some College Radicals,” *New York Times*, 2 May 1970, p. 1.

<sup>164</sup> Richard Nixon, “The President’s News Conference of May 8, 1970,” *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon, 1970*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 419. While some students had reportedly thrown rocks at the National Guardsmen, Tom Grace, an eyewitness who was shot in the leg, claimed in a memoir that he had not seen any of the Guardsmen actually hit by rocks but rather that the rocks “seemed to fall short of their intended targets.” He also claimed some of the Guardsmen had picked up the rocks and thrown them back. Thomas M. Grace, *Kent State: Death and Dissent in the Long Sixties*, (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016), p. 3.

<sup>165</sup> Quoted in Lelyveld, 1970, p. 20.

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>167</sup> White, 1969, p. 70.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

VIETCONG,” tables distributing literature from Hanoi and China, and a silent tribute to Ernesto “Che” Guevara to open the meeting.<sup>169</sup> Although it did not represent the majority, the expression of pro-communist and pro-Viet Cong sentiments among antiwar critics in academia was not uncommon during the most heated years of protest (ca. 1968-1972). Even before this period, however, isolated pro-communist public statements had been made not only by students but also by university staff members. At a teach-in at Rutgers on 23 April 1965, thirty-five-year old professor and historian of the American South, Eugene D. Genovese, notoriously professed, “those of you who know me know that I am a Marxist and a Socialist. Therefore... I do not fear or regret the impending Viet Cong victory in Viet Nam. I welcome it.”<sup>170</sup> The public statement turned the tenured, “very quiet and not highly conspicuous member of the department,” as described by a colleague, to a “public figure” overnight.<sup>171</sup> Genovese received harsh critique from Republican politicians who tried to mobilize the university to expel him, including former Vice President, Richard Nixon, who charged in a letter to the *New York Times* that such “demonstrations against our policy in Vietnam encourage the enemy, prolong the war and result in the deaths of American fighting men.”<sup>172</sup> These attacks were, however, in vain. Genovese maintained his position at Rutgers and also received a considerable deal of support from academic allies. Professor of political science, James Mellen from Drew University in New Jersey, for example, concluded his teach-in with about 2,000 student spectators in September 1965 declaring, “as a professed Marxist and Socialist, I do not hesitate to state my position. I stand side by side with Professor Genovese.”<sup>173</sup>

Although the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) described the antiwar movement itself as more of a “peace umbrella” of diverse groups of demonstrators than a pure student movement, the role of the “intellectual sphere” was particularly noted for its strong influence

---

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., p. 217.

<sup>170</sup> Eugene D. Genovese, quoted in Allan C. Brownfeld, “Forums for Subversive Doctrine,” *Christian Economics*, 2 November 1965, reprinted in *The New Left: Memorandum Prepared for the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary*, 90<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> session, 9 October 1968, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 167-168.

<sup>171</sup> Richard L. McCormick, interview with Michael J. Birkner, printed in Michael J. Birkner, *McCormick of Rutgers: Scholar, Teacher, Public Historian*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001), p. 79.

<sup>172</sup> Richard Nixon, “Letter to the Editor,” 27 October 1965, printed in “Nixon Explains Stand on Ousting Genovese,” *New York Times*, 29 October 1965, p. 42.

<sup>173</sup> James Mellen, quoted in *The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement: The Problem of Communist Infiltration*, staff study prepared for the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws to the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate, 89<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 22 October 1965, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 14.

and determined activity.<sup>174</sup> The CIA recognized the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC) as the “main mechanism for coordinating both domestic and foreign protest activity related to Vietnam.”<sup>175</sup> The SMC was responsible for organizing some of the largest nationwide protests, such as the Moratorium to End the Vietnam War on 15 October 1969, which brought over 250,000 to march in the nation’s capital, and another Moratorium March one month later on 15 November, attended by an estimation of 500,000.<sup>176</sup> Nixon was aware of the growing influence of student protestors. Three weeks after the first Moratorium March, on 3 November 1969, he delivered a notorious address in which he charged that the “energy and dedication” of the nation’s young people had decayed “into bitter hatred against those responsible for the war.” Despite this contempt and the cries of the supposed “minority” of Americans who favored an immediate withdrawal of troops from Vietnam, Nixon declared plainly that he would not adhere to these demands, but rather to the wishes of the “silent majority” that preferred the “Vietnamization” approach of training and equipping the South Vietnamese forces until they were strong enough to fight the Vietcong themselves.<sup>177</sup> Despite the indifference he outwardly displayed toward the demands of dissenters, the peace movement deeply troubled Nixon and he made a remarkable effort to have the CIA, the FBI, and the National Security Administration (NSA) closely monitor its activities and intercept the phone calls of its leaders to gather information that could weaken its influence.<sup>178</sup>

Another notable and impressively outspoken group of young peace activists who blatantly rejected the inherent goodness of American military might was a portion of the Vietnam veterans themselves. The growing emotions of shame, hatred, and denial among veterans were made painfully clear to the public by a twenty-seven-year old John F. Kerry, Yale

---

<sup>174</sup> Quoted in Charles DeBenedetti, “A CIA Analysis of the Anti-Vietnam War Movement: October 1967,” *Peace and Social Change*, 9(1), spring 1983, p. 36.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37.

<sup>176</sup> Mobe organizers claimed, however, that the ‘Second Moratorium March’ had brought together “two Woodstocks” (which would have amounted to approximately 800,000 participants). Quoted in A. J. Langguth, *Our Vietnam: The War 1954-1975*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), p. 555. For participant statistics see also Michael Clodfelter, *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Encyclopedia of Casualty and Other Figures, 1492-2015*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co. Publishers, 2017), esp. pp. 708-713.

<sup>177</sup> Richard Nixon, “Address to the Nation on the War in Vietnam,” 3 November 1969, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon, 1969*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 909.

<sup>178</sup> For more on Nixon’s attempts to monitor the leaders and allies of the peace movement and the movement’s influence on his handling of the war, see Daniel Farber, “Introduction,” Daniel Farber (ed.), *Security v. Liberty: Conflicts Between Civil Liberties and National Security in American History*, (New York: Russell Sage, 2008), pp. 1-26; Paul G. Pierpaoli Jr., “CHAOS, Operation (1967-1973),” in Jan Goldman (ed.), *The Central Intelligence Agency: An Encyclopedia of Covert Ops, Intelligence Gathering, and Spies*, vol. 2: *Documents*, (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2015), pp. 62-63; Katherine Scott, “Nixon and Dissent,” in Melvin Small (ed.), *A Companion to Richard Nixon*, (New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), pp. 311-327; Melvin Small, “Influencing the Decision Makers: The Vietnam Experience,” *Journal of Peace Research*, 24(2), June 1987, pp. 185-198.

University graduate and decorated member of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW), who testified before the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee on 22 April 1971, demanding – not respect or compensation – but an “immediate withdrawal from South Vietnam.” “The country doesn’t know it yet,” he warned, “but it has created a monster, a monster in the forms of millions of men who have been taught to deal and to trade in violence and who are given the chance to die for the biggest nothing in history.” He spoke of incidents of murder, rape, and genital mutilation committed by U.S. soldiers, and of the ravaging of Vietnamese villages and food stocks driven by racist revulsion. He accused the United States of an unwillingness to face the reality of the inhumanity committed by its military due to a reluctance to give up its image of benevolence. Referring to the Mỹ Lai Massacre of March 1968, during which U.S. troops brutally killed unarmed civilians in a small, South Vietnamese village, Kerry charged: “We rationalized destroying villages in order to save them. We saw America lose her sense of morality as she accepted very coolly a Mỹ Lai and refused to give up the image of American soldiers who hand out chocolate bars and chewing gum.” Refuting this image, Kerry declared, “we cannot consider ourselves America’s best men when we are ashamed of and hated for what we were called on to do in Southeast Asia.”<sup>179</sup> One of the journalists covering Kerry’s testimony recalled how Kerry’s speech had transformed him from a moderate hawk to a firmly convinced dove: “That day, Kerry pushed me (and many other Americans) over the brink.”<sup>180</sup> Kerry also drew critique from conservatives like writer and founder of the *National Review*, William F. Buckley Jr., whose commencement address before the U.S. Military Academy at West Point on 8 June 1971 denounced the antiwar testimony as the “indictment of an ignorant young man.”<sup>181</sup> Buckley blamed the academics for such ignorance, condemning Kerry’s rhetoric as “the crystallization of an assault upon America which has been fostered over the years by an intellectual class given over to self-doubt and self-hatred, driven by a cultural disgust with the uses to which so many people put their freedom.”<sup>182</sup>

Amid the turbulence of the times, educational reformers felt the need to further improve and adjust the reform movement in the social studies. By 1968, the course of the NSS reforms

---

<sup>179</sup> John F. Kerry, “Vietnam Veterans against the War, Speech before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,” in *Legislative Proposals Relating to the War in Southeast Asia, United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations*, 92<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 22 April 1971, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

<sup>180</sup> Marvin Kalb, “When Kerry Stormed D.C.,” *The National Interest*, 124, March/April 2013, p. 27.

<sup>181</sup> William F. Buckley Jr., “John Kerry’s America,” commencement address to the U.S. Military Academy in West Point, N.Y., 8 June 1971, reprinted in William F. Buckley Jr., *Let Us Talk of Many Things: The Collected Speeches*, (New York: Basic Books, 2008), p. 181.

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 182.

took a more explicitly political turn on its quest for relevance. Evans denotes this point in time until the movement's demise in the 1970s as the era of the "Newer Social Studies," or a period in which the objectives of the reforms sought to transform the "student as little league social scientist" into "the student as social activist."<sup>183</sup> In the context of growing protests, civil unrest, and the assassinations of President Kennedy; antiwar Democrat, Robert F. Kennedy; and Civil Rights activists, Malcolm X and Martin Luther King Jr., the social studies sought to place a larger focus on issues-centered approaches that would more strongly emphasize, for example, Black history, women's history, Latino history, and Native American history. In a persuasive 1968 *Social Education* article, professor of education, Gerald Leinwand, accused the social studies and its "inquire and discover" method of "remain[ing] detached and aloof, perhaps even alienated, from the throbbing events of our time."<sup>184</sup> The NCSS responded by adjusting their curriculum guidelines in 1971 to advance the issues-centered approach, adding objectives such as "the social studies program should be directly related to the concerns of students" and "the social studies program should deal with the real social world," underscoring "pervasive and enduring social issues," and providing "intensive and recurrent study of [diverse] cultural, racial, religious, and ethnic groups."<sup>185</sup>

This change in focus gave way to experiments like the NCSS Multiethnic Project, designed to reflect, protect, and foster the diversity of U.S. society in public schools. The NCSS confessed that while the "highly cognitive, 'structure of a discipline' approach" of the 1960s was a "much needed intellectual stimulus for the social studies," the 1970s would require "the profession to come to grips more directly with the social problems at hand and the personal concerns troubling young people and adults in every corner of this land."<sup>186</sup> Thus for a few more years, the social studies continued its rebellious journey of revising, questioning, and challenging history and truth and inviting the nation's youth to do the same.

---

<sup>183</sup> Evans, "National Security Trumps Social Progress," 2010, p. 16.

<sup>184</sup> Gerald Leinwand, "The Year of Non-Curriculum: A Proposal," *Social Education*, 32(6), October 1968, p. 542.

<sup>185</sup> Gary Manson, Anna Ochoa, Gerald Marker, and Jan Tucker, "Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines," *Social Education*, December 1971, p. 860.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 855.

## 1.2 DISMANTLING BORDERS, REVISING HISTORY: SOCIAL INQUIRY IN PRACTICE

By 1971, reformers in the field of the social studies had developed over one hundred projects, games, and simulations for the classroom, and over one hundred new textbooks.<sup>187</sup> This production continued steadily well into the 1970s. This section will scrutinize the ways in which the NSS and the events of the era marked their imprint on U.S. history textbooks of the 1960s and 1970s. Specifically, it will lay focus on how the manifestation of social inquiry in practice worked to challenge dominant war narratives of the 1950s. This was accomplished, in part, by the inclusion of primary source material – especially from persons with conflicting viewpoints. A review of Merrill’s *America Is*, for example, briefed that the book “emphasize[d] social history and a pluralistic society, including original source documents to give students a feeling for the lifestyles and beliefs of average American citizens of the time.”<sup>188</sup> Books like Scott Foresman’s *Ideas in Conflict* or American Book Company’s series, *Viewpoints in World History*, were dedicated entirely to the non-narrative presentation of diverse and conflicting opinions on various topics and historical events.<sup>189</sup> A remarkable focus on the perspective of the Other – including, if not especially, the Soviet Union – represented a groundbreaking approach to questions regarding the Cold War and other international conflicts in which the United States was involved. Houghton Mifflin’s *As Others See Us: International View of American History* was even comprised exclusively of excerpts from foreign social studies and history textbooks, including those circulated in current or former enemy nations (e.g. Soviet Union, Japan), depicting war against the United States, as well as political cartoons from these countries featuring the United States.<sup>190</sup> This tactic represented a commitment to instilling an understanding in readers that could spark interest in intergroup cooperation. Lippincott’s *The Search for Identity: Modern American History* listed “demonstrating a belief in equal rights for others regardless of race, creed, or sex” and “showing interest in cooperative solutions to social problems” as two of the “behavioral goals” that it intended to instill in students.<sup>191</sup> The emphasis on similarities between cultural or ideological opposites helped to enforce a moral economy of

---

<sup>187</sup> See Social Science Education Consortium, *Social Studies Curriculum Materials Data Book*, (Boulder, C.O.: Author, 1971).

<sup>188</sup> Judith E. Hedstrom and Frances Haley (eds.), *Social Studies Materials and Resources Data Book*, vol. 4, (Boulder, C.O.: Social Science Education Consortium, 1979), pp. 9-10.

<sup>189</sup> See Daniel Powell (ed.), *Ideas in Conflict*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1975); Bernard Feder (ed.), *Viewpoints in American History*, (New York: American Book Company, 1974).

<sup>190</sup> See Donald W. Robinson (ed.), *As Others See Us: International View of American History*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969).

<sup>191</sup> Quoted in Hedstrom and Haley, (eds.), pp. 31-32.

history education in which the United States and its institutions would no longer be blindly accepted as ‘good’ – or at least not better than its counterparts elsewhere.

Naturally, the development and distribution of new materials onto the textbook market was a gradual process. This meant, for the most part, the new trends in the social studies became visible in the late 1960s and were especially observable throughout the 1970s. Some textbooks published in the 1960s followed the formats of their predecessors, presenting the uncritically optimistic view of American history that historian, Frances Fitzgerald, had observed in her renowned 1979 study of U.S. history textbooks, *America Revised*: “Ideologically speaking, the histories of the fifties were implacable, seamless. Inside their covers, America was perfect: the greatest nation in the world, and the embodiment of democracy, freedom, and technological progress.”<sup>192</sup> This included an impeccable image of the military. Such a trend was evident in texts like Prentice Hall’s *Our Nation From its Creation*, which in its account on World War II maintained that the U.S. military had helped women and minority groups to discover themselves and achieve better opportunities, while hardly concerning itself with the hardships they faced during their service: “American women proved, too, that freedoms had not made them soft. Thousands joined the auxiliary armed services... Although most Negroes continued to be segregated in the armed forces, more and more were commissioned as officers.”<sup>193</sup> Houghton Mifflin’s *A History of the United States* similarly painted an overwhelmingly positive description of minorities’ experiences in the military, asserting plainly that “most minority groups fared better in World War II.”<sup>194</sup> Such textbooks were furthermore laden with highly emotional descriptions of American heroes and enemies – highlighting as much contrast as possible. Prentice Hall’s *Your America*, for example, explained tensions between the United States and Latin America – particularly regarding the role of the former as “policeman” of the continent – with each ‘side’s’ basic descriptive characteristics. For one, the authors pointed out the economic differences: while “we have developed our resources and attained a high standard of living,” Latin America “tended to remain poor and undeveloped.” Then there were the cultural reasons: while American “customs and ideas tend to be more like those of England,

---

<sup>192</sup> Frances Fitzgerald, *America Revised: What History Textbooks Have Taught Our Children about Their Country, and How and Why Those Textbooks Have Changed in Different Decades*, (New York: Random House, 1979), p. 11.

<sup>193</sup> Nathaniel Platt and Muriel Jean Drummond, *Our Nation from Its Creation: A Great Experiment*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966), p. 811.

<sup>194</sup> Richard C. Wade, Howard B. Wilder, and Louise C. Wade, *A History of the United States*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), p. 740.

Latin America is more like Spain.”<sup>195</sup> Latin American hostility toward the United States, according to this account, could only have been explained by jealousy and the inability to understand foreign customs – but not, for example, by the insensitivity of U.S. foreign policy given certain circumstances in Latin America. *Your America* similarly blamed the difficulties of international conflict on the cultural specificities of certain foreign cultures, such as World War II, during which “the Japanese fought stubbornly.” Ending the Japanese experience there, the authors continued with: “Our troops suffered from tropical diseases and treacherous ambushes after landing through the surf on a beach raked with machine-gun fire.”<sup>196</sup> Such textbooks drew not only cultural but also moral contrasts to explain conflict, each time making it quite clear which side was ‘correct.’ Van Nostrand’s *History of Our Republic*, for example, affirmed that American skepticism of Soviet honesty “arose from the different moral standards of the two sides,” claiming that the West “followed a moral code which forbade the breaking of a treaty,” while the “Reds” believed in the virtue of dishonesty and “defined morality as *anything which would advance the cause of Communism*. This means that the Reds felt no obligation to live up to the letter or the spirit of their treaties, but regarded it as quite moral to break any promise made to the capitalists.”<sup>197</sup> Naturally, the morally superior side of every conflict needed strong, attractive, and likable leaders. *History of Our Republic* recognized this when it introduced Dwight D. Eisenhower during his time as an army general as a “tall, light-haired man with a sunny disposition and a fetching smile.” Despite the critique he received, the authors maintained, “there was no doubt that his genius for compromises made him an invaluable reconciler of quarrels among the Allies.”<sup>198</sup>

Against a background of biased textbooks with little data to support their claims, the reformers of the 1960s and 1970s felt they had much work to do. As the scholarly influence became more apparent, the thin history book written in large print would become thicker and its font size would become smaller as it became tightly packed with more information, supplementary sources, and lists of suggested additional readings. As one of the more urgent priorities of the new curriculum developers was to encourage the discussion and consideration of various perspectives, they made extensive use of open chapter exercises – especially the critical thinking exercises. These exercises often hinted at the existence of alternative answers

---

<sup>195</sup> Vivienne Anderson and Laura M. Shufelt (eds.), *Your America*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964), p. 601.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 630.

<sup>197</sup> Leland D. Baldwin and Marry Warring (eds.), *History of Our Republic*, (Princeton, N.J.: van Nostrand, 1965), p. 780.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 684.

to the conventional, one-sided solutions that had until now been prevalent. McGraw-Hill's textbook of the telling title, *As It Happened: A History of the United States*, authored by Sellers from Berkeley, for example, concluded its section on World War II with provocative questions related to Japanese imperialism in Asia. In the search for alternative – perhaps even controversial – answers, Sellers supplemented his account with statements made by Japanese leaders who claimed that the United States had placed Japan under harsh economic pressure during World War II, continuing to add that “the Roosevelt Administration did in fact place strict embargos on strategic materials, especially oil, to Japan in 1940 and 1941. At the same time, the United States continued such shipments to China and Great Britain, against whom Japan was fighting.” Sellers then asked students: “Do the Japanese have a legitimate complaint?” The exercise subsequently continued to draw comparisons between Japanese and American imperialism:

The Japanese also criticize the United States for trying to “maintain and strengthen...its dominant position” in Asia. In point of fact the United States had claimed the Hawaiian Islands, established its colony in the Philippines, had built several military bases in Asia and the Pacific, and had a powerful economic influence in China.

1. Is there any basis for the contention that Asians have had to sacrifice themselves to non-Asian exploitation for decades?
2. Did the Japanese have any right to declare an Asia for the Asians doctrine and then try to dominate Asia themselves? Is the Monroe Doctrine basically a claim of America for the Americans? Are the two positions more similar or different?

Finally, Sellers reminded his readers that a true historian, or “critic... should never accept official government explanations without reservation. This refers to the statements of his own country as well as those of others. The historian in his role of critic has a personal duty to look at all sides of a historical event in order to determine the truth.”<sup>199</sup> Sellers wrote that the transmission of skills needed for independent historical investigation to students was his ultimate goal in writing *As It Happened* in 1975. In its preface, Sellers described the book as a history composed of diverse first-hand accounts and underlined the student's role in analyzing these sources:

Each is a piece of history, as seen through the eyes of the person who lived it. In the readings and author commentary, you will encounter the situations and problems that citizens of the

---

<sup>199</sup> Charles G. Sellers, *As It Happened: A History of the United States*, annotated teacher's ed., (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975), p. 703.

United States have faced in the past. As It Happened will help you learn to form hypotheses and develop answers to explain why people acted as they did to shape the country. You will form your own interpretation of the past. In a very real sense, this book is incomplete. The material is here, but your participation is necessary to bring it together and make it work.<sup>200</sup>

Employing an approach based on the validity of multiple perspectives meant that many new textbooks – while never explicitly *endorsing* communism as an ideology – dared to offer insight into the communist take on the Cold War and often refrained from naming the Soviet Union as the sole, imperialist aggressor in the conflict. Harper & Row’s *A Short History of the American Nation*, for example, while quite unambiguously positioning itself as anticommunist in 1977, admitted to the overwhelming support the Maoist government enjoyed in China and criticized the initial attempts of the United States to intervene:

...American intervention in the civil war would unquestionably have alienated the Chinese people, who were fed up with foreign meddling in their affairs. That any action could have prevented the loss of China is unlikely, given the unpopularity of Chiang’s government and the ruthless zeal of the Chinese communists. Probably the United States gave the nationalists too much aid rather than too little. A hands-off policy might have tempered Mao’s resentment. Such a policy was also impracticable, considering the hostility of Americans to communism in the midst of the Cold War.<sup>201</sup>

While the Chinese communists were described here as “ruthless,” the Americans were portrayed as similarly hostile toward their ideological opposite. The text also illuminated that Mao’s “resentment” toward the United States most likely stemmed, at least in part, from a frustration with American intervention in Chinese affairs, and was thus, to some extent, understandable.

Many books, such as Addison-Wesley’s *An American History*, mentioned key points of the ‘revisionist’ critique of the Cold War in 1976, which postulated that the United States was “at least as responsible as the Soviet Union” for the events of the conflict, and that it *also* sought economic hegemony on a global scale: through the proliferation of international trade, cheap labor, and forced access to the natural resources of developing nations.<sup>202</sup> The event of Soviet expansionism was moreover placed into historical perspective rather than simply denounced as

---

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., p. xi.

<sup>201</sup> John A. Garraty, *A Short History of the American Nation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), p. 461.

<sup>202</sup> Rebecca Brooks Gruver, *An American History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley, 1976), p. 909.

an evil attempt at world domination. One teacher's guide to Scott Foresman's *Promise of America* even encouraged instructors to inform students about the history of the "communist experience" before asking them to contemplate on the validity of Soviet military conquests in Eastern Europe:

The narrative in the text explains the Soviet presence in Eastern Europe from both the Soviet and the American points of view. Students can read the question on page 107 first and then read the narrative to find answers to the question. The narrative does not discuss the Soviet people, the land, the literature, or the communist experience. You may wish to supplement the narrative with background material on the Soviet Union.<sup>203</sup>

In Holt, Rinehart and Winston's 1968 publication, *The Shaping of Western Society: An Inquiry Approach*, Fenton and Good extensively explored the roots of communist ideology in the Soviet Union using excerpts of texts written by influential communist thinkers and accounts affording insight into Russia's imperial past and "the habits and traditions of the Russian people."<sup>204</sup> These textbooks strove to provide a better understanding of the specific circumstances that led communist sympathizers to hold the beliefs they had. *History of Our Republic* suggested in 1965 that a lack of such understanding constitutes the very *root* of hostility, using the example of U.S. military force against socialist-friendly regimes in Latin America. "This was, unfortunately, a failure to understand certain Latin American problems," the authors argued, as there were many reasons that Latin Americans "granted their governments so much power over the economy." One of these included safety, as it was "dangerous (in a country with authoritarian traditions) to permit the rise of a group of great enterprisers who would not hesitate to take over the country and thwart the aspirations of the people for democratic and economic rights."<sup>205</sup> Here, the authors put forth that the American-style free market economy was far from applicable in all circumstances, but rather failed in different contexts for various valid reasons. Other reasons for such discrepancies in economic systems concerned conceptions of morality. Many textbooks, true to their commitment to relativist approaches, suggested that the United States and the Soviet Union held two different, yet equally valid, *types* of moralities – rejecting the presumption that the United States

---

<sup>203</sup> Larry Cuban and Philip Roden, *Promise of America* [Scott Foresman Spectra Program], vol. 1: *Teacher Tactics*, (Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1971), p. 103.

<sup>204</sup> Edwin Fenton and John M. Good (eds.), *The Shaping of Western Society*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 344.

<sup>205</sup> Baldwin and Warring (eds.), 1965, p. 753.

represented a morally superior society while the Soviet Union did not. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich's *The National Experience* argued in 1977:

The Cold War thus became an intricate, interlocking, reciprocal process, involving authentic differences in principle, real and supposed clashes of interest, and a wide range of misunderstanding and misperception. Each superpower believed with passion that its own safety as well as world peace depended on the success of its peculiar conception of world order. Each superpower, in pursuing its own clearly expressed and ardently cherished principles, only confirmed the fear of the other that it was bent on aggression.<sup>206</sup>

It was thus the incompatibility of these two opposing ideals, as well as the unwillingness of each side to understand the arguments of the other – out of both fear and ignorance – that perpetuated the friction.

Despite their relativist approach, textbooks nevertheless predictably tended to portray certain historical actors in a more negative light, while depicting others more favorably. Senator Joseph McCarthy, a contemporary example, was an unambiguously negative personality. Detailed accounts on McCarthy's rise to power, the consequences of his accusations, and his downfall often took up several pages. While textbooks acknowledged that his anticommunist witch hunt had enjoyed considerable support from the American public, certain dislikable characteristics of his personality were continually emphasized. He was punitively described as an arrogant, "dangerous," "self-appointed leader" who rose to power by "bullying" and "unfairly accusing" innocent people on his "reckless hunt" for fame.<sup>207</sup> He used his "genius for publicity, a desire for power, and a willingness to use whatever tactics... necessary to further his goals and his own career."<sup>208</sup> Furthermore, it was highlighted that McCarthy's obsessed and ultrapatriotic ideological beliefs had caused many decent American citizens to be deprived of their rights. On the contrary, members of the peace movement against the war in Vietnam were treated in a significantly different tone. One obvious explanation for the unwavering praise they received could be that the antiwar demonstrations were either happening during the time of publication, or were a very recent historical event, as were the pain and shame of the war itself.

---

<sup>206</sup> John M. Blum, William S. McFeely, Edmund S. Morgan, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., and Kenneth M. Stampp, *The National Experience: A History of the United States*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., vol. 2, (Fort Worth, T.X.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), p. 717.

<sup>207</sup> In order of appearance: Gruver, 1976, p. 930; John Edward Wiltz, *The Search for Identity: Modern American History*, (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1978), p. 656; William B. Frost, James A. Brown, Ralph Adams Ellis, and David M. Fink, *A History of the United States: The Evolution of a Free People*, (Chicago: Follett, 1969), p. 603; Jack Abramowitz, *American History* [Follett Social Studies Program], 5<sup>th</sup> ed., (Chicago: Follett, 1979), p. 576; Allen Weinstein and R. Jackson Wilson (eds.), *Freedom and Crisis: An American History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., vol. 2, (New York: Random House, 1978), p. 810.

<sup>208</sup> Gruver, 1976, p. 923.

Most textbooks since the early 1970s tended to commend the achievements of the antiwar movement, exemplified clearly in the following excerpt from *An American History*'s three-page account on the movement, "a significant social phenomenon":

Within the United States, the peace movement succeeded in making Vietnam and domestic protest the dominant issue in the election of 1968. Antiwar activism was largely responsible for forcing President Johnson out of office, and the nation was made to confront the fact that the 'national consensus' of 1964 was completely shattered. In only nine years America had lost its traditional optimism and faced with deep internal division a host of unsolved foreign and domestic problems.<sup>209</sup>

Apart from helping bring an end to the war, the activists, most importantly, held a mirror up to American society and forced it to admit to its faults. The protests were thus described as a sign of the nation's "emerging consciousness."<sup>210</sup> Peace activists were accordingly portrayed predominantly as virtuous citizens who demonstrated a steadfast commitment to their ideals: "free speech, equality of opportunity, world peace, and individual freedom."<sup>211</sup> They were also depicted using images of peaceful protests in Washington – their story, however, not devoid of violence. Almost every textbook examined featured at least one image, normally large in size, displaying unarmed student protestors being attacked either by the police or National Guardsmen, principally during the police riots at the DNC in Chicago or the Kent State Massacre. *An American History* further emphasized in the text that when students were fired at by the National Guard at Kent State University, "none had weapons on them. At least three of the dead students had probably been observers. It seems that the troops had overreacted since tear gas, which was in their possession, was never used."<sup>212</sup> Both the images and descriptions used to reconstruct these attacks demonstrated a partiality to the cause of the demonstrators and a critique of the actions of the police and Guardsmen. This approval of demonstrations points to a rather critical position in most textbooks on the Vietnam War itself.

---

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., pp. 986, 988.

<sup>210</sup> Blum, McFeely, Morgan, Schlesinger, and Stamp, 1977, p. 787.

<sup>211</sup> Weinstein and Jackson Wilson (eds.), 1978, p. 870.

<sup>212</sup> Gruver, 1976, p. 1008.

### 1.3 HEARING THE OTHER: COMPASSION AND EMPATHY IN WAR NARRATIVES

As previously discussed, another innovative aspect of the NSS was its emphasis on the student's development of informed opinions and values, and on the ability to adeptly share these opinions with others. The presentation of all possible arguments and the identification of the sources of one's own feelings were prerequisites for such a discussion culture. Introducing his chapter on "The United States and the World" in *As It Happened*, Sellers declared that his readers will learn to "demonstrate an understanding of the influence of their own system of values on how they interpret foreign-policy data by correctly identifying appropriate statements in their written and oral presentations as expressions of value judgments."<sup>213</sup> Teacher's guides strictly emphasized the reduction of teacher influence on classroom discussions when it came to student opinions. One teacher's guide to Holt, Rinehart and Winston's *A New History of the United States: An Inquiry Approach*, for example, featured the discussion exercise in 1975: "Do you think that the United States should have diplomatic and trade relations with a nation if Americans dislike its government or internal social policies? Encourage students to present their own ideas without guiding them toward a consensus."<sup>214</sup> These manuals often included diverse viewpoints in their answer sheets to give instructors an idea of the wide range of opinions they could receive from students. Many books accentuated that the text provided was not the single source of available information. The addition of supplementary materials and sources, found in one's own research, was strongly encouraged, such as in the teacher's guide to *As It Happened*, a book which already included diverse primary sources: "You may have ideas of your own about other trends of American society and may want to collect some sources to add to the ones presented here."<sup>215</sup> Students were sometimes expected to express how they felt about certain historical events by illustrating their feelings visually or through poetry and literature. A few textbooks, targeted at lower grades, even suggested the use of songwriting or interpretive dance inspired by these feelings. *Our Nation from its Creation*, for example, asked students in 1966 to express their feelings artistically regarding various events of World War II: "Write a poem or draw a cartoon expressing your feelings about (a) the Pearl Harbor attack, (b)

---

<sup>213</sup> Sellers, 1975, p. 55.

<sup>214</sup> Irving Bartlett, *A New History of the United States: An Inquiry Approach* [Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Curriculum], teacher's guide, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975), p. 152.

<sup>215</sup> Sellers, 1975, p. 715.

the fall of Corregidor, (c) merchant seamen on the Archangel-Murmansk run, (d) the D-Day invasion, (e) blood donors, (f) black marketeers, or (g) the dropping of the atomic bomb.”<sup>216</sup>

Despite the encouragement to develop one’s own opinions and feelings, the commitment of social inquiry textbooks to the promotion of intergroup understanding and cultural relativism at times resulted in the incitement of specific emotions. This observation will be illustrated using the example of the stimulation of empathy for the Other. *Our Nation from its Creation* attempted, for example, to explain general hostility toward the United States around the world using statistics on appalling global economic inequalities.

With only six percent of the world’s population, the United States enjoys about fifty percent of the world’s wealth. Whereas the share of the average American in what the United States produces annually is about \$2,500, the capital income of the Far East is less than \$100 a year. This is true of the Middle East and Africa and much of Latin America as well.<sup>217</sup>

In other cases, textbooks used war narratives to thematize human suffering. Such narratives arguably play a significant role in the shaping of public attitudes toward a specific conflict, past or present, and the groups involved. A one-sided depiction of wartime suffering that focuses solely on national losses and casualties while omitting those of the ‘enemy’ is likely to stir up resentful feelings toward that group within a community. Contrastingly, when the direct effects of one’s own group’s offensive tactics on its opponent’s wellbeing are exposed and discussed, community members are more likely to feel compassion for that group at the expense of their sympathy for the perpetrating in-group. Birgitta Höijer states that compassion is shaped by the perception of “suffering and needs of distant others through media images and reports. Global compassion is then a moral sensibility or concern for remote strangers from different continents, cultures and societies.”<sup>218</sup> These images and reports can also thematize events in the past. Inquiry textbook displays of suffering differed, however, from ahistorical media displays of distant suffering in that they directly addressed the historicity and moral accountability for that suffering.

The authors of inquiry textbooks went to great lengths to discuss and portray the injustices committed by both the Allies and the Axis powers during World War II. The ethicality of President Truman’s decision to drop two atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki was

---

<sup>216</sup> Platt and Drummond, 1966, p. 820.

<sup>217</sup> Ibid., p. 836.

<sup>218</sup> Birgitta Höijer, “The Discourse of Global Compassion: The Audience and Media Reporting of Human Suffering,” *Media, Culture and Society*, 26(4), 2004, p. 514.

heavily questioned in critical thinking and open discussion activities. Students were often asked to imagine alternative solutions to end the war with Japan and to explain their reasoning. Images of not only the explosion but also graphic photographs of the rampant destruction in both cities enjoyed generous page space, supporting the assertion that the bombs were a “horrible weapon” that caused “terrible destruction.”<sup>219</sup> In one such moral discussion on the bombs, *History of Our Republic* pointed out in 1965 that many critics felt the use of such war tactics was as unforgivable as some of contemporary history’s most undisputed horrors: “...many people rated the indiscriminate bombing and burning of cities as crimes no more excusable than Nazi genocide. This accusation struck particularly hard at Allied policy, and with peculiar force at the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.”<sup>220</sup>

To truly communicate the suffering of the bombs’ victims, detailed descriptions of destruction were sometimes accompanied by the personal accounts of survivors. Random House’s *Freedom and Crisis*, for example, quoted the chilling recollections of a young girl who was riding the trolley in Hiroshima when the bomb struck:

At that moment my eyes were suddenly blinded by the flash of piercing light and the neighborhood was enveloped in dense smoke of a yellow color like poison gas. Instantly everything became pitch dark and you couldn’t see an inch ahead. Then a heavy and tremendously loud roar. The inside of my mouth was gritty as though I had eaten sand, and my throat hurt. I looked toward the east, and I saw an enormous black pillar of cloud following upward. “It’s all over now,” I thought.<sup>221</sup>

Not only was the bombing of Japan made into the subject of moral discussion, but even the Allied bombing of Germany was stated to have had horrible consequences. Many textbooks included photographs of devastated German cities. Follett’s *Evolution of a Free People* included such an image with the caption: “Beginning in the summer of 1943, Allied planes bombed Germany’s major cities around the clock. The raids not only crippled Germany’s industries, but also caused irreplaceable losses of historic buildings and inflicted immeasurable human suffering.”<sup>222</sup> This sympathy is telling, given that the Nazi Germans were traditionally considered the unequivocally evil enemy that needed to be destroyed at all costs, and thus hardly was their suffering thematized in conventional textbooks. Inquiry textbooks, however, depicted *all* human suffering as regrettable, regardless of the identity of the victim.

---

<sup>219</sup> Blum, McFeely, Morgan, Schlesinger, and Stamp, 1977, p. 707; Wade, Wilder, and Wade, 1966, p. 443.

<sup>220</sup> Baldwin and Warring (eds.), 1965, p. 701.

<sup>221</sup> Quoted in Weinstein and Wilson, 1978, p. 771.

<sup>222</sup> Frost, Brown, Ellis, and Fink, 1969, p. 569.

The questioning of American ruthlessness in times of war was not restricted to the use of weaponry. The internment of Japanese-Americans on the West Coast following the Pearl Harbor attack was another injustice of World War II that was scrutinized at length. Reconstructions of the systematic incarceration of over 110,000 individuals often included descriptions of the sinister camps, “surrounded by armed guards and barbed wire,” and quotes from individuals who experienced the oppression firsthand.<sup>223</sup> *Search for Identity* explained in a subsection titled “Hostility against Japanese-Americans” that many Japanese felt “angry and hurt over such mistreatment,” causing some of them to renounce their American citizenship.<sup>224</sup> Follett’s *An American History* included this excerpt from a full-page personal account titled “A Japanese American Remembers” in 1979:

I really didn’t know what was going on. But I remember my dad saying at mealtime that night: “They may take me, they may take Mom, but remember you are American citizens. They can’t do these things to you, and whatever happens to any of us, this is our family home.” We left San Jose on big trains and were taken to Santa Anita, a racetrack in southern California. We were fortunate in that we didn’t get placed in one of the horse stables. They tried to keep friends and families together as much as they could. To show their loyalty, the Japanese Americans at Santa Anita made camouflage nets for use by the troops. From Santa Anita we went to a camp in Wyoming. These camps had barbed wire, guard towers, and searchlights.<sup>225</sup>

Although the victim recalled that the American troops tried to keep families together as much as possible, the speaker’s father’s warning: “They can’t do these things to you” (given the speaker’s American citizenship), reminded his son and the reader later on that the United States had committed a dire violation of the civil and human rights of tens of thousands of U.S. citizens on the home front. Laidlaw’s *United States History for High Schools* made this point blatant in its 1966 chapter exercise: “How were the liberties of Japanese-Americans violated?”<sup>226</sup> *America Is* criticized in 1978 that despite this breach of rights, “full repayment... was never made.”<sup>227</sup>

The recent wars in Korea and Vietnam were examined through a particularly critical lens. “The Korean War caused many deaths and great damage. More than a million civilian

---

<sup>223</sup> Henry N. Drewry, Thomas O’Connor, and Frank Freidel, *America Is*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., (Columbus, O.H.: Merrill, 1978), p. 451.

<sup>224</sup> Wiltz, 1978, p. 598.

<sup>225</sup> Quoted in Abramowitz, 1979, p. 551.

<sup>226</sup> Boyd C. Shafer, Richard A. McLemore, and Everett Augspurger, *United States History for High Schools*, (River Forest, I.L.: Laidlaw, 1966), p. 625.

<sup>227</sup> Drewry, O’Connor, and Freidel, 1978, p. 451.

men, women, and children of Korea were killed. Several million lost their homes. The armed forces also lost heavily. The U.S. alone had more than 33,000 dead and more than 100,000 wounded,” reported Scholastic’s *American Adventures*.<sup>228</sup> These human losses revealed themselves to be even more frustrating when textbook authors indicated that they essentially occurred in vain, as the United States had ultimately failed in its goal to unify Korea: “After the American people had lost thirty-three thousand lives and spent \$22 billion, the Korean situation returned to what it had been before the war,” rebuked *An American History*.<sup>229</sup> *History of Our Republic* added that then Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson, had not even “consider[ed] Korea vital to our defense.”<sup>230</sup> The Vietnam War, however, was awarded significantly more attention in textbooks than the Korean War. Although both sides of the conflict in Vietnam were charged with having killed and wounded many civilians, vivid descriptions of the devastation of Vietnamese vegetation and villages directly attributed blame to the U.S. military, as Sellers unrelentingly reminded his readers:

The land also suffered from this war. At the end of the American bombing campaign, there were almost thirty million bomb craters in South Vietnam, each 20 to 30 feet deep and 30 to 40 feet across. These craters rendered croplands unusable and provided breeding grounds for malarial mosquitoes. In order to deny NLF and North Vietnamese troops sanctuary and ground cover, the United States destroyed vegetation by the use of herbicides and Rome plows – giant blades mounted in front of bulldozers. One acre in six in South Vietnam had been sprayed before the herbicide program was discontinued in 1971. In mountain areas, whole forests simply died, and were overrun by tough scrub and hardy grasses. Peasants returning to their villages years after spraying found it difficult if not impossible to grow rice and vegetables in the poisoned ground.<sup>231</sup>

Here it was stressed that the destruction of land caused by U.S. troops had a direct correlation to human suffering. *A Short History of the American Nation*, which in 1977 featured shocking images of the jungle before and after defoliation, mentioned that the use of such chemicals, as well as the “direct killing of civilians by American troops,” were the main reasons for the vociferous critique of President Johnson on the home front.<sup>232</sup> The mentions of Vietnamese noncombat casualties and staggering death tolls were sometimes accompanied by images that afforded a glimpse into the suffering endured by Vietnamese civilians, such as photographs of

---

<sup>228</sup> Ira Peck, Steven Jantzen, and Daniel Rosen, *American Adventures*, (New York: Scholastic, 1979), p. 567.

<sup>229</sup> Gruver, 1976, p. 943.

<sup>230</sup> Baldwin and Warring, 1965, p. 737.

<sup>231</sup> Sellers, 1975, p. 801.

<sup>232</sup> Garraty, 1977, p. 509.

refugees forced to flee battles in their villages, or of women and children crying, mourning the loss of their family members. The focus on graphic eyewitness accounts and civilian losses removed the impacts of war from a purely political context to assign a face to the casualties and unveil the enemy as a relatable, vulnerable human being just like the readers themselves. This tactic raised the morality of war violence, in general, to question.

Raw accounts of violence and destruction and the arousal of empathy served another purpose: they encouraged the questioning of the virtue of national pride and the blind support of one's own government in times of war. *The National Experience*, for example, provocatively claimed in 1977 that U.S. actions in the Vietnam War had proven that the United States, in actuality, failed to live up to its virtuous ideals:

The war killed at least 1.5 million Indochinese and turned a third of the population into refugees. The 6.7 million tons of bombs dropped by American planes left the landscape seared with craters. Defoliation, undertaken to deprive the Viet Cong of forest cover, affected one-third of the forest area of South Vietnam and destroyed perhaps half the country's mangrove forests. The indiscriminate use of chemical herbicides and giant bulldozers led to talk of 'ecocide' – the crime of destroying the natural environment. President Marcos of the Philippines spoke for many Asians when he said in 1971, "Heaven forbid that the U.S. should duplicate what it has done in South Vietnam if the war should come to our country."... America's myth of itself as a benevolent, wise, and invincibly powerful nation perished in the jungles of Indochina... Most Americans believed that America had extended its power around the planet in order to protect free nations from communist aggression. But the shock of Vietnam put the situation in a chilling new light. In the course of twenty-five years, it now seemed, America had established an empire of its own.<sup>233</sup>

The tale of America's good intentions of helping South Vietnam was rejected completely in favor of a theory that observed the United States as an imperialist nation with a quest to conquer the globe. Sellers similarly forced his readers to ask themselves: "Based on your interpretation of this unit, has the history of American foreign policy been consistent with the principles put forward in the Declaration of Independence? Defend your answer."<sup>234</sup> As soon as textbooks started making sense of the conflict in Vietnam as early as the late 1960s, they generally denounced the war as an intrusive "insurrection against the government supported by or acquiesced in by a majority of the South Vietnamese people."<sup>235</sup> This public support among the

---

<sup>233</sup> Blum, McFeely, Morgan, Schlesinger, and Stamp, 1977, p. 798.

<sup>234</sup> Sellers, 1975, p. 55.

<sup>235</sup> Gruver, 1976, p. 986.

Vietnamese was understood, furthermore, to be very logical. *Evolution of a Free People* explained in 1969 that under the Viet Cong, farmers lived rent-free on their farms in exchange for their rice and services. “When the Viet Cong were driven out, the owners reclaimed their property and the right to exact payment from the farmers. It is easy to understand why many farmers were less than enthused about their liberation.”<sup>236</sup>

Textbooks also included photographs of U.S. soldiers on the battlefield, often facing extremely difficult situations in the jungle and appearing all but heroic. While World War II, on the other hand, was commonly understood to have been a decisive and uncontroversial Allied victory, *Freedom and Crisis* even criticized the American use of war propaganda to boost morale and “patriotic sentiments” by “stirring up hatred toward the enemy, Germans and Japanese. Seldom did it assert any positive American war goals.”<sup>237</sup> Here, a direct association between propaganda, pride, and hatred for the enemy was explicitly laid out, which in turn encouraged a cautious approach to national pride. In a world of alternative moralities, there came to exist official versions of history in which the United States and its military were aggressors with blood on their hands and less than honorable episodes in their recent past. This presentation of various takes on the same, well-known stories and the push for students to develop their own takes on U.S. history, in some cases, turned out to be very much at odds with the preferences of their parents and other citizens, as Chapter 2 will discuss at length.

#### 1.4 VETERANS DAY: THE “FORGOTTEN HOLIDAY”

Academia was far from the only realm of society in which pride in the U.S. military and its endeavors began to fade, although this trend is often associated with ‘hippies’ and intellectuals. This will become clear in the following subsection, which delves into the news media to uncover parallel discourses on the U.S. military before and during the Vietnam era. The purpose of this analysis is to illustrate that the moral economy of history education is not a system which exists completely independently of other tendencies in society. It is often nurtured by a larger moral regime, and in turn – through its institutionalized creation and dissemination of official knowledge – influences and stabilizes those discourses. The nature of these larger dialogues on the military and war will be illustrated using newspaper articles on the observation of Veterans Day – a federal holiday dedicated to U.S. service members. Veterans Day in many ways

---

<sup>236</sup> Frost, Brown, Ellis, and Fink, 1969, p. 652.

<sup>237</sup> Weinstein and Wilson (eds.), 1978, p. 800.

signified *how* Americans were to commemorate their military and its members, and thus examining its observation shines light on certain aspects of a moral regime that dictates the validity of certain rituals and practices. These newspapers reveal a shift in the meaning, importance, and relevance of the military and their holiday over time, which paralleled to some extent the general increase in the questioning of military tactics and the necessity of war in the educational arena.

#### 1.4.1 A Celebration of Armistice to a Tribute to Bloodshed

When President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the first Armistice Day on 11 November 1919, exactly one year after the end of World War I, it was intended to have citizens around the world display and practice a “solemn pride in the heroism of those who died in the country’s service and... gratitude for the victory.” These practices would include large parades, special sermons in churches and synagogues marked with prayers for lasting world peace, and an official moment of silence at eleven past eleven o’clock in the morning in somber remembrance of those who lost their lives. Furthermore, he declared, Armistice Day was an “opportunity” for the nation “to show her sympathy with peace and justice.”<sup>238</sup> During and in the aftermath of World War II, however, the dream of world peace came to appear ever more distant. *The Los Angeles Times* regretted on Armistice Day 1949 that:

Armistice Day is well named. Despite the well-nigh universal hope of 1918 that it might be something more, it turned out to be only an armistice – a temporary cessation of hostilities. Since that truce abruptly ended a decade ago, we have continued to observe the date, but with increasing embarrassment... It was a day of unbounded joy and hope, perhaps the highest point of optimism which the human spirit has yet reached. It was a fragile hope, but a fine one. To our sorrow, perhaps to our shame, we no longer cherish that hope. We are older, sadder, and – we think – wiser. But we do not need another wake for the dead. If Armistice Day is to have a new meaning, let it serve to strengthen our resolve that the armistice we now have shall last longer than the one that began 31 years ago.<sup>239</sup>

The holiday did, indeed, transform to hold a new meaning. As hopes for peace were increasingly recognized as unrealistic amid Cold War tensions, memories of the truce in 1918

---

<sup>238</sup> Woodrow Wilson, “Armistice Day Proclamation,” 11 November 1919, Library of Congress, ([www.loc.gov/item/2004540423/1919-11-01/ed-1/](http://www.loc.gov/item/2004540423/1919-11-01/ed-1/); accessed 26 April 2020).

<sup>239</sup> “Another Armistice,” *Los Angeles Times*, 11 November 1949, p. A4.

also became less relevant for younger generations of Americans. The prevalence of headlines such as “Porkchop Hill on Korea Front Marks Bloody Armistice Day” further highlighted the irony of the celebration.<sup>240</sup> It was also increasingly seen as necessary to dedicate a national holiday to the veterans of all American wars: from the Spanish-American to Korea. In 1954, President Eisenhower thus proclaimed Armistice Day be changed to Veterans Day. This observance, now an exclusively American affair, would be dedicated to the “sacrifices of all those who fought so valiantly, on the seas, in the air, and on foreign shores, to preserve our heritage of freedom.”<sup>241</sup> The raw reality and inevitability of the catastrophe of war throughout the second half of the twentieth century made it clear that the commemoration of soldiers must become the greatest priority before the celebration of peace. As *The Los Angeles Times* noted decades later on Veterans Day 1989, “because wars did not end and soldiers continued to die, Armistice Day became Veterans Day, a time to remember the bloodshed of war.”<sup>242</sup>

#### 1.4.2 Who Are the Veterans?

True to the initial purpose of honoring the dead, late Armistice Day and early Veterans Day headlines most commonly referred to the occasion’s honorees as the ‘war dead.’ Veterans were occasionally referred to as ‘heroes,’ although most commonly in relation to death (e.g. as ‘fallen heroes’), whose heroism stemmed directly from the ultimate sacrifice for their country.<sup>243</sup> Veterans Day stories in the 1940s honored service members for this sacrifice and their sense of duty. In light of the unpopularity of the wars in Korea and Vietnam, however, authors of Veterans Day pieces increasingly – yet carefully – implied that this work was perhaps not so extraordinary after all. Some asserted that members of the military were far from being the only citizens affected by the horrors of war. The *New York Times*, for example, provoked on Veterans Day 1959:

Who are the veterans? Technically, they are the more than 22,000,000 Americans alive today who have served in the armed forces during wartime. These are the citizens for whose benefit, and for whose widows and children, a vast network of special aid and pension legislation has been enacted, the most recent upward revision of which took place this year. They constitute a

---

<sup>240</sup> “Porkchop Hill on Korea Front Marks Bloody Armistice Day,” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1952, p. 2.

<sup>241</sup> Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Proclamation 3071 – Veterans Day, 1954,” 12 October 1954, *Federal Register*, 19(198).

<sup>242</sup> Louis Vincent, “Remembering Armistice Day,” *Los Angeles Times*, 10 November 1989, p. B6.

<sup>243</sup> See, for example, “Peace Prayers Set Armistice Day Key in Troubled World: 5,000 March to Eternal Light for Ceremony in Honor of the City’s Fallen Heroes,” *New York Times*, 12 November 1951, p. 1.

vast segment of our population – more than one person out of every eight – but they are not the only veterans, in the broadest sense, of a modern war. Men and women ten thousand miles from a battlefield who have never donned a uniform, children not yet born, merchants and machinists, cowboys and clerks, teachers and tailors – all who live through war are touched by war and are, therefore, the victims of war... Everyone who experiences war becomes a veteran of war. The greatest brake on war is the knowledge and understanding that people the whole world over have of war – for we are all veterans.<sup>244</sup>

This piece depicted soldiers simply as everyday citizens who served in the military just as any other citizens performed their duties. The emphasis on the social benefits that service members and their families received further implied that they were already quite adequately compensated for their service. The soldier's status was humbled and his work lessened by the assertion that *all* citizens, not just service members, are veterans. Another brief *New York Times* story on Veterans Day 1961 stressed that neither are those in uniform the sole victims of war, nor are the victims exclusively American:

But while we remember those who fell in battle, we now have to remember those who were not soldiers but who, nevertheless, died in war. We have to remember the innocent civilians who perished in the bombed cities of Britain, in Berlin and other German cities and in Hiroshima and Nagasaki – and in the concentration camps.<sup>245</sup>

Statements like these diverted attention away from service members on their holiday and weakened their heroic image by putting their sacrifice on an equal footing with the hardships faced by other American civilians and even those in enemy nations who died at the hands of U.S. troops. They also prove that the increase in apathy toward the U.S. military began already *before* Johnson's initial escalation of the Vietnam War in 1964.

In 1961, Ollie Stewart of the American Legion addressed the trend of waning of patriotism in U.S. society in a three-page story in *American Legion Magazine* on the commemoration of French veterans in France – “a humane approach to their veterans that is all too often lacking here.”<sup>246</sup> Contrastingly, Robert E. L. Eaton, National Commander of the Legion, compared the American public's deficient display of pride to a deteriorating marriage in which the wife's complaints of her husband's lack of affection only worsened matters. He claimed that Americans – the “husband” – were probably “as patriotic as they ever were, but that modern sophistication has made them reluctant to display their feelings,” then assigning

---

<sup>244</sup> “We Are All Veterans,” *New York Times*, 11 November 1959, p. 34.

<sup>245</sup> “Two Minutes of Silence,” *New York Times*, 11 November 1961, p. 22.

<sup>246</sup> Ollie Stewart, “How France Remembers,” *American Legion Magazine*, August 1961, p. 14.

the Legion responsibility for rekindling these feelings by urging citizens to display flags and participate in patriotic festivities on Memorial Day, Flag Day, Independence Day, and Veterans Day. “The American flags which decorate our streets, line the entrances to our cemeteries and wave from our homes speak for themselves to our fellow citizens and to the younger generation,” he preached.<sup>247</sup> Nevertheless, the condemnation and critique of antiwar demonstrators, draft card burners, “student instigators,” and others involved in what the Legion decried as “campus disorders,” enjoyed significantly more attention in the organization’s magazine than did reports on the effects of fading patriotism on returning veterans.<sup>248</sup> Colonel Robert D. Heinl mourned the status of the returning soldier in the *Armed Forces Journal* – “distrusted, disliked, and often reviled by the public” – deploring that “the uniformed services today are places of agony for the loyal, silent professionals who doggedly hang on and try to keep the ship afloat.”<sup>249</sup>

By the late 1960s, amid the height of critique of the events in Southeast Asia, headlines referring to the honorees of Veterans Day as ‘fallen heroes’ in news stories transformed into more neutral headlines using the terms ‘veterans’ or ‘vets.’ As the pro-military enthusiasm of World War II subsided with time, the era of Korea and Vietnam witnessed a noticeable change, not only in the news coverage of Veterans Day, but in the glamor of the observances themselves. The length of such news articles decreased from full page reports on national ceremonies and local parades to small bits concisely covering the basic details of the celebrations – sometimes even lacking a photograph. Compared to the spectacles of “colorful garbed bands and strutting majorettes interspersed throughout a column of marching units and impressive memorial floats,” once boasted by the *Los Angeles Times* of a Long Beach parade in 1958, Veterans Day parades in the 1960s and 1970s suffered drastic participant losses and lack of public interest.<sup>250</sup> “A simple ceremony honored the Nation’s veterans yesterday at Arlington National Cemetery,” reported the *Washington Post* dryly in 1966, moving on to cover some details of the ceremony and other Armistice celebrations in Europe.<sup>251</sup> In some instances, mentions of Veterans Day were limited to succinct public announcements regarding the closing of public schools and banks. By 1965, as the Vietnam War emerged as a ubiquitous topic in Veterans Day articles, the antiwar protests managed to steal significant spotlight. One observes, especially in the

---

<sup>247</sup> Robert E. L. Eaton, “A Few Words on Patriotism,” *American Legion Magazine*, April 1974, p. 14.

<sup>248</sup> “Opposing Views by Congressman on the Question: Should the U.S. Continue to Assist Colleges Where Campus Disorders Exist?” *American Legion Magazine*, September 1969, p. 24.

<sup>249</sup> Colonel Robert D. Heinl, “The Collapse of the Armed Forces,” *Armed Forces Journal*, 7 June 1971, p. 30.

<sup>250</sup> “Veterans Day Events Scheduled,” *Los Angeles Times*, 9 November 1958, p. SC1.

<sup>251</sup> Claude Koprowski, “Simple Rites Honor War Dead,” *Washington Post*, 12 November 1966, p. B1.

larger, metropolitan newspapers, that the patriotic festivities were increasingly overshadowed by the outbreak of peace protests, draft card burning, and other antiwar demonstrations planned on the same day. In some cases, the Veterans Day protestors were veterans of the Vietnam War themselves, like the VVAW, who participated in Veterans Day Parades in the Bay Area in the 1970s, holding “two hundred clenched fists... in the air” and antiwar banners with phrases such as “FIGHT THE RICH, DON’T FIGHT THE WARS!”<sup>252</sup>

In November 1968, a group of college students from the University of Cincinnati who called themselves the Committee to Bring War Atrocities Home announced their plan to burn a puppy covered in homemade napalm on Veterans Day to protest American violence in Vietnam. Although the burning did not actually take place and the protestors claimed afterward that they “never did intend to burn” the animal, but rather sought to “prove that the people are more sensitive and outraged at the prospective burning of a dog than about the burning of people in Vietnam by napalm,” this incident and other similar protests successfully diverted Veterans Day attention away from the commemoration of soldiers and toward other political topics deserving attention.<sup>253</sup>

Service members received another blow to their prestige in 1971, as the federal government moved Veterans Day from 11 November to the fourth Monday of October under the Uniform Monday Holiday Act to grant government employees more free Mondays. That year, the *New York Times* reported that with 500 participants, the annual Veterans Day parade in Manhattan “was marked by its lowest turnout in years.”<sup>254</sup> *American Legion Magazine* heavily criticized the new “perfectly meaningless date,” as well, calling the switch an insult and a mere attempt to profit the travel industry:

Thirty years of pressure by the travel and resort business to create long weekends so that it could make more money ended in Congress capitulating, to create Monday holidays out of Washington’s Birthday, Memorial Day, Columbus Day and Veterans Day. And in the juggling, Veterans Day was even moved into October, for no reason that had anything to do with what it

---

<sup>252</sup> Steven Hassna, “VVAW History: San Francisco Vets Day Parade 1972,” *The Veteran*, spring 1997, 27(1), p. 8. Banner text displayed in VVAW photograph on p. 8.

<sup>253</sup> Joseph Schneider, quoted in, “Cincinnati Group Doesn’t Burn Dog,” *New York Times*, 12 November 1968, p. 30.

<sup>254</sup> Jonathan Kandell, “Only 500 Parade on Veterans Day: 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Marchers Hear Pleas for Employment,” *New York Times*, 26 October 1971, p. 20.

celebrates. Thus do the almighty buck and the passion for a few long weekends trample on tradition and ignore meaning.<sup>255</sup>

The author implied that the meaning of Veterans Day was inseparable from the date on which it was observed. The negligence of the federal government to acknowledge this meaning was thus a telling sign of veterans' impaired societal status. After years of protest, testimonies by veterans groups like the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) before Congress, and the persistence of some states to hold their ceremonies on the original date, the law was amended in 1975, moving the holiday back to the 11th of November to take effect in 1978.<sup>256</sup>

Throughout the 1970s, the military continued to struggle with its popularity. An increasing number of veterans like John Kerry and the VVAW saw the increasing effort to heroize Vietnam War veterans as a distraction away from the urgency of a final withdrawal. Yet other service members felt Vietnam veterans deserved special recognition, regardless of how the war ended. President Jimmy Carter, a veteran of the U.S. Navy, considered Vietnam veterans the country's unappreciated heroes. In 1978, he addressed the lack of respect he observed toward Vietnam veterans in his Veterans Day speech at Arlington National Cemetery:

My son Jack served in Vietnam. And although I came back from the wars as something of a hero – although I was not a hero – my son came back unappreciated, sometimes scorned by his peer group who did not join in the conflict. And I think there is a special debt of gratitude on the part of American people to those young men and women who served in Vietnam, because they have not been appreciated enough... To fight in a self-sacrificial way in Vietnam, when there was not this depth of gratitude and commitment on the part of the people back home, is an extremely difficult thing, even above and beyond the difficulty of previous wars.<sup>257</sup>

Thus the debate and discussion of veterans in the context of their day of commemoration indicates that the questioning and criticizing of the U.S. military and American goals in international conflict were not limited to university students or experts in the academic sphere, i.e. textbook authors and curriculum developers. As inferable from the newspapers observed,

---

<sup>255</sup> Robert B. Pitkin, "What's the Matter with November 11?" *American Legion Magazine*, November 1972, pp. 18-19.

<sup>256</sup> The VFW and other members of the military testified before the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations in 1974, claiming Congress had "made a mistake" in changing Veterans Day to the fourth Monday in October, as 11 November was "a day to... carry out the highest ideals of our American heritage." Francis W. Stover, quoted in *Hearings before the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate*, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> session, 3 June and 11 July 1974, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), p. 40.

<sup>257</sup> Jimmy Carter, "Veterans Day Remarks at Ceremonies at Arlington National Cemetery," 24 October 1977, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Jimmy Carter, 1977*, book 2: June 25 to December 31, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978), p. 1900.

along with the loss of prestige in schools, the military seemed to suffer a general loss of trust and devotion from the public until a few years after the official end of the Vietnam War in 1975.

### 1.5 CONCLUSION: HUMANISM OR “UNCONSCIONABLE ARROGANCE”?

Although the Vietnam era witnessed tragic war in Southeast Asia, domestic protest, assassinations, civil strife, and social injustice, it is difficult to argue that these tumultuous events constituted the initial spur for the development of a new moral economy. The fear of Soviet progress during the Sputnik era and the subsequent funding of national reforms proved that this groundbreaking value system of moral relativism and critical thinking initially spawned from the anxious patriotism of the 1950s rather than it did from the anti-traditionalist skepticism of the 1960s. It was the scholarly experts who were chosen to lead the country away from catastrophic loss in the Cold War toward educational excellence, who determined in which direction the ship was to sail. These experts – who until now had lurked primarily in their lecture halls, rarely slipping out to engage themselves with the public schools – shared a common commitment to the certain procedural values that prevailed in the humanities and social scientific disciplines in academia, such as critical thinking and respect for data.

Moral values, on the other hand, were to be examined, specified, discussed, and reevaluated in the classroom. That no value system or conception of morality is correct was the only moral value teachers were to advance. Students were to use the inquiry method to ask relevant questions, examine the data and their own beliefs, come to new conclusions, and – if necessary – alter their beliefs accordingly. Reformer and historian, Peter B. Dow, praised the short-lived reform period as having briefly cultivated “a deeper appreciation of other cultures, and a more fundamental understanding of human culture” – a remarkable intermission from the “traditional provincialism of American education” that preceded and eventually managed to defeat it.<sup>258</sup> Historian of education, Karen L. Riley, dubbed the NSS “one of the most ambitious curriculum initiatives of the twentieth century” and its developed materials “among the most innovative and creative that educators, parents, and students had access to in decades.”<sup>259</sup> It is little wonder that FitzGerald, in *America Revised*, noticed Fenton’s text, *A New History of the United States: An Inquiry Approach*, for its critical revisionism. Fenton, by uncovering “unpleasantnesses” in American history “that have barely been recorded by history texts and

---

<sup>258</sup> Dow, 1991, p. 6.

<sup>259</sup> Karen L. Riley, “Foreword,” in Stern (ed.), 2010, p. ix.

are not in general well-known,” demonstrated “that there are some limits to American power and American virtue.”<sup>260</sup> She particularly praised Seller’s *As It Happened* as one of the “most sophisticated of books” in circulation for its continuous inclusion of the perspective of foreign governments in international conflict and its questioning of “the judgement of past Presidents and Administrations.”<sup>261</sup>

Yet the movement faced obvious obstacles and demonstrated a certain amount of negligence that would eventually prompt its downfall. This downfall is said to have begun with the implementation of an anthropological project designed by Bruner and directed by Dow called Man: A Course of Study (MACOS), designed in the 1960s and taught until the mid-1970s to explore the question “What is human about human beings?” With newly developed materials, including teachers’ guides, booklets, ethnographic films, and a general shift away from reliance on the textbook, the course sought to unfold “the uniqueness of human beings as a species and the underlying similarities that unite all races, ethnic groups, and cultures,” as Dow so optimistically anticipated.<sup>262</sup> The course contents, with their roots in humanism and cultural relativism, dealt with the cultural practices of groups like the Netsilik Inuit, some of which were considered severely controversial in U.S. society, such as senicide and infanticide. It took but a few years for outrage and critique to surface, especially from conservatives, including citizens – especially parents – who felt that their values were threatened by the teaching of what they considered to be obscenities. Republican Congressman John B. Conlan from Arizona decried the anthropological project as “a dangerous assault on cherished values and attitudes concerning morals, social behavior, religion, and our unique American economic and political lifestyle.”<sup>263</sup> Conlan’s assistant, George Archibald, attended a NCSS meeting in 1976, where he stood before his adversaries and denounced the entire reform movement as a “classic example of an unrepresentative minority of educationists” gathering “to radically alter American education for the purpose of socio-economic and political change, without the approval of the people.” He called the NSS and its focus on global history and perspectives a “de-emphasizing [of] American history and our American heritage” that “completely disregard[ed] the wishes of local citizens and taxpayers.”<sup>264</sup> He then warned the Council

---

<sup>260</sup> FitzGerald, 1979, p. 140.

<sup>261</sup> Ibid., pp. 141-142.

<sup>262</sup> Peter B. Dow, quoted in John B. Conlan and Peter B. Dow, “The MACOS Controversy,” *Social Education*, October 1975, p. 389.

<sup>263</sup> John B. Conlan, quoted Conlan and Dow, 1975, p. 388.

<sup>264</sup> George H. Archibald, NCSS Wingspread Conference in Racine, W.I., 16 May 1976, folder “Wingspread Conference,” box 2, NCSS, pp. 18-20.

solemnly, “make no mistake about it: taxpayers and parents are ready to marshal every resource at their disposal to ensure that they win. And win they will.”<sup>265</sup> Archibald’s chilling threat to the NCSS foreshadowed the victory of parents over academics that was to characterize the next decade in a fierce battle between two opposing moral economies and the power over official historical narratives.

It is interesting to note that, quite early on, certain figures of the reform movement had warned precisely of the precociousness of which Archibald accused the reformers involved with the creation of MACOS. In 1962, *Social Education*’s Lewis Paul Todd asserted that “it should be obvious that no program of revision can expect to progress very far unless it has the understanding and support of a substantial body of public opinion in the community itself.”<sup>266</sup> Disregard for the community would cost the movement its success and would furthermore demonstrate faulty character: “Any single group, whether in the academic world or in the public at large, that blandly assumes it is qualified singlehandedly to formulate a social studies program adequate for the needs of today and tomorrow is guilty of unconscionable arrogance.”<sup>267</sup> Indeed, one of the aspects perceived to be the most problematic of the movement was its endorsement of cultural relativism and its rejection of any superior value system, possibly at the expense of students’ family or community values. As Evans notes paradoxically, “any school reform, despite the rhetoric of the reformers, is inevitably entwined with questions of value, endorsing a particular set of values and either minimizing or ignoring a competing set.”<sup>268</sup> Even Fenton himself recognized the limitations of teaching relativism in 1966, stating that “every teacher affects the value system of his students whether he likes it or not... Even the teacher who tries conscientiously to avoid teaching values to his students does so; the very act of avoiding indoctrination expresses a value judgment.”<sup>269</sup>

Another problematic aspect of the reforms was their prioritizing of the development of a challenging curriculum that would suit especially gifted students. Even Bruner, who himself believed students should be treated like young academics, prudently pondered on the adverse effects – or the potential “perils of success” – associated with such a curriculum. He warned that such teaching could lead to a meritocracy in which only talented children would receive a rewarding education: “The late bloomer, the early rebel, the child from an educationally

---

<sup>265</sup> Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>266</sup> Lewis Paul Todd, “Afterword: Revising the Social Studies,” in Berelson (ed.), 1962, pp. 289-290.

<sup>267</sup> Ibid., p. 291.

<sup>268</sup> Evans, *Hope for American School Reform*, 2010, p. 84.

<sup>269</sup> Edwin Fenton, “Teaching about Values in the Public Schools,” in Fenton (ed.), 1966, pp. 41-42.

indifferent home – all of them, in a full-scale meritocracy, become victims of an often senseless irreversibility of decision.”<sup>270</sup> Thus some of the NSS leaders were well aware of the consequences such a sweeping educational reform could pose.

The changes in many history textbooks as a result of the new moral economy were vast. Students of the social studies were presented with unprecedented challenges to their patriotism and socialized values. These challenges were the first attempts in the realm of education since the outbreak of the Cold War to revise the history of U.S. foreign policy in order to influence the prevalent, antagonistic attitudes toward the Soviet Union and other communist and socialist nations. The reformers believed that the Cold War could only be brought to an end through diplomacy and mutual understanding, rather than competition and the display of military strength. Textbooks revealed the latter to have been exploited not only by the communists, but also the United States. One of the ways authors achieved this disclosure was by publishing firsthand war stories told by America’s enemies – some political leaders, others ordinary civilians. The inclusion of these experiences was thought to arouse empathy for the Other by assigning a human face to the victims of U.S. military tactics abroad and exposing these campaigns to have, at times, been inhumane and questionable. Apart from primary sources, data on casualties and the magnitude of destruction caused by combat assisted in making the losses and consequences of war – not only for ‘us,’ but for the Other – more tangible to readers.

Thus at times, the empathy textbooks sought to provoke was at odds with national pride and pride in the military. Some revised narratives depicted the U.S. military as an institution guided by ignorance, which failed to understand that an American-style free market economy was unfit and even harmful under certain political and cultural circumstances. The recent conflict in Southeast Asia had very likely contributed to the critical stance on the military at war that we observe in many textbooks. The antiwar movement, especially student activism, was in many cases met with sympathy by universities and even some high schools. Textbook authors similarly tended to implicitly approve of the antiwar protests and denounce the violence used by the authorities against demonstrators. Though critical thinking and cultural relativism was on the NSS agenda for several years before the Americanization of the Vietnam War in 1964, the events of the conflict and the vociferous critique of the regime and the military at home had likely allowed for such values in the social studies to be more widely accepted by schools and teachers than if the military had maintained the benevolent image it enjoyed immediately after World War II. The tone and content of Veterans Day newspaper articles

---

<sup>270</sup> Bruner, 1961, p. 77.

unveil that the esteem of the U.S. soldier and military suffered greatly throughout the 1960s and 1970s due to a skepticism in society that began as early as the late 1950s. Hence there is reason to believe that the Vietnam War was not the only catalyst for this trend. Not only did the reported observances undergo a significant loss in participants and spectator enthusiasm, but the newspapers themselves – principally the larger, metropolitan papers – dedicated less stories and page space to the observances during this time than they did in the immediate years following the end of World War II. Stories on protests and opposition to the war came to eventually overshadow the reporting of festivities and parades. Thus during this period, the military had not only to battle with the moral questioning of its actions overseas but also with a lack of perceived relevance in society, in general.

There is no feasible possibility to measure the ‘success’ of NSS programs, as measured, for example, by a change in student attitudes and behavior regarding social issues. There is similarly little research on the reach of these programs. There is ample reason to believe, however, that the new curricula and teaching methods had not reached every corner of the country. One 1979 study based on three NSF-funded social studies projects estimated that between 10 and 25 percent of the country’s classrooms had implemented at least one of the projects.<sup>271</sup> Another study conducted in 1973 on social studies classrooms specifically in Kansas and Missouri concluded that the NSS curricula had reached “only a minority of social studies teachers” in these states, as measured by teacher familiarity with new projects.<sup>272</sup> These results appear plausible considering the little attention curriculum developers paid to the social realities and importance of traditional (particularly family and Christian) values in rural areas. Chapter 2 will analyze the consequences of this failure to develop a plan of action in the event of strong, local opposition to the reforms – specifically the vicious textbook wars it prompted – and the parameters of the new moral economy of history education that emerged as a result. This resulting moral economy based on the dissemination of national pride over intergroup understanding was not independent from, but rather positioned itself as ideologically opposite to, the guiding principles of the NSS. These principles in social studies education became ever more difficult to defend by the time a general patriotic fervor swept over society of the 1980s. The strength and success of this resistance and change proves that the immediate post-Sputnik

---

<sup>271</sup> James P. Shaver, O. L. Davis, and Suzanne W. Helburn, “The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions from Three NSF Studies,” *Social Education*, 43(2), 1979, pp. 150-154.

<sup>272</sup> John Guenther and Wayne Dumas, “Teacher Familiarity with and Use of Project Social Studies Materials in the Midwest,” *Educational Leadership*, 30(7), April 1973, p. 643.

course of action was relatively short-lived and ultimately came to hold less influence in the realm of history education than expected by those involved in its creation.

## Late Cold War Anxiety and “New Stirrings of Patriotism”: Absolute Morality and the Benevolent Superpower

*What passes for identity in America is a series of myths about one's heroic ancestors. –*  
James Baldwin<sup>273</sup>

---

The turbulent events of the 1960s and 1970s had left many in the United States questioning their belief in American goodness. By the late 1970s, however, this general trend in attitudes began to shift. On 11 December 1979, about one month after American diplomats were taken hostage at the U.S. embassy in the Iranian capital of Tehran, the *New York Times* warned of “signs that Americans are expressing the strong feelings of nationalism that some believed had been submerged after Vietnam.”<sup>274</sup> Journalist Wendell Rawls Jr. suspected this nationalistic surge to have been born from the strong emotions surrounding the hostage crisis, and quoted prominent radio host, Larry King, who claimed:

There was very little nationalism or patriotism evident in the callers before Nov. 4... Malaise may even be the right word to describe the public attitude. But the Iranian crisis united people with a purpose. The flag and patriotism became important again. There was not much feeling expressed in favor of going to war over it, but people want some kind of revenge.<sup>275</sup>

The extent to which the revival of patriotic feelings in the 1980s truly owed itself to the heat of the Iranian hostage crisis is immeasurable. If patriotism was, in fact, heightened by the event, it did not stop there – and as this chapter will demonstrate, it did not necessarily start there, either. The feelings felt by Americans in response to the Iranian hostage crisis were arguably fueled by a larger passion belonging to a desperate search for a national identity (and contra-identities) that would replace an image tainted by political corruption, internal division, and military failure.

---

<sup>273</sup> James Baldwin, “A Talk to Teachers,” *Saturday Review*, 21 December 1963, reprinted in James Baldwin, *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Non-Fiction, 1948-1985*, (New York: Saint Martin's Press, 1985), p. 330.

<sup>274</sup> Wendell Rawls Jr., “In Iran Crisis, ‘Patriotism Became Important Again,’” *New York Times*, 11 December 1979, p. 20.

<sup>275</sup> Larry King, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 20.

This corresponded to a search for a new moral economy of history education in the educational realm. American culture and politics of the 1980s were said to be characterized by a so-called ‘patriotic resurgence,’ or what the *New York Times* in 1981 called a “general resurgence of political conservatism and patriotic fervor.”<sup>276</sup> “New stirrings of patriotism,” as journalist R. W. Apple Jr. observed, seeped into all realms of society from popular music, to foreign policy, to educational reform.<sup>277</sup> Perhaps unsurprisingly, the latter manifested itself most strongly in the teaching of history in schools. The strong emphasis on patriotic feelings across various spheres of society represented the ideological basis for the development of the new and powerful moral economy of history education that will serve as the focus of this chapter. This new moral economy would reject the premises of the moral and cultural relativism and global thinking that served as a foundation for the moral economy of the 1960s and 1970s. This vehement abolition was made possible by a remarkable fusion of interests between unlikely collaborators. Christian fundamentalists, corporate activists, and political conservatives, alike, united themselves under one goal throughout the 1970s: to abolish ‘new histories’ by changing textbooks, bringing patriotism back into public school education, and reestablishing ‘traditional’ methods of history teaching. This traditionalism favored the dictation and memorization of facts over the stimulation of critical thinking, but also the strict separation of various school subjects over interdisciplinary approaches – thus rejecting the very idea of the social studies as such. The U.S. history textbooks of the late Cold War came to reflect the mood of the period – presenting altered, morally absolutist understandings of war and national identity based on national pride.<sup>278</sup> This accordingly produced very different

---

<sup>276</sup> Robert Palmer, “The Pop Life: Riding the Country’s Wave of Patriotism,” *New York Times*, 13 May 1981, p. C34.

<sup>277</sup> R. W. Apple Jr., “New Stirrings of Patriotism,” *New York Times*, 11 December 1983, p. 70. For more on the revival of patriotic fervor in popular music of the 1980s, see Steve Greenberg, “Where is Graceland? 1980s Pop Culture through Music,” in Gil Troy and Vincent J. Cannato (eds.), *Living in the Eighties*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 152-166.

<sup>278</sup> Much of the work of moral philosopher, James Rachels, concerned itself with the concept of moral absolutism. Rachels described the “absolutists” as those who “believe that certain sorts of actions are intrinsically wrong – wrong simply because of the kinds of actions they are. Such actions might sometimes have good consequences, but that does not matter. The intrinsic character of the act makes it impermissible.” James Rachels, “Lying and the Ethics of Absolute Rules,” in James Rachels, *Can Ethics Provide Answers? And Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*, (Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997), pp. 126-127. One prominent proponent of this view of morality was Immanuel Kant, who claimed there existed certain absolute standards of morality to which all rational, free beings adhered. In *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*, Kant laid out a principle of universalizability for rational behavior: “I ought never to conduct myself except so that I could also will that my maxim become a universal law,” as humans inherently *knew* right from wrong. Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, 1785, trans. Allen W. Wood, (New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press, 2002), p. 18. The term moral absolutism will also refer here to the *rejection* of moral relativism.

representations of war and the U.S. military than those that were prominent during the Vietnam-era.

This chapter will argue that the textbooks under the moral economy of history education to come were based on the propagation of patriotism, but also, communicated a revival of Cold War anxiety and fear of Soviet progress – or more specifically – of American failure. To illustrate this premise, this chapter will firstly uncover the fervent national debates on education and textbooks during the 1970s. Although corporate players in politics helped strengthen pro-American and pro-capitalist narratives in textbooks and education through philanthropy, extensive lobbying, and covert projects, this chapter will lay particular focus on the bottom-up side of the story: more specifically, the impassioned grassroots movements of enraged parents and taxpayers who used local democratic processes to attack the textbook industry from below for producing materials they considered to contradict their moral convictions. Most of these controversial textbooks were social inquiry materials produced as part of the New Social Studies (NSS) movement analyzed in Chapter 1, especially due to their emphasis on critical thinking and relativism. Such procedural values in the social studies posed grave implications for the dominance of Christian and traditional American values in education and thus dissatisfied members of – especially rural – communities who felt neglected by decision makers in the educational realm. These groups successfully demanded the discontinuation of NSS programs, the defunding of inquiry textbooks, and the development of new materials that highlighted patriotism. The chapter will then zoom in on these new textbooks to assess the prevalent understanding of American identity and war under the new moral economy. Here we observe a prevalent shift toward a depiction of the United States as the unambiguously benevolent superpower that represented ‘good’ morals in the continuous battle against evil in the late Cold War.<sup>279</sup> An examination of the affective specifics of these textbooks then follows, revealing that the emotions that were *supposed* to be felt toward most events in the history of U.S. foreign policy were pride and loyalty. There also existed, however, a strong emphasis on fear of the Other, coupled with a strengthened focus on cultural and ideological differences. The final analysis in this chapter reveals that a revived importance of the observance of Veterans Day and the increased idealization of soldiers paralleled some of the narrative changes found in history textbooks. Around the same time that textbooks began glorifying the military

---

<sup>279</sup> This research refers to the period following the end of détente, or the policy of relaxing Cold War tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union in the mid-1970s, until the end of the Cold War as the “late Cold War” period.

and simplifying the details of political conflict, newspapers increasingly referred to troops of *all* wars, both fallen and alive, as ‘heroes,’ rather than simply as ‘servicemen.’

## 2.1 “AMERICA IS NO LONGER BEAUTIFUL IN OUR TEXTBOOKS”: REVOLT AND CONSERVATIVE RESURGENCE<sup>280</sup>

Edwin Fenton, one of the main contributors to the curriculum and textbook development of the NSS, wrote in 1966 that the reform movement signified “a pending revolution in the teaching of the social studies” and that there was “little doubt that a systems approach to the teaching of the social studies will soon be upon us.”<sup>281</sup> Furthermore, he argued that the time of perpetuating a system based on “teaching by lecture and rote memorization from texts” was over: “Virtually the entire teaching profession now agrees that this cycle must be broken.”<sup>282</sup> New models of history education that would shape children into young historians were being developed and implemented in the classroom throughout the 1960s and 1970s. “This process,” educationist and reformer, Evans Clinchy, warned, “is fortunately or unfortunately... unending.”<sup>283</sup>

By the late 1970s, it became clear that Fenton and his colleagues had been mistaken. What the scholars involved in the designing of the NSS failed to account for was how the new strategies and instructional materials would be received, not by fellow academics, but by a wider audience. Perhaps it was true that almost the “entire teaching profession” believed social inquiry was the best way to teach students to independently explore the world around them, but the beliefs of ‘the people’ in the nation’s school districts regarding this exploration were overlooked in this process – and underestimated. This section will revisit the backlash reaction to the NSS, led predominantly by alarmed parents of schoolchildren, who fought to reestablish a discourse that promoted patriotism and discouraged critical thinking. These protestors considered many widely used textbooks to be a blatant contradiction to the conceptions of morality that they perceived to characterize a coherent collective American identity. These efforts and the support of ideological allies would successfully change the character of social studies education in the United States. This development serves as a prime example of how a

---

<sup>280</sup> Quote in Mel and Norma Gabler with James C. Hefley, *What Are They Teaching Our Children? What You Can Do About Humanism and Textbooks in Today’s Public Schools*, (Wheaton, I.L.: SP Publications, 1985), p. 47.

<sup>281</sup> Edwin Fenton, “Preface,” in Edwin Fenton (ed.), *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), pp. v, vi.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., p. vii.

<sup>283</sup> Evans Clinchy, “The New Curricula,” in Ronald Gross and Judith Murphy (eds.), *The Revolution in the School*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), pp. 220-240, reprinted in Fenton (ed.), 1966, p. 512.

moral economy can be attacked, abolished, and replaced by proponents of opposing understandings of morality and nation. It furthermore exemplifies a characteristically American form of protest and educational reform from below sparked by pressure exerted by families themselves onto the private, multimillion dollar textbook enterprise. Although, as Chapter 3 will illustrate, the post-Cold War moral economy of the 1990s and its corresponding textbooks came to exhibit some specific characteristics of its own regarding the dissemination of patriotic sentiments, the patriotic resurgence of the 1980s had lasting effects on textbook content that lasted throughout the 1990s and beyond.

### 2.1.1 People versus Textbook: Parents Seize the Reigns

The educational reformers of the 1960s had expected some initial rejection of their materials to emerge in especially rural pockets of the country, particularly due to their focus on student-centered learning and the stimulation of critical thinking. The backlash they received, however, had not been anticipated by anyone involved in the projects. This section will show how fervent moral opposition to the ideals of the NSS and the New Left led to some of the greatest educational conflicts in the United States of the twentieth century. Its beginnings, however, were humble and owed themselves in large part to one couple from the East Texan oil town of Longview. Norma and Mel Gabler, devout evangelical Christians, parents of three sons, and members of their public school's parent-teacher association (PTA), were the first to publicize their critique of 'liberal' textbooks and spread their fury throughout the United States like wildfire. By the 1980s, *People* dubbed them the "most influential of the 'new right' activists" and *Texas Monthly* the "folk who cause[d] textbook publishers to quake with anxiety, liberal educators to fume with indignation, and indignant conservative parents to regard them as heroes in the struggle against humanism, communism, evolution, and moral relativity."<sup>284</sup> This esteem, however, was not attained overnight.

The Gablers' battle began in 1961 when their oldest son, Jim, drew their attention to a specific passage on the U.S. Constitution in his history textbook, Laidlaw Brothers' *Our Nation's Story*. Jim and both of his parents considered the textbook to have misleadingly described the role of the federal government and to have intentionally overlooked the rights of citizens and individual states. "This set Mel on fire," the Gablers' biographer reported, "he

---

<sup>284</sup> Kent Demaret, "The House of the Two Gablers Helps Decide What Johnny Can't Read in Texas Schools," *People*, 5 October 1981, p. 86; William Martin, "The Guardians Who Slumbereth Not," *Texas Monthly*, November 1982, p. 146.

passed the book to Norma and she too became very upset... The emphasis appeared to be on modern history... World Communism and its plan for world domination was [*sic*] hardly touched upon.”<sup>285</sup> From that decisive moment on, the Gablers set out on their crusade to “provide children with the truth” by examining every textbook on the state’s approved list and taking matters to the State Textbook Committee in the case of textbooks containing sex, vulgarity, or anti-Americanism.<sup>286</sup> This section will argue that the “fire” ignited in the Gablers stemmed, in part, from their anxious search for a viable, coherent American truth molded partially by their evangelical faith and belief in Armageddon, and that it was the very nature of objective historical investigation that exacerbated those fears.<sup>287</sup>

In 1961, after the incident with Jim’s textbook, the Gablers immediately founded the Educational Research Analysts (ERA). Inspired by the work of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), who in the late 1950s published and distributed a list of 170 objectionable schoolbooks that were seen as a “subtle way of undermining the American system of work and profit,” the ERA was established as a conservative, Christian, non-profit organization dedicated to reviewing all school textbooks approved by the state of Texas.<sup>288</sup> With headquarters at the Gablers’ kitchen table and manpower initially limited to the Gablers themselves, the ERA published the results of its research and other informational materials, distributed them for free, and used them to request the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) to ban those textbooks found to be morally offensive. After numerous battles with the PTA and administration of their sons’ school over its textbook adoptions, the couple took their grievances to hearings around Texas.

Mel’s oil company job bound him to the city of Hawkins, Texas, and thus it was Norma – the real motor behind the anti-textbook campaign – who dedicated her time to traveling

---

<sup>285</sup> James C. Hefley, *Textbooks on Trial: The Informative Report of Mel and Norma Gabler’s Ongoing Battle to Oust Objectionable Textbooks from Public Schools – and to Urge Publishers to Produce Better Ones*, (Wheaton, I.L.: Victor Books, 1977), p. 15.

<sup>286</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 16.

<sup>287</sup> Although there has been no unanimous agreement among theologians upon a definition of “evangelical,” this dissertation will borrow from a definition offered by George Gallup Jr. in 1978 as an individual who “has had a born again conversion, accepts Jesus as his or her personal Savior, believes the Scriptures are the authority for all doctrine, and feels an urgent duty to spread the faith.” See George Gallup Jr., quoted in Albert J. Menendez, “Who Are the Evangelicals?” *Christianity Today*, 22(8), 27 January 1978, p. 42. These include American Christian fundamentalists and evangelists. For the purposes of the media analysis included in this research, I extend the definition, as does historian Anne C. Loveland in her comprehensive study of American evangelicals, to additionally observe the evangelical faith as it is “represented by the National Association of Evangelicals and *Christianity Today*.” See Anne C. Loveland, *American Evangelicals and the U.S. Military 1942-1993*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994), pp. ix-x.

<sup>288</sup> Quoted in Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America? Culture Wars in the Public Schools*, (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 2002), p. 106.

around the state to testify at hearings, and eventually around the country to deliver lectures on the impurities she found in her research. During her public appearances, Norma needed to appeal to her identity as a concerned and caring mother to get her point across, thus she maintained a calm and joyful temperament. Her goal was not to endorse the new history of women and minorities, but rather to encourage the reemphasis of the prominent, White, male figures whom she considered to be America's heroes. Ellie Hopkins, editor of the local *Longview News-Journal* and close friend of the Gablers, advised Norma in 1969: "Watch your attitude and tone of voice at the hearings. You may be boiling inside, but keep your voice under control." By doing so, Norma was to differentiate herself from the "belligerent loudmouth [student] protestors" – a clear reference to the young, antiwar activists – by presenting herself as "ordinary people, seeking to do good for homes, schools, and country."<sup>289</sup>

On the one hand, Norma's presence as the spokesperson for conservative values in the debate on textbooks disputed the notion that women held no role in the public sphere. On the other, it dovetailed neatly with her commitment to traditional family values that allocated the home as the space of a woman's reign. "I still get called an extremist now and then. I'm extremely proud of being a mother, and I am extremely proud of being an American, so I guess that makes me an extremist,"<sup>290</sup> Norma told *People*. In the interview, she listed her main grievances against modern education and 'new history':

Number one, absolutes are seldom included in education. I challenge anyone to find a textbook that says lying is wrong. Number two, the serious questioning of authority is becoming more prevalent. Number three, there is constant emphasis on change, change, change, without regard for the effects. If you put all these together, an 8 or 9-year-old can gradually be conditioned away from the values of his home.<sup>291</sup>

Social inquiry textbooks and critical thinking thus threatened Norma's role as a mother because their objective and student-centered approach undermined her teaching of values at home. In her view, textbooks were to endorse and extend the lessons of the home into the classroom, rather than override them. This fear of losing control over her children's values was exemplified in Norma's testimony against a middle school textbook in 1982 that asked readers to verify the facts listed in an exercise by referring to outside sources. She criticized the authors because she felt such independent research "could lead to some very dangerous information." When asked

---

<sup>289</sup> Ellie Hopkins, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 63.

<sup>290</sup> Norma Gabler, quoted in Demaret, 1981, p. 86.

<sup>291</sup> Norma Gabler, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 88.

to expand on this statement, she responded, “I just don’t think questions should be asked unless the information has already been covered in the text.”<sup>292</sup> Jim’s original complaint to his parents in 1961 about his textbook was thus a sign that her son was potentially in danger of being exposed to such information, and represented thus her claim to her right to protest the source of danger.<sup>293</sup>

The Gablers first attended a textbook adoption hearing together in Dallas in January 1962, where they spoke before a legislative committee appointed by the Texas House of Representatives. Mel concluded their statement against certain submissions with the accusation that the public school system represented a space “where propaganda is substituted for truth.”<sup>294</sup> Mel implied that there existed only *one* absolute truth of which children could and should be taught and of which public schools were depriving their students, rather than multiple valid truths contingent on culture and experience. Norma’s testimony against four history textbooks at a hearing in Austin in 1969 on charges of anti-Americanism (and thus pro-communist leanings) gained particularly positive attention by the press in Texas. David Hawkins commented on the textbook hearing and ‘new history,’ with its focus on revisionism in the *Dallas Morning News*, attesting:

We don’t have to reinterpret or falsify to make the sum of our history plain to our students and the world. But we do need to re-emphasize... the beautiful. We need once more to call the roll on the heroes who breathed life and meaning into our commitment – into our historical premise that freedom is a sounder omen of national endurance than the Russian proposition that the same history that exalts them dooms us.<sup>295</sup>

On the one hand, the anxiety observable in the speeches of textbook critics was linked to the competitive assumption that Soviet progress directly corresponded to American failure. On the other, it was connected to the fear that the acceptance of several, equally valid perspectives and versions of morality in the discussion of the Soviet Union and other world cultures would demote the validity of the one American truth they felt guided history. The Gablers called the practice of relativism “arbitrary selectivity,” in which “socialist third world governments are touted and their failures hardly mentioned,” while “governments allowing extensive freedom

---

<sup>292</sup> Norma Gabler, quoted in Martin, 1982, p. 268.

<sup>293</sup> For more on the Gablers’ crusade within the context of the family values movement and the evangelical transformation of American political culture in the twentieth century, see Seth Dowland, *Family Values and the Rise of the Christian Right*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015), esp. pp. 49-56.

<sup>294</sup> Mel Gabler, before legislative committee in Dallas, 24 January 1962, quoted in Hefley, 1977, p. 24. All hearings were recorded for study by the Texas State Textbook Committee.

<sup>295</sup> David Hawkins, “In Teaching U.S. History: We Need to Resume Yea-Saying,” *Dallas Morning News*, 25 September 1969, p. 2D.

for free enterprise, if not given demerits, are ignored.”<sup>296</sup> The *true* portrayal of American history was also overshadowed by “problems” like Watergate and the Vietnam War, they argued, which enjoyed too much emphasis in textbooks, “while solutions achieved through the American system” were “largely censored.”<sup>297</sup>

The American truth of goodness and noble positivity was informed not only by the wish for celebration of national heroes. The Gablers’ morals were also influenced by their evangelical faith and their belief that ‘Christian morality’ truly governed the way Americans live and feel. “To the vast majority of Americans,” one of the ERA’s informational pamphlets read, “the terms ‘values’ and ‘morals’ mean one thing, and one thing only; and that is the Christian-Judeo morals, values, and standards as given to us by God through His Word written in the Ten Commandments and the Bible... After all, according to history these ethics have prescribed the only code by which civilizations can effectively remain in existence!”<sup>298</sup> An interpretation of morality as being adopted from the Bible thus deemed moral relativity in history class impossible, as moral questions involved only one correct answer. Hopkins demonstrated this view in an editorial in the *Longview News-Journal* on the Gablers’ testimony in 1969, in which he asserted that relativist approaches to history challenged the Christian belief in absolutes and proposed a dangerous acceptance of ‘abnormal’ behavior:

It is well known that Christianity was removed from textbooks on the pretext that the state has no right or authority to teach religion. Now, morality is being removed on the premise that texts should be neutral... Failure to teach moral implication in human action and relationships is to convey an acceptance of these other things as being the ‘norm,’ rather than problems to be corrected.<sup>299</sup>

Hopkins’ plea for an emphasis on absolute, Christian and American morals and values in schools and textbooks greatly helped the Gablers’ case to ban a series of Macmillan textbooks from Texas schools in the early 1970s.

The teaching of traditional American values was thought by textbook critics to be pertinent to a student’s establishment of a positive identification with the self and the nation. Among these values counted national loyalty and the unwavering belief in democracy and free-market capitalism. In 1971, Norma commented on the danger of breeding a negative collective

---

<sup>296</sup> Gabler, Gabler, and Hefley, 1985, pp. 54, 57.

<sup>297</sup> Ibid., p. 55.

<sup>298</sup> Quoted in Martin, 1982, p. 264.

<sup>299</sup> Ellie Hopkins, “Textbook and Rebellion,” *Longview News-Journal*, 2 November 1970, p. 4A.

identity among students. On a San Antonio radio show, she recited to the host a statement she had made before the Lions Club one week earlier, arguing:

If you have a small child and you repeatedly tell him from the day he was born all the things that are wrong with him, when he gets older, he will become frustrated and feel hopeless. This is exactly what's happening to our young people today. This comes from hearing so much more bad than good in your country.<sup>300</sup>

This view contended that attention paid to the so-called “bad” episodes of American history would provoke a sense of guilt and shame in children and thus negatively influence their self-esteem. Norma felt that the positive emotions associated with national pride inherently *belonged* to American children and were being stolen from them by historical revisionism. “The new histories,” she told their biographer, “at least the ones we have read, don’t have [the story of the national anthem] and [*sic*] many, many others. Our children are being robbed of patriotic feelings. They’re being denied much of the thrill of loving our country.”<sup>301</sup> Missing out on this “thrill” was furthermore dangerous for the future, for the Gablers considered textbooks to possess not only pedagogical, but also political power. One flyer printed and distributed by the ERA read, “TEXTBOOKS mold NATIONS because they largely determine HOW a nation votes, WHAT it becomes, and WHERE it goes!”<sup>302</sup>

When the Gablers rated one textbook published by Allyn & Bacon, *A Global History of Man*, as the most objectionable of five world history textbooks for high schools, Richard Carroll, president of the company, wrote a letter to the Gablers in 1971, sending a copy to the SBOE and the Commissioner of Texas Education. He pled,

Like it or not we do have a credibility gap problem with our youth. The syrupy emotionalism, devoid of real facts, and an unwillingness to admit shortcomings that characterized social science education in the ‘50s and ‘60s, has contributed to the problem... We do not have your fears that somehow this text will weaken our country. We know that the opposite is true – teachers and students using this text will gain a better appreciation and understanding of their country and the world. They will learn that ours is the greatest country in the world; they will also learn that we can contribute to making it an even greater country by working within our constitutional framework to remedy the ills of society. They will not receive a “pabulum” treatment that will leave them vulnerable, at a later stage of their lives, to the entreaties of those who seek to overthrow our system of government... You have set yourselves up as the supreme

---

<sup>300</sup> Norma Gabler, *Allan Dale Show*, WOAI, San Antonio, 2 February 1971, quoted in Hefley, 1977, p. 96.

<sup>301</sup> Norma Gabler, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 184.

<sup>302</sup> Quoted in Martin, 1982, p. 150.

judges of the motivations and activities of over a hundred people involved in the authorship and editorial processing of the text materials. You discount the thought that these people can be God-loving and God-fearing individuals who also want to preserve and protect their country. In my opinion, your presumptions... abuse the rights of all of us, whether or not we are residents of Texas. It is, after all, our country, not just yours.<sup>303</sup>

Norma had particularly slandered *Global History* before the SBOE on charges that the text positioned itself as sympathetic to Mao Zedong's brand of communism (after confusing a direct quote with narrative text), and for treating the American Revolution as one of many revolutions throughout the world, rather than as a movement unique and superior to others. Thus in Norma's eyes, the book failed because it neither openly denounced opposing forms of government (namely communism), nor did it explicitly praise U.S. government, society, or history as superior. She similarly attacked another Allyn & Bacon publication, *The American Adventure*, for focusing too much on Watergate and the Vietnam War. Carroll's response to the Gablers' actions, however, is telling, because rather than presenting his work as belonging to an opposing or a superior moral economy, he argued within the framework of the Gablers' moral economy – guided by national pride, fear of the threat of a foreign “overthrow,” and the belief in a Judeo-Christian God.

Naturally, many publishers of the attacked textbooks tended to personally disagree with the Gablers' accusations. Nevertheless, they often could not afford to lose the state of Texas as a client. As Texas constituted one of the nation's largest states and the biggest spender on schoolbooks, textbook publishers – as private entrepreneurs – were rarely able to ignore the demands of the SBOE regarding the content of their submissions. Texan school districts had adopted their textbooks from state-approved lists since 1919, when the SBOE first authorized the statewide adoption system. ‘Adoption states’ such as Texas were generally concentrated in the west and the south of the United States, while larger, less politically conservative states, like New York, belonged primarily to the so-called ‘non-adoption states’ – or states that left the approval and evaluation of textbooks up to individual school districts.<sup>304</sup> California, while considered a populous, left-leaning ‘adoption state,’ adopted its materials uniformly only for

---

<sup>303</sup> Richard Carroll to Norma and Mel Gabler, Dr. J. W. Edgar, SBOE, 12 February 1971, letter reprinted in Hefley, 1977, pp. 91-92.

<sup>304</sup> In fact, the Board of Education of New York City, the state's most populated city, prided itself on the diversity of materials permitted by its ‘non-adoption’ system. “The wide choice of instructional materials available to schools under the ‘open list’ policy... makes it possible for supervisors, in consultation with their teachers, to order books, visual aids, and other materials best fitted to the pupils’ needs,” boasted a City of New York Board of Education pamphlet in 1955. Ethel F. Huggard (ed.), “Selecting Instructional Materials for the Public Schools of New York City,” (New York: City of New York Board of Education, 1955), p. 6.

lower grade levels and left the adoption of more complex material up to its local districts. This regional discrepancy in adoption methods allowed for an imbalance of power over the textbook market to grow throughout the twentieth century – so much so that Fenton claimed in 1967 that the abolition of the “entire state adoption system would probably be the most fruitful step” in implementing the NSS, as “freedom [would] encourage the best social studies departments in every state to blaze new paths.”<sup>305</sup> Texas was not only the largest textbook client in the nation compared to individual school districts, but several states in the region tended to ‘side’ with Texas on the approval or rejection of publisher submissions. Given the high expenses of developing a textbook, producing a text that did not cut the Board’s approved list was costly, if not economically devastating for a publishing company – especially if it was pressured to significantly amend its material and create a second submission. Thus if a textbook did not sell in Texas, it was often difficult to sell elsewhere.<sup>306</sup> While selection committees in Texas had generally endorsed and accepted the flow of national trends in textbooks in the first half of the twentieth century, the Gablers’ battle proved to be a turning point that tipped the power of selection away from textbook authors and publishing companies and toward taxpayers.

Most publishers were very aware of the increasing influence of the Gablers’ evaluations throughout the 1970s. In 1981, the *New York Times* called the “soft-spoken couple” an “important symbol of parents across the nation,” whose “message needs, at the very least, to be heard if not heeded by the \$940-million-a-year American textbook industry.”<sup>307</sup> In 1980, CBS-TV reporter, Mike Wallace, visited the Gablers’ in Longview for a “60 Minutes” report on the ERA’s work. For the report, he additionally interviewed several prominent textbook publishers regarding censorship in Texas and its effect on the national market as a whole. Edward B. Jenkinson, professor and chairman of the Committee against Censorship of the National Council of Teachers of English, told Wallace that the Gablers “probably have more influence on the use of textbooks than any other two people.” Carroll, who also appeared on the program, similarly admitted that the Gablers had “become more and more of a force for publishers to contend with.” He deplored furthermore, “I don’t think that two people should have that power, that degree of influence... I think that a teacher must have the right to teach so that students

---

<sup>305</sup> Edwin Fenton, *The New Social Studies*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967), p. 122.

<sup>306</sup> For more on the influence of Texas state legislation on the national textbook market, see, for example, Carolyn A. Brown, “The Struggle to Be Seen,” in James H. Williams and Wendy D. Bokhorst-Heng (eds.), *(Re)Constructing Memory: Textbooks, Identity, Nation, and State*, (Rotterdam, N.L.: Sense, 2016); Jim Walsh, Frank Kemerer, and Laurie Maniotis, *The Educator’s Guide to Texas School Law*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005).

<sup>307</sup> Dena Kleinman, “Influential Couple Scrutinize Books for ‘Anti-Americanism,’” *New York Times*, 14 July 1981, p. C1.

will have the right to know.” When asked if his publishing company had ever “changed materials to suit the Gablers,” Thomas Murphy, vice-president of the textbook division of Holt, Rinehart & Winston, admitted: “Yes, we did. Sometimes we do change textbooks. All publishers do.”<sup>308</sup>

While some publishers did undergo the costs of producing a separate version of their textbook for Texas and its allies, most publishers observed the controversy and simply complied with the pressure exerted on them by the protestors, including Carroll himself. In response to an attack by the Gablers on a passage in one of Allyn & Bacon’s English textbooks featuring a scene containing violence, rather than defend the text, Carroll declared: “We now consider it an editorial mistake to have a violent episode in a reader.”<sup>309</sup> Fred McDougal, president of McDougal, Littell & Co., even told the *Chicago Tribune* in 1979 that Mrs. Gabler and the state of Texas are “a litmus test for how liberal a textbook can be.”<sup>310</sup> The overall result of this influence was summarized well by Bob Jones, a representative of Holt, Rinehart & Winston, as he bluntly admitted: “When you’re publishing a book, if there’s something that is controversial, it’s better to take it out.”<sup>311</sup> Critique of this interplay of power came especially from the left. Nat Hentoff of the left-wing journal, *The Progressive*, charged such “spineless publishers” with causing “manifest harm” to students by selling lies to maximize their profits.<sup>312</sup> To Houghton Mifflin’s comment that “publishers simply reflect the attitudes and demands of the society,” Hentoff countered: “You want dummies, they’ll make you dummies.”<sup>313</sup>

The work of the ERA, at least in part, influenced the SBOE’s textbook approvals and propelled the adoption of specific guidelines for the evaluation of submissions in 1974. Although these guidelines pertained mostly to biology textbooks and the discussion of the origins of mankind, among them was the requirement to “promote the free enterprise system, respect authority and individual rights, and not [to] encourage civil disorder, social strife, or law-breaking.”<sup>314</sup> Here we observe indirect references to educational approaches that

---

<sup>308</sup> Interview with Mike Wallace, “What Johnny Can’t Read,” CBS “60 Minutes,” CBS-TV Network, 15 June 1980, Mike Wallace CBS/60 Minutes Papers, Season I: September 1968 – July 1969, box 8, Bentley Historical Library at University of Michigan.

<sup>309</sup> Richard Carroll, quoted in James C. Hefley and Harold Smith, “What Should Johnny Read?” *Christianity Today*, 28, 7 September 1984, p. 25.

<sup>310</sup> Fred McDougal, quoted in Casey Banas, “A Mother’s War on Textbooks,” *Chicago Tribune*, 19 August 1979, p. 14.

<sup>311</sup> Bob Jones, quoted in Nat Hentoff, “The Dumbing of America,” *The Progressive*, 48(2), February 1984, p. 29.

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 30.

<sup>313</sup> Damaris Ames, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>314</sup> Quoted in Hefley and Smith, 1984, p. 25. These guidelines applied primarily to instructional materials in the natural sciences and saw that state-approved textbooks that engaged with the “origins of humankind” disregard evolutionary theory as a proven fact and identify it as merely “one of several” theoretical explanations. “Texas

objectively studied various economic systems without ‘taking sides,’ as well as to the antiwar and other anti-establishment protests that broke out just few years before.

In 1978, the Gablers reviewed twenty-eight textbook submissions alone to the state of Texas and successfully prevented the adoption of eighteen of them in that single year. But these victories should not be observed merely as local victories. In 1980, Jenkinson of the National Council of Teachers of English, who had researched the anti-textbook movement, claimed in an interview with *People* that in that same year, 1978, there were seventy-three textbook protest groups in Minnesota alone.<sup>315</sup> In 1972, schoolbook protests even led the state of Georgia to reevaluate and eventually remove ten texts from the state’s approved list that were “authored by, edited by, or containing information continued by” none other than NSS pioneer, Edwin Fenton. This selection included his social inquiry text, *The Americans: A History of the United States*, on grounds that the textbook’s views on racism against Blacks and American involvement in the Vietnam War violated state law that saw that public school curriculum promote the “study of and devotion to American institutions and ideals.”<sup>316</sup> What was worse was that the text discouraged loyalty to the U.S. military, charged Georgian State Board of Education member and leader of the opposition, Kenneth Kilpatrick, at a Board meeting on 16 December 1971: “I believe there is more in this book about the Vietnam War than the American Revolution. And by my analysis, the dialog on the military draft would cause people who didn’t have an opinion prior to reading it to tend to shape an anti-draft opinion.”<sup>317</sup> Al Leake of the Georgia Basic Education Council (GBEC), a small special interest group that had attacked Fenton’s textbooks since the late 1960s, similarly took his grievances to the Georgia State Board of Education, protesting that Fenton’s books “did not teach Americanism.”<sup>318</sup>

In response, Fenton published an article in the *Atlanta Constitution* in January 1972, taking a similar approach to Allyn & Bacon’s Richard Carroll, contending that his books *did*, in fact, teach Americanism – that social inquiry and “taking part in public life after careful

---

Textbook Disclaimer 1974-1984,” quoted in Eugenie C. Scott, *Evolution vs. Creationism: An Introduction*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), p. 241. These guidelines were then revoked in 1984, when the SBOE added the provision that “theories should be clearly distinguished from fact and presented in an objective educational manner.” Texas SBOE, 1 Operating Rules (2013), §2.9(a).

<sup>315</sup> See Edward B. Jenkinson, quoted in Giovanna Breu, “A Worried Indiana Professor Says More and More U.S. Schools Are Censoring and Banning Books,” *People*, 1 September 1980, p. 75.

<sup>316</sup> Quoted in Tom Linthicum, “School Board Bars 10 Texts by Fenton,” *Atlanta Constitution*, 17 December 1971, p. 19B; Georgia School Laws, 1942, sec. 32-706, quoted in Tom Linthicum, “Protests Delay Okay of Social Studies Texts,” *Atlanta Constitution*, 25 November 1971, p. C14.

<sup>317</sup> Kenneth Kilpatrick, quoted in Linthicum, “School Board Bars 10 Texts by Fenton,” 1971, p. 19B.

<sup>318</sup> Al Leake, quoted in Ronald W. Evans, *The Tragedy of School Reform: How Curriculum Politics and Entrenched Dilemmas Have Diverted Us from Democracy*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 87.

consideration of all the available evidence” is “a vital ingredient of the great tradition I call Americanism,” rather than an opposing or non-patriotic approach. Furthermore, he argued, social inquiry was designed precisely to prepare a student for participating in American democracy. Concluding the article, in explicit response to Kilpatrick, Fenton retaliated, “‘The Americans’ devotes 25 pages to the American Revolution and 9 pages to Vietnam.”<sup>319</sup> Despite Fenton’s defenses, a slight majority of the Board remained unconvinced by his arguments and voted 5-4 on 18 May 1972 to remove all of his texts from the state’s approved list. Regarding Fenton’s discussions on the Vietnam War, the Board “particularly objected” to a section in *The Americans* titled “Why Fight For America?” a fictional piece about a nineteen-year-old boy who receives notice that he is to be drafted to Vietnam and responds that he would rather go to prison than to war.<sup>320</sup> Students were then asked to analyze his reasons for refusing the draft. Although the books were not banned and local Georgian districts were still permitted to purchase the books for their schools without state funds, few actually did.

While textbook critics in Texas and Georgia worked *within* the bureaucratic system to put forth their preferences, some protestors used the Gablers’ rhetoric to stage boycotts and work *against* the system, such as the textbook rioters of Kanawha County, West Virginia in 1974. The leaders of these riots, Alice Moore, member of the Kanawha County Board of Education, called personally upon Norma to request a review of some of the books that had been approved by her county’s textbook selection committee. Although her grievances mainly pertained to the introduction of sex education and the use of certain books for the language arts – such as works by Allen Ginsberg, Eldridge Cleaver, and Malcolm X – she described these as featuring “lots of profanity and anti-American and racist anti-white stories.”<sup>321</sup> Moore summoned parents to protest and have their children boycott school until the books were banned from the county’s schools. As the boycotts persisted and the protests intensified, schools were firebombed and school busses were shot at with rifles by parents and concerned residents who described the county’s textbook list as “‘dirty,’ ‘godless,’ and ‘Communist.’”<sup>322</sup> As Moore began attending textbook hearings in West Virginia, Norma lent her very similar advice to that which Ellie Hopkins had once advised Norma a few years earlier regarding her expected behavior at the hearings. “Stay sweet and keep smiling,” Norma advised Moore, “don’t let them get away with calling you a censor. Tell them the books have already been censored of morality

---

<sup>319</sup> Edwin Fenton, “Textbooks and ‘Americanism.’” *Atlanta Constitution*, 4 January 1972, p. 4A.

<sup>320</sup> Beau Cutts, “Educators Won’t Finance Textbook, But ‘Americans’ is not Banned,” *Atlanta Constitution*, 19 May 1972, p. 6A.

<sup>321</sup> Alice Moore, quoted in Hefley, 1977, p. 160.

<sup>322</sup> Ben A. Franklin, “3 Held in Dispute over Textbooks,” *New York Times*, 19 September 1974, p. 14.

and patriotism... And keep asking ‘Where are my rights as a parent and the rights of my children not to use the books?’”<sup>323</sup> Moore, too, assumed her role as a concerned mother to stage one of the most heated – and violent – textbook riots in the nation’s history.

In 1974, Moore demanded the Textbook Selection Committee before the Kanawha County Board of Education: “I’m asking you to show me something pro-American.”<sup>324</sup> Shortly afterwards, she drafted a set of guidelines for the future adoption of textbooks, publicizing them in two local newspapers. Among these guidelines was the selection criterion that:

Textbooks must encourage loyalty to the United States... and emphasize the responsibilities of citizenship... Textbooks must not encourage sedition or revolution against our government or teach or imply that an alien form of government is superior... Textbooks shall teach the true history and heritage of the United States... Textbooks must not defame our nation’s founders or misrepresent the ideals and causes for which they struggled and sacrificed...<sup>325</sup>

Throughout the spring of that year, textbook protestors led by Moore – coming mainly from the Christian fundamentalist community, including prominent ministers – distributed flyers and pamphlets featuring selected excerpts from the “inter-ethnic and inter-cultural” schoolbooks in question.<sup>326</sup> They additionally circulated a petition that demanded textbooks that “demean, encourage skepticism, or foster disbelief in the institutions of the United States of America and in Western civilization” be banned. Moreover, approved textbooks were to portray the “history and heritage of this nation as the record of one of the noblest civilizations that has existed,” embodying the dire need for superiority in a time of uncertainty. 12,000 residents of Kanawha County signed the petition.<sup>327</sup>

The anti-textbook movement was significant because it epitomized the desire of local, rural communities for independence from Washington and coastal cities and a strong distrust of those perceived as ‘outsiders.’ The struggle exemplified a type of culture and class warfare, in which local townspeople felt unheard, frustrated, and obligated to express their opposition to the moral economy of the ‘educational elites.’ One reverend, Marvin Horan, who became a

---

<sup>323</sup> Norma Gabler, quoted in Hefley, 1977, p 166.

<sup>324</sup> Alice Moore, quoted in Lynn Withrow, “Book Controversy Generates Heat at Board Meeting,” *Charleston Daily Mail*, 24 May 1974, p. 1A.

<sup>325</sup> Published in Yvonne Schiavonni, “School Board Sets Guidelines for Future Textbook Adoption,” *Charleston Daily Mail*, 22 November 1974, p. 1.

<sup>326</sup> Quoted in Calvin Trillin, “U.S. Journal: Kanawha County, West Virginia: Some Elements in a Dispute That Resulted in the Closing of Schools, the Shutting Down of Industry, the Wounding of Men, and the Cancellation of Football Games,” *New Yorker*, 30 September 1974, p. 120.

<sup>327</sup> Published in Ronald L. Lewis and John C. Hennen Jr. (eds.), *West Virginia: Documents in the History of a Rural-Industrial State*, (Dubuque, I.A.: Kendall/Hunt, 1975), p. 313.

leader of the protests in West Virginia, wrote the National Education Association (NEA), which was called in to evaluate the situation in Kanawha County in the winter of 1974:

We are very skeptical of what people want to do with us or to us, especially those that are in authority, because we've been put through the wringers of deceit by the courts, by the lawyers, by the Board of Education, and we just don't feel that we can jeopardize any more of our integrity to the likes of this. So we have decided to come together and stand together until the books are removed.<sup>328</sup>

Thus not only were 'new' schoolbooks perceived as having robbed children of patriotism, but they also robbed small towns of their autonomy and served as a symbol of this loss of power. Another protestor in Kanawha County told news reporters that the riots were intended to "get this government down to where they'll listen to us little old hillbillies."<sup>329</sup> A bishop in Charleston similarly attested in his statement to the NEA that the issue was a question of unjust distribution of power:

For many of the people who live outside the city limits, there is a sense of powerlessness born in the absence of an adequate voice to influence the decision-making process. It is more than an economic or cultural gap. It is a feeling of being voiceless and powerless. For some, textbooks became a trumpet for voiceless people, and the protest became an instrument in the hand of powerless people.<sup>330</sup>

This feeling of powerlessness in decision-making spawned, in large part, from the Gablers' rhetoric of 'us versus them,' and their supposition that their views represented a type of 'silent majority.' This was epitomized in Mel's claim that "it is the publishers and educational bureaucrats who are out of line with the majority."<sup>331</sup> Indeed, The Gablers' biography boasted that the couple had "proven that ordinary people, if they work hard enough, can effect [*sic*] change for decency and morality... [and show] that the 'public-be-damned' attitude of some academic and government elitists can be challenged."<sup>332</sup> These elitists, according to the introduction of Norma and Mel's book, *What Are They Teaching Our Children?*, included "editors in the publishing houses, the writers of the textbooks, the salaried officials of the Texas Education Agency, and the educators in the field," who had all "been trained under the same

---

<sup>328</sup> Marvin Horan, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 311.

<sup>329</sup> Quoted in Trillin, 1974, p. 121.

<sup>330</sup> D. Frederick Wertz, quoted in Lewis and Hennen Jr. (eds.), 1975, p. 308.

<sup>331</sup> Quoted in Hefley and Smith, 1984, p. 24.

<sup>332</sup> Hefley, 1977, p. 9.

liberal philosophy.” This philosophy ultimately belonged to “progressive education’s grand scheme to change America.”<sup>333</sup> Undeniably, many educationists *did* wish to bring about change in the social studies and education throughout the 1960s and 1970s. The NEA, which represented the conspiracy of educational elites, according to the Gablers, even proclaimed in 1976 that its goal was to “change the course of American education for the twenty-first century by embracing the ideals of global community, the equality and interdependence of all peoples and nations, and education as a tool to bring about world peace,” a quote which the Gablers had interpreted as evidence for a liberal takeover of education and a nullification of American values.<sup>334</sup> This rhetoric made it difficult for ‘liberal’ educationists, curriculum developers, and publishers of inquiry textbooks to defend their viewpoints, as doing so gave critics the impression of hostility toward ‘ordinary America.’

The anti-textbook movement saw educational experts not only as untrustworthy, but also as having abused the power of schools that were paid for by hardworking tax-payers. This suspicion was demonstrated clearly in one Kanawha County protestor’s claim in 1974: “We built these schools with our sweat and taxes and, son, no bureaucrat is going to tell me that my kid has to learn garbage.”<sup>335</sup> Republican politicians sympathized with the protestors’ claim to participation in curriculum planning based on their tax paying. In a foreword to the Gablers’ biography, *Textbooks on Trial*, Republican Congressman, John B. Conlan, for example, declared that “educators paid with public funds should encourage rather than destroy the fundamental beliefs, moral standards, and religious convictions of families they serve, as well as our nation’s great heritage of political and economic freedom.”<sup>336</sup> In 1975, the NEA eventually ruled that the debated textbooks in the Kanawha County conflict were not to be banned from West Virginia’s approved textbook list and were to remain in circulation; however, principals of individual West Virginia schools were granted the power to veto their use in the classroom and even ban them from school libraries. As a result, many schools simply refrained from adopting the controversial textbook materials at all.

Despite their roots in certain evangelical ideals, textbook protests in the 1970s were not an exclusively Southern affair. Anthropology textbooks introduced as part of the NSS program,

---

<sup>333</sup> Gabler, Gabler, and Hefley, 1985, p. 11.

<sup>334</sup> National Education Association, *Declaration of Independence: Education for a Global Community. A Summary Report of the NEA Bicentennial Program*, (Washington: Author, 1976), p. 5; See Gabler, Gabler, and Hefley, 1985, p. 52.

<sup>335</sup> Quoted in Curtis Seltzer, “A Confusion of Goals: West Virginia Book War,” *The Nation*, 2 November 1974, p. 432.

<sup>336</sup> John B. Conlan, “Foreword,” in Hefley, 1977, p. 5.

Man: A Course of Study (MACOS), in the 1960s even stirred upheaval in Burlington, Vermont in 1973, where a group of parents self-designated themselves as “textbook watchdogs” to monitor publisher textbook submissions. “If the humanists can get one generation to become completely indoctrinated by humanism,” one founder of a “watchdog” organization told the *Burlington Free Press*, “that will be the end of the U.S. We’ll be citizens of the world.”<sup>337</sup> In Vermont, the greatest riot had taken place in a small town called Morristown immediately following one of Norma’s talks on textbooks. In 1978, in Warsaw, Indiana, parents even burned English literature books that they saw as contributing to the “moral breakdown” of their youth.<sup>338</sup> One critic of the books wrote the *Indianapolis Star* declaring “the Bible states ‘train up a child in the way he should go.’ This whole idea of letting children make up their minds on everything is out of hell. That philosophy is destroying this country. It is time for us as Christians and you as parents to wake up out of apathy.”<sup>339</sup> Indeed, for those who burned the books, the question was about power and control over children, demonstrated by the comment of one school board member who declared: “The bottom line is: Who will control the minds of the students: parents and the citizens of the community or some external force?”<sup>340</sup> The twenty-four-year-old English teacher who was fired for having assigned the books in her classes argued that the parents simply “don’t want their kids taught... they are so afraid of them being taught to think.”<sup>341</sup>

Much of the hostility was directed toward the teaching profession, in general. One Republican Representative from Indiana wrote the *Daily Journal* of Franklin, Indiana that he is:

...weary of the arrogant teachers who think they can teach with impunity any weird subjects from witchcraft to wine-making... I am weary of their whining about their low salaries when they work nine months a year and chose of their own volition to go into teaching... It’s about time all school boards tell teachers they will be held accountable for quality education in each class and that they must follow the guidelines as set forth by the board. If they don’t like it, let them get another job where they will not retard, corrupt and confuse young minds.<sup>342</sup>

---

<sup>337</sup> Lorna Lecker, “Textbook Controversy Leads to Organization of School Book ‘Watchdogs,’” *Burlington Free Press*, 26 November 1973, p. 1.

<sup>338</sup> Samuel O. Dungan II, quoted in Noel Rubinton, “Battle Brewing in Warsaw over Book Banning, Burning,” *Indianapolis Star*, 12 July 1978, p. 1.

<sup>339</sup> R. Senior, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>340</sup> William Chapel, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 20.

<sup>341</sup> Teresa Burnau, quoted in *ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>342</sup> Donald Boys, “Supporting Book Banning,” *Daily Journal*, 20 July 1978, p. 4.

The 1970s witnessed not only rampant textbook riots but also a significant amount of academic freedom cases brought about by teachers who were suspended or dismissed from their positions for teaching material considered too liberal or too critical by parents or the school administration. Such cases were not limited to Southern states, but even reached as far north as New York.<sup>343</sup> The emergence of this new moral economy of history education proved professionally dangerous for those with an occupation in education as the demands and preferences of parents and ‘ordinary citizens’ came to hold more weight in determining how history should be taught – and similarly gained more sympathy from certain elites.

### 2.1.2 The Great Coalition: Big Business Backs Christian Fundamentalists

Certain pockets of society felt a greater sense of security and comfort with the types of narratives Moore sought to propagate in schools. Simple, patriotic stories appealed especially to those on the radical right. Such groups rejected the NSS approach to observing history as a complex, multi-faceted conglomeration of various truths, as it exposed the realities of oppressed voices that had suffered at the hands of racism, sexism, traditionalism, and war. Some far-right groups offered the anti-textbook movement thus substantial financial and organizational support. The neoconservative John Birch Society, for example, commended Alice Moore and her supporters for their patriotism and devout Christian faith and distributed literature for their cause. They rejected the books in question as a “liberal sprinkling of obscenities; atrocious language passed off as non-standard grammar; numerous subversive and Communist authors; inflammatory racial tracts; openly radical polemics; promotion of narcotic drugs; and, even detailed and explicit glamorization of prostitution.”<sup>344</sup> The White supremacist terror organization, the Ku Klux Klan, similarly backed the Kanawha County protestors by participating in local protests and sending men to Washington D.C. to burn crosses in opposition to the textbooks, although the Gablers’ biographer described the group’s activities as “very limited involvement.”<sup>345</sup> One of the most influential supporters of the textbook takedown,

---

<sup>343</sup> For a detailed list of the various academic freedom cases that took place in the 1970s, see Ronald W. Evans, *Fear and Schooling: Understanding the Troubled History of Progressive Education*, (New York: Routledge, 2020), esp. pp. 113-159.

<sup>344</sup> William Hoar, “Parents Revolt When Textbooks are Propaganda,” *American Opinion*, November 1974, p. 1.

<sup>345</sup> Hefley, 1977, p. 174. On the involvement of the Ku Klux Klan in the anti-textbook movement, see also George Hillocks Jr., “Books and Bombs, Ideological Conflict and the Schools: A Case Study of the Kanawha County Book Protest,” *The School Review*, 86(4), August 1978, pp. 632-654; Paul J. Kaufman, “Alice’s Wonderland; Or, School Books Are for Banning,” *Appalachian Journal*, 2(3), spring 1975, pp. 162-168; David Skinner, “A Battle over Books: West Virginians Battled over Their School Books in 1974,” *Humanities*, 31(5), September/October 2010.

however, offered protestors its financial support on a more covert level of operation, namely philanthropists and large corporations with similar fears and ambitions. Investigation through critical thinking and analysis of various primary sources meant that children could potentially develop not only a negative opinion about their leaders, but also about capitalism, which posed a costly threat to corporate power.

On 23 August 1971, an unsettled Lewis F. Powell Jr., then corporate lawyer and two months later Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, wrote a confidential letter of great urgency to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce titled “Attack on American Free Enterprise System.” He warned:

There is reason to believe that the [college] campus is the single most dynamic source [of widespread assault on the enterprise system]. The social science faculties usually include members who are unsympathetic to the enterprise system... The Chamber should consider establishing a staff of highly qualified scholars in the social sciences who believe in the system... [They] should evaluate social science textbooks, especially in economics, political science and sociology... The objective of such evaluation should be oriented toward restoring the balance essential to genuine academic freedom. This would include assurance of fair and factual treatment of our system of government and our enterprise system, its accomplishments, its basic relationship to individual rights and freedoms, and comparisons with the systems of socialism, fascism and communism. Most of the existing textbooks have some sort of comparisons, but many are superficial, biased and unfair.<sup>346</sup>

Eventually leaked to the public over a year later, what came to be known as the “Powell Memo” expressed the fears of corporate players who had watched the 1960s in revulsion as university campuses around the country expressed their opposition to American capitalism – “a system they [had] been taught to distrust – if not, indeed, ‘despise,’” Powell bemoaned, by “attractive, magnetic” university professors who “exert[ed] enormous influence – far out of proportion to their numbers – on their colleagues and in the academic world.”<sup>347</sup> Similar to conservative evangelicals, Powell, the Chamber of Commerce, and other corporate activists were convinced that one-sided teaching and textbook composition were contributing to the spread of domestic

---

<sup>346</sup> Lewis F. Powell Jr., “Confidential Memorandum: Attack on American Free Enterprise System,” memo to Eugene B. Syndor Jr., U.S. Chamber of Commerce, original typescript, 23 August 1971, (<http://law2.wlu.edu/deptimages/Powell%20Archives/PowellMemorandumTypescript.pdf>; accessed 25 January 2018, hereinafter Powell Memorandum), pp. 12, 15, 16-17. For an in-depth account of the “Powell Memo” and its effect on the relationship between business and politics, see Ronald W. Evans, *Schooling Corporate Citizens: How Accountability Reform has Damaged Civic Education and Undermined Democracy*, (Routledge: New York, 2015), esp. pp. 92-122.

<sup>347</sup> Powell Memo, pp. 13-14.

anti-Americanism and anti-capitalism, even at the K-12 level. This anxiety led to the establishment of a range of conservative organizations and lobbyists as a counterassault to the emerging power of the New Left, dedicated to inducing long-term changes in the attitudes and core beliefs of the public on the topics of American capitalism and the nation's overall image. By the 1980s, big business became a leading force driving educational reform.

The "Powell Memo" prompted several changes in the relationship between education, business, and politics. After the circulation of the memo, the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), as well as many individual corporations, immediately moved their headquarters to Washington D.C.<sup>348</sup> But pro-business activists did not become active only in Washington D.C. In 1974, James McKenna, attorney for the newly founded, pro-business, conservative think-tank, the Heritage Foundation, "paid frequent visits" to Kanawha County to legally "help parents who objected to liberal textbooks chosen for their schools."<sup>349</sup> One protestor recalled his relationship to McKenna, claiming, "McKenna and his wonderful wife Lea became very close friends with us... Had it not been for James T. McKenna, I think I would have been railroaded off to prison."<sup>350</sup> Connaught "Connie" Marshner, "prolific conservative speaker and writer" and education director at the Heritage Foundation, was also one of the leading protestors in Kanawha County.<sup>351</sup> In 1978, the Foundation even published and distributed the Gablers' article, "A Parent's Guide to Textbook Review and Reform." Some corporations similarly displayed explicit support for the Gablers' crusade. In March 1973, Exxon Pipeline Company even published an article on Norma Gabler in its publication, *The Liner*, praising the "determined woman" for her "years of dedicated effort" in taking down textbooks.<sup>352</sup> It is unclear, however, to what extent the company offered the Gablers or other textbook protestors their financial support.

---

<sup>348</sup> The number of private firms with lobbyists in the nation's capital had increased by over 1,000 percent from 175 in 1971 to 2,445 in 1982. In just a matter of four years, the number of corporations with their own political action committees (PACS) more than quadrupled from 294 in 1976 to 1,204 in 1980. For corporatization statistics, see Lee Drutman, *The Business of America is Lobbying: How Corporations Became Politicized and Politics Became More Corporate*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), esp. pp. 55-59.

<sup>349</sup> Lee Edwards, *The Power of Ideas: The Heritage Foundation at 25 Years*, (Ottawa, I.L.: Jameson Books, 1997), p. 19.

<sup>350</sup> Avis Hill, quoted in Karl C. Priest (ed.), *Protestor Voices: The 1974 Textbook Tea Party: A First Time First-Hand Protestor Account of the Event that Launched the Fight for the Heart and Soul of America*, (Poca, W.V.: Praying Publishing, 2010), p. 309.

<sup>351</sup> Ibid., p. 152.

<sup>352</sup> "Her Review Revealed Marilyn Monroe Given More Textbook Space Than George Washington," *The Liner*, March 1973, Hall-Hoag Collection of Dissenting and Extremist Printed Propaganda, Part II, Brown University Library.

The desire of big business and corporate activists to fundamentally alter textbook narratives to promote more capitalist-friendly perspectives dovetailed perfectly with the agenda of the grassroots anti-textbook movements, which, for much different reasons, similarly wished to teach children only the beauty of American history, culture, and free enterprise. This cooperation is nevertheless interesting because although the textbook riots, in part, stemmed from deep-seated class tensions and a distrust of the elite classes, ultra-rich conservatives, with similar views on American patriotism, were seen as more trustworthy and as having possessed better morals than the supposedly liberal education establishment, and were thus *not* seen as ‘outsiders.’ The real impact of big business on the success of these movements, however, is difficult to measure, as most of the foundations and institutes who offered their support did so underhandedly.

### **2.1.3 Good, Evil, and the U.S. Military**

The formation of a new moral economy of history education in the late 1970s and 1980s was made possible through a unique exercise of democratic political processes to alter historical narratives. Yet, there were a number of intertwined cultural and political changes that occurred simultaneous to the textbook riots which also worked to significantly amend the tone of discourse on war and national identity in the United States. The organized resistance against a perceived liberal dominion in society permeated the world of politics, as well, yielding changes that came to belong to a series of political, cultural, and economic developments collectively referred to as the ‘conservative resurgence’ of the 1980s and 1990s. Many attributed this resurgence to the politics of the Reagan administration, some to a collective reaction to the weaknesses and “absurdities of the Carter Administration.”<sup>353</sup> The conservative resurgence had many ideological influences – some of them religious. This section will scrutinize the role of the military and evangelical values in the conservative resurgence. This intersection is important, as the discursive changes that took place during this period both facilitated and contributed to the educational reforms that appealed to the Gablers and other textbook protestors. It affords a glimpse into their guiding regime of truth, rooted in evangelicalism, and thus helps us to understand their plea for obedience in schools, the hindrance of questions and critical thinking, and unwavering praise of the military.

---

<sup>353</sup> See Kevin Phillips, “Bush Running Against the Grain,” *Los Angeles Times*, 7 August 1988, p. A6.

The growing number of individuals identifying themselves as evangelical Christians in politics, the military, and in the overall population in the late 1970s marked a remarkable demographic shift in American society. After Gallup poll data from the 1970s indicated a substantial increase in the amount of born-again Christians in the United States, George Gallup Jr. labelled the year 1976 as the “Year of the Evangelical” – the year in which Jimmy Carter would also be elected the first born-again Christian president of the United States.<sup>354</sup> *TIME* and *Newsweek* soon picked up the term, spurring increased media interest on the rising influence of evangelicalism in U.S. society and politics.<sup>355</sup> This influence peaked with the election of Ronald Reagan, another evangelical Christian, whom many within the faith considered to have been chosen by God.<sup>356</sup>

In 1980, Reagan won 63 percent of the White evangelical vote and in 1984, a massive 80 percent. While the electoral participation of most other groups decreased during this period, evangelical voter turnout happened to *increase* – ever more in favor of the Republican Party. In 1976, Reagan’s predecessor, Carter, on the other hand, had received only 33 percent of the White evangelical vote.<sup>357</sup> Despite his ardent faith, Carter declared his straightforward commitment to the “complete separation of church and state,” and saw himself a “strong defender of the First Amendment.”<sup>358</sup> Beside his strict secularism, Carter was also heavily ridiculed by other evangelicals for his softness on foreign affairs, especially for his unsuccessful handling of the Iranian hostage crisis.<sup>359</sup> Televangelist and evangelical minister, Pat Robertson,

---

<sup>354</sup> George H. Gallup, *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1972-1978*, vol. 2: 1976-1977, (Wilmington, D.E.: Scholarly Resources, 1978), pp. 858.

<sup>355</sup> “Religion: Counting Souls,” *TIME*, 108(14), 4 October 1976, p. 75; *Newsweek* then tweaked the term slightly, using the plural in: “Born Again! The Year of the Evangelicals,” *Newsweek*, 25 October 1976, p. 68.

<sup>356</sup> In 1980, Reverend D. James Kennedy endorsed the presidential candidate at a National Affairs Briefing in Dallas as a “man who believes that Word, who trusts in the living God and his Son Jesus Christ.” D. James Kennedy, quoted in Bruce Buursma, “Evangelicals Give Reagan a ‘Non-Partisan’ Stump,” *Christianity Today*, 19 September 1980, p. 50. When President Reagan and Vice President Bush were later renominated as the Republican candidates for the 1984 election, conservative leader, Reverend Jerry Falwell, closed his speech at the Republican National Convention (RNC) with a prayer that dubbed the running mates “God’s instruments for rebuilding America.” Jerry Falwell, quoted in John Herbers, “Mondale Charges Reagan Supports Imposing of Faith,” *New York Times*, 7 September 1984, p. A1.

<sup>357</sup> For election statistics, see A. James Reichley, “Religion and Political Alignment,” *The Brookings Review*, 3(1), fall 1984, p. 30.

<sup>358</sup> Jimmy Carter, quoted in Ronald B. Flowers, “President Jimmy Carter, Evangelicalism, Church-State Relations, and Civil Religion,” *Journal of Church and State*, 25(1), winter 1983, p. 116. In 1978, Carter professed before the Southern Baptist Brotherhood Commission that “in public office you cannot impose your own religious beliefs on others.” Jimmy Carter, “Remarks to the Southern Baptist Brotherhood Commission,” *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Jimmy Carter, 1978*, book 1: January 20 to June 24, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1979), p. 1115.

<sup>359</sup> See, for example, James T. Baker, “Jimmy Carter’s Religion,” *Commonweal*, 103, 1 July 1976, pp. 430-433; Wes Michaelson, “The Piety and Ambition of Jimmy Carter,” *Sojourners*, 5, October 1976, pp. 15-18.

claimed, for example, that “millions of evangelicals were frankly disgusted” with Carter’s policies and lack of assertiveness.<sup>360</sup>

Thus many evangelicals voted highly ideologically. Reagan impressed evangelical voters with his conservative political platform and conscious attempt to fuse his political persona with his faith. Many of Reagan’s policies dovetailed neatly with evangelical values, such as his solid stance against abortion, for prayer in public schools, and against the global spread of atheist communism. At a news conference shortly after his second inauguration in 1985, he even told reporters in the Oval Office that “the Bible contains an answer to just about everything and every problem that confronts us. And I wonder sometimes why we don’t recognize that one book could solve a lot of problems for us.”<sup>361</sup> Evidently referring to certain portions of the Bible over others, Reagan continually gravitated toward the display of readiness for war over Carter’s famous commitment to pacifism. After the U.S. invasion of the socialist island of Grenada in 1983, a small, cheerful ceremony was held for returning American medical students from the island’s St. George’s University, during which students waved American flags as the Marine band played ballads and Reagan assured them: “What you saw ten days ago was called patriotism.”<sup>362</sup> Here, Reagan *equated* “patriotism,” and thus goodness, directly to the display of military might. But this patriotism was also connected to a moral battle much larger than worldly politics.

While evangelical Christians in the United States were, in the early twentieth century, often critics of the military and militarism due to a profound skepticism of war and violence, the Cold War proved to enable a turning point in this general perspective, as believers came to make up an ever-growing proportion of military chaplains.<sup>363</sup> Fear of Soviet imperialism and

---

<sup>360</sup> Pat Robertson, quoted in D. Michael Lindsay, *Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 56. The term “televangelist” was first coined by *TIME* in 1952 to describe bishop and television personality, Fulton Sheen, renowned for his preaching via national television and radio from the 1930s to the 1960s. See “Bishop Fulton Sheen: The First ‘Televangelist,’” *TIME*, 59(15), 14 April 1952, pp. 133-135. This term to denote the specific use of communication media to spread the word about Christianity was further popularized by 1981 study by Hadden and Swann. See Jeffrey K. Hadden and Charles E. Swann, *Prime Time Preachers: The Rising Power of Televangelism*, (Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley, 1981).

<sup>361</sup> Ronald Reagan, “President’s 28<sup>th</sup> News Conference,” 21 February 1985, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Ronald Reagan, 1985*, book 1: *January 1 to June 28*, (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1988), p. 201.

<sup>362</sup> Ronald Reagan, quoted in Apple, 1983, p. 70.

<sup>363</sup> In fact, in 1945, when President Harry S. Truman proposed the universal military training (UMT) program, which would require all male citizens between eighteen and twenty years of age to complete one year of compulsory military training and then serve six further years in a general reserve force for national emergencies, Protestant groups around the nation were almost unanimously opposed, including evangelical groups like the NAE, who considered the proposal an attempt at “the militarization of the nation in peacetime,” as printed in the organization’s official magazine, *United Evangelical Action*. “NAE Convention Resolutions,” *United*

attack also compelled evangelicals to more strongly consider the military the most appropriate institution to spread the word of the Gospel across national borders and to carry out a crusade against evil in an increasingly godless world. Some of the most extreme hawkish positions on the Vietnam War were held by evangelical leaders, such as John Rice, editor of the fundamentalist newspaper, *Sword of the Lord*. Rice argued in 1966 that warfare is morally acceptable when its purpose is to eliminate sin: “In God’s sight, sin is always worse than bloodshed.”<sup>364</sup> Furthermore, God granted governments the power to execute His will: “Kings and governors carry the sword of God and they are the ministers of God to execute His wrath and vengeance upon sinners.”<sup>365</sup> For Rice, communists embodied such sinners and their ideology was punishable by death. “I believe that the enslavement of millions of people by communism is indescribably wicked. Any good Christian ought to have holy indignation over it,” he preached, “I have no doubt that if there is ever holy and righteous cause for war, it is to prevent godless communism with its murder and torture and persecution from taking over other lands which ask our help.”<sup>366</sup>

Evangelical hawks justified their approval of the military offenses in Vietnam by likening God’s will to America’s global interests. Like Rice, Lieutenant General William K. Harrison Jr., highly revered president of the Officers’ Christian Fellowship (OCF) and the “first highly visible ‘born-again’ celebrity,” according to his biographer, used the Bible to defend military service as a Christian duty.<sup>367</sup> He cited biblical instances in which gory battles between good and evil resulted in moral justice. He spoke of honorable soldiers, centurions, and captains in the Roman army who had faith in Jesus Christ as the son of God and received the Holy Spirit. “There is no indication that any of these discontinued his military service, nor is there any command in the New Testament that a Christian should not be a soldier,” yet there *was*, “a mandate given by the Lord through Paul that we should remain in the calling in which we are called.” Furthermore, he clarified, George Washington and Robert E. Lee, two of the nation’s greatest soldiers, were also “simple Christians.” Thus not only did just war exist in the Bible,

---

*Evangelical Action*, 1 July 1952, p. 8. The NAE claimed that the government was “capitalizing on the anxieties of the present world crisis to introduce a system of militarism strangely like those inflicted upon the people in the Old World.” “What of UMT?” *United Evangelical Action*, 15 February 1952, p. 7; For a historical account of Truman’s UMT proposal and his campaign to win approval, see Frank D. Cunningham, “Harry S. Truman and Universal Military Training, 1945,” *The Historian*, 46(3), May 1984, pp. 397-415; For more on the evangelization of the U.S. military during the Cold War see Dowland, 2015, esp. pp. 181-198.

<sup>364</sup> John Rice, *War in Vietnam: Should Christians Fight?* (Murfreesboro, T.N.: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1966), p. 13.

<sup>365</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>366</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>367</sup> D. Bruce Lockerbie, *A Man Under Orders: Lieutenant General William K. Harrison Jr.*, (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979), p. 178.

but Christian values also guided the leaders of America's just wars. What constituted a just war relied on Harrison's distinction between murder and "judicial death," the former being condemned by the Bible and the Ten Commandments, the latter occurring "for the purpose of maintaining justice or righteousness." Thus the moral goal must outweigh our love for the enemy. Unavoidably, he applied his argument to the question of civilian casualties in Vietnam: "One of the saddest effects of war is the hurt done to women, children and other non-combatants... Obviously, every possible effort should be made to avoid harm to civilians. Nevertheless, many of them are engaged in active support of the war in various ways. Such persons are a fair target."

While the troops were sent to Vietnam to fight for moral justice, the antiwar protestors, on the other hand, who in their own battle for alleged justice, fought *not* for morality, but simply to disobey authority and cause anarchy. The battle at home was a non-Christian battle, since Christians are to generally adhere to the orders of government, not challenge them:

To avoid chaos, society must be organized, that is governed... In order to reap the benefits of organized society, the individual must surrender certain freedoms to the government, that is, he should obey the law. Christians are so enjoined (Matt. 22:22; Rom. 13:1-7; I Peter 2:13-16). Acknowledging the authority of the government, the Christian is to pray for rulers (I Tim. 2:1,2).<sup>368</sup>

Addressing the controversial topic of Christian loyalty to the government in times of war, in 1973 – as public approval of American involvement in Vietnam approached an all-time low – Nancy Tischler of the widely circulated evangelical magazine, *Christianity Today*, boldly denounced those pacifist Christians who objected to U.S. military presence in Vietnam and considered fighting a sin:

Christians should not consider withdrawing from this tournament of the world, the flesh, and the Devil... To be true wayfaring Christians, we must not be content with cloistered virtue but must confront and overcome evil. The pose of purity implicit in our shunning of the "evildoers" and our condemnation of the evil allows the churchman the unearned luxury of avoiding confrontation with his own sin... Who among us has not benefited from the battles our military have [*sic*] fought throughout our history? Critics now note the evils brought home by the Viet Nam war, but they ignore the benefits we have greedily reaped from wars in our comfortable, secure citadel of righteous indignation... We do our church a disservice to condemn a whole

---

<sup>368</sup> William K. Harrison Jr., "May A Christian Serve in the Military?" n. D., William K. Harrison Jr. Papers, accession #038, folder 2, box 2, Dallas Theological Seminary. Harrison must have completed this article somewhere between the winding down of the Vietnam War and his death in 1987.

body of citizens, creating in them a sense of isolation and of helplessness and of shame while flattering ourselves in our fake innocence. If we are to continue to have a military (and I suspect we are not willing to do without it yet), we as Christians should seek to create a rapport with the members of that group for our own sakes as well as theirs... If we must fight wars in our fallen world, God grant that we have Christian leaders!<sup>369</sup>

While Rice and Harrison excused the American killing of North Vietnamese enemies and civilians through the claim to a crusade for righteousness, Tischler acknowledged that U.S. troops *did* commit sins in Vietnam and even brought them home with them. Nevertheless, she excused their actions by extending the fault of sin into the hands of all Americans who admittedly benefited from these war-related sins.

After the Vietnam War was lost, national shame began to reside, and the patriotic resurgence began leaving its imprint on society, evangelical leaders voiced their approval of increased military spending and a buildup of nuclear arsenals even more clamorously. President Reagan initiated such policies. Reagan's pro-military and pro-nuclear buildup stances should not be analyzed separately from his appealing "pro-family, pro-life, and pro-morality agenda," as historian, Anne C. Loveland, described it – as contradictory as these trajectories may seem.<sup>370</sup> On 8 March 1983, Reagan delivered a notorious speech to the NAE in Orlando, in which he notoriously referred to the Soviet Union as the "focus of evil in the modern world," dubbing the Cold War thus a battle between unambiguous forces of good and evil.<sup>371</sup> In stark contrast to the American morals of fighting for freedom and fearing God, Reagan rebuked that the "only morality [Soviet leaders] recognize is that which will further their cause, which is world revolution."<sup>372</sup> Hence while U.S. militarism in the twentieth century was described by Reagan as the "searching for a genuine peace" and keeping "alight the torch of freedom... not just for ourselves, but for millions of others around the world," Soviet militarism could only be interpreted in his view as an attempt to impose world domination *at the expense* of others.<sup>373</sup> This is because Reagan clearly rejected the possibility of multiple true perspectives, or that each

---

<sup>369</sup> Nancy M. Tischler, "Onward, Christian Soldiers?" *Christianity Today*, 2 February 1973, p. 17.

<sup>370</sup> Loveland, 1996, p. 213.

<sup>371</sup> Ronald Reagan, "Remarks at the Annual Convention of the National Association of Evangelicals in Orlando, Florida" ("Evil Empire Speech,") 8 March 1983, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Ronald Reagan, 1983*, book 1: *January 1 to July 1*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984), p. 363. The speech came to be known unofficially as the 'Star Wars Speech' among critics of Reagan's defense policies after Democratic Senator Edward M. Kennedy denounced his plans for a space-based antimissile system as "reckless 'Star Wars' schemes." Edward M. Kennedy, quoted in "'Star Wars': How the Term Arose," *New York Times*, 25 September 1985, p. A10.

<sup>372</sup> Reagan, 1983, p. 362.

<sup>373</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 363, 362.

aggressor simply failed to understand the standpoint of the other. He predicated a moral struggle of blatant duality: “I urge you to beware the temptation of... declaring yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil.”<sup>374</sup> To acknowledge any part of the Soviet perspective as valid was to surrender to the forces of evil.

Reagan repeatedly demonstrated a belief in Armageddon in the apocalyptic rhetoric of his public appearances. In 1983, Reagan told a Jewish lobbyist for the American Israel Public Affairs Committee: “I turn back to your ancient prophets in the Old Testament and the signs foretelling Armageddon, and I find myself wondering if – if we’re the generation that’s going to see that come about. I don’t know if you’ve noted any of these prophecies lately, but believe me, they certainly describe the times we’re going through.”<sup>375</sup> One of the most prominent believers of a modern-day Armageddon, televangelist, Hal Lindsey, expressed in his plea for an increase of nuclear weapons, *The 1980s: Countdown to Armageddon*, that “the Bible supports building a powerful military force.”<sup>376</sup> Military strength equaled justice, he attested, and thus “the Bible is telling the U.S. to become strong again.”<sup>377</sup> Thus we observe a shared identity between the military as an institution and Christians who saw themselves moral warriors. Both were perceived by evangelicals as being involved in the same battle for righteousness in the eyes of God, and as being called upon by the Lord Himself.

As we have already observed in the textbook riots, evangelical groups became active not only in the political sphere during the late 1970s but also in the educational arena. On the one hand, many evangelicals and other conservatives opposed the NSS and social inquiry on moral grounds and, in turn, its corresponding textbooks and curricula. On the other, they tended to support certain educational reforms that were targeted at improving national test scores, which had been severely lagging since the 1960s, as they believed social inquiry was to blame. In fact, one of the main reasons given by teachers themselves for the decrease in student interest and performance in the social studies during this period was that social inquiry textbooks often required an extraordinarily high level of reading and reasoning skills and were therefore

---

<sup>374</sup> Ibid., p. 364.

<sup>375</sup> Ronald Reagan, telephone conversation with Thomas A. Dine, quoted in Wolf Blitzer, “Reagan Felt Worried about Beirut Bomb” *Jerusalem Post*, 28 October 1983, p. 3.

<sup>376</sup> Hal Lindsey, *The 1980s: Countdown to Armageddon*, (Toronto: Bantam Books, 1981), p. 149.

<sup>377</sup> Lindsey, 1981, p.149.

difficult for many students to comprehend.<sup>378</sup> In April 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education, established under the Reagan administration, published an urgent report to the U.S. Department of Education titled *A Nation at Risk*. The report warned that rampant academic underachievement in public schools threatened the international competitiveness of the American education system. “If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war. As it stands, we have allowed this to happen to ourselves,” the report lamented.<sup>379</sup>

The fear of a loss in American academic rigor led to the creation of several new educational reform movements, such as “Back-to-Basics” and the Educational Excellence Movement, that were based on a focus on the “three R’s” (reading, writing, arithmetic) and a return to “traditional education” characterized by the learning of facts rather than questioning them.<sup>380</sup> Such movements appealed to religious conservatives who were strongly opposed to the questioning of authority and traditional values. In the early 1980s, the Moral Majority, a conservative political organization founded by Reverend Jerry Falwell in 1979, published a set of educational “commandments” regarding school curriculum and circulated it to students in the state of North Carolina. The “commandments” read:

- Don’t - discuss the future or future social arrangements of governments in class.
- Don’t - discuss values.
- Don’t - write a family history.
- Don’t - play blindfolded games in class.
- Don’t - write an autobiography.
- Don’t - take intelligence tests. Write tests only on your lessons.
- Don’t - discuss boy/girl or parent/child relationships in class.
- Don’t - confide in teachers, particularly sociology or social studies or English teachers.
- Don’t - join any social action or social work group.

---

<sup>378</sup> Gerald Marker conducted a study in 1980 to investigate the main reasons for teachers’ abandonment of NSS instructional materials in their social studies classes. He found that a majority of teachers interviewed reported “difficulty making the inquiry phase of the materials work.” Most teachers found themselves skipping complicated data in the textbooks because students “missed the point or could not read the material.” Gerald Marker, “Why Schools Abandon ‘New Social Studies’ Materials,” *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 7(4), 1980, p. 52.

<sup>379</sup> National Commission on Excellence in Education, *Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, report to the U.S. Department of Education, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), p. 9.

<sup>380</sup> Ben Brodinsky, “Basic to the Basics: The Movement and its Meaning,” *Phi Delta Kappan*, 58(7), March 1977, p. 552; Bill Honig, “Educational Excellence Movement: Now Comes the Hard Part,” *Phi Delta Kappan*, 66(10), June 1985, p. 676; Widespread concern over the effectiveness of schools, as failed government monopolies, also led to increased privatization in education and an increased public support for the establishment of charter schools nationwide.

- Don't - take "social studies" or "future studies." Demand course definitions: history, geography, civics, French, English, etc.
- Don't - role play or participate in sociodramas.
- Don't - get involved in school sponsored or government-sponsored exchange or camping programs that place you in the homes of strangers.
- Don't - submit to psychological testing.
- Don't - get into classroom discussions that begin:
  - What would you do if...?
  - What if...?
  - Should we...?
  - Do you suppose...?
  - Do you think...?<sup>381</sup>

These "commandments" made clear references to the social inquiry approach of the NSS curriculum, which *encouraged* critical thinking, the cultivation of grounded personal opinions, and classroom discussions on feelings, values, and other controversial topics. Furthermore, they demonstrated an act of protest amid a perceived quasi-religious war between Christianity and the 'religion' of the educational elites, which, according to their critics, was secular humanism. This was exemplified blatantly in Falwell's statement in a 1981 advertisement that the Moral Majority "strongly oppose[d] the teaching of the religion of secular humanism in the public school classroom."<sup>382</sup> This view was shared by religious anti-textbook protestors like Norma and Mel Gabler, of whom the latter told the *New York Times* in 1985 that "humanism is the religion of the public schools." He similarly referred to schools as "government seminaries," implying that they were the site of religious dissemination of the establishment's godless values upon children.<sup>383</sup> Thus fundamental Christians were involved not only in war, in a conventional sense, but in a religious war against a perceived religious enemy over the right to teach their values to children.

#### 2.1.4 The Social Studies Reflects

Those involved in the NSS movement watched the events of the 1970s and 1980s in horror, as much of their work received some of the most ruthless accusations in a time during which the

---

<sup>381</sup> Published in Ben Brodinsky, "The New Right: The Movement and Its Impact," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(2), October 1982, p. 90.

<sup>382</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 90.

<sup>383</sup> Mel Gabler, quoted in Kleinman, 1981, p. C1.

importance of national pride came to outweigh that of empathy and understanding. Many of the reformers were convinced that analyzing history through the eyes of the various people who lived it would irreversibly revolutionize public school education, and thus could not understand how such an intricate, scholar-designed program could fail so miserably. Others, however, came to doubt the movement themselves for various reasons. Some complained that the curriculum developers and project directors did not remain true to the original objective of working together closely with the schools, but rather acted as scholarly tyrants that dictated what and how the schools were to teach. Robert Adams, a curriculum developer who designed social studies materials for the Instructional Reading Group (IRG) elementary school program in the 1960s, for example, lamented in 1975 that the group “spent too much time looking over [its] shoulders at [its] academic colleagues... and much too little time working... with the teachers themselves.”<sup>384</sup> Others felt that the reformers, as esteemed academics from the Northeast, were often oblivious to the values that prevailed in many local and rural communities, as the outbreak of revolts against the curriculum eventually confirmed.

Harvard historian, Badi G. Foster, delivered a speech on this bias at the National Conference on Education and Citizenship in 1976, agitating his audience with questions like:

Are we the people? Who are we? How much of an ethnic, racial and socio-economic cross-section of the U.S. are we? What do we mean by the citizens, people? Do we mean those who were invited to this conference? What of those who are not here, those who do not possess the signs, the symbols, the sources of power that are ours, that put us on the lists to be called to a national conference? Who has been invited to this conference, who is absent, who has been excluded? What are the criteria by which we were selected? Are the old connections sufficient to bring together those who have become disconnected, of who perhaps never have been connected to their government? If we listen carefully to each other, do we find alternative visions of society, alternative ideologies, alternative critiques? ... Are we a part of the problems with which we are concerned? Or by our presence here, have we defined ourselves as those who must conceptualize for others, who must lead the leaderless, often by turning citizens into objects or so much data? Do we carry the mantle of “citizens” of old, an elite to guide the unknowing masses out of darkness?<sup>385</sup>

---

<sup>384</sup> Robert Adams, quoted in Peter B. Dow, *Schoolhouse Politics: Lessons from the Sputnik Era*, (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 69.

<sup>385</sup> Badi G. Foster, “Are We the People? Thoughts on Creating Alternatives in Citizen Education,” speech at National Conference on Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good in Kansas City, M.O., 20-23 September 1976, transcript, folder “Citizenship Education – National Conference – Kansas City, Sept. 1976, Agenda, Advance Copies of Speeches (1),” box 55, NCSS, pp. 2-4.

Foster charged that most of the participants present had never even read a school textbook and nevertheless made decisions that gravely influenced them. In deciding *for* the people, they essentially negated the role of culture. Peter B. Dow, director of the anthropological catastrophe, MACOS, admitted in 1991 that social studies reformers today would have “placed a greater emphasis on communal values.”<sup>386</sup> Even Jerome Bruner himself, the psychologist behind social inquiry learning in the 1960s, wrote in 1986 that he had distanced himself from his aims of teaching children to be independent social scientists through their liberation from community and culture during the era of the NSS:

My model of the child in those days was very much in the tradition of the solo child mastering the world by representing it to himself in his own terms. In the intervening years I have come increasingly to recognize that most learning in most settings is a communal activity, a sharing of the culture. It is not just that the child must make his knowledge his own, but that he must make it his own in a community of those who share his sense of belonging to a culture.<sup>387</sup>

By the 1980s, protests, political changes, and educational reforms had made the NSS and its approach to schooling difficult to defend. This was true even for the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), one of social inquiry’s greatest advocates, and the teachers themselves who taught these programs in their schools. Both were forced to confront a continuous wave of events that dubbed their efforts ill-conceived, as vocal Americans from around the nation dismissed humanistic conceptions of morality and nation and the rejection of the role of religion in the classroom and in child-rearing. Mindella Schultz, NCSS member and educational consultant to publishing company, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, regretted her failure and that of her highly educated colleagues to recognize or predict such strong popular resistance to cultural relativism in 1976:

We designed tools that forced students to surface values that were affecting their opinions... What we discovered was that some times [*sic*] their values were in conflict with the values of the school, or their homes, or the community in which they lived. When we became aware of their conflicts, we were in trouble. We really didn’t know how to handle this dilemma... We wrote bland objectives that implied morals and values, but avoided public discussions of whose morals and whose values we were perpetuating... If Harvard’s scholars didn’t know the answers to our problems, who did? ... Their objectives stressed teaching respect for knowledge and

---

<sup>386</sup> Dow, 1991, p. 57.

<sup>387</sup> Jerome S. Bruner, *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*, (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1986), p. 127.

teaching the concept of cultural relativism. Neither objective seemed very controversial. Who would argue against a school's teaching respect for knowledge? And among social scientists, the concept of cultural relativism was as close to a truth as you can get... It is now quite clear that there are many Americans who see implications in these objectives that never occurred to me... It is not the function of the public school to convince its students that the givens of the secular culture are necessarily better or worse than the givens of their home culture or church culture.<sup>388</sup>

Schultz admitted that although the profession tended to reject absolute "truths," the concept of cultural relativism embodied, in many respects, the "truth" that guided the NSS programs and teachings. That all values are valid and equal is a value in and of itself, contended another unsettled NCSS member and educator from Pittsburgh to the editor of the official NCSS journal, *Social Education*, commenting on the "blatant fallacies of the so-called inquiry method of teaching," most notably its inevitable indoctrination of children: "We are to inculcate our values into the minds of our students. The approach, though, is to make 'them' think that it was their own idea. In this way, the students will be more ready to accept the already tried and supposedly proven premises... Is this any less subtle, devious, or predictable than a television commercial?"<sup>389</sup>

At times, discussions on values in the classroom also proved to produce the opposite of the intended effect. Schultz admitted in another paper submitted to the NCSS Publication Board that because of this one-sidedness approach to teaching the 'right' values, talk about values in her classroom eventually led students *away* from peaceful, democratic discussion:

What was happening in my classroom did not seem to me to be very promising in terms of the development of democratic behavior patterns... More and more of the debates were ending in bitter draws. Both sides clarified significant values and became vocal and rigid in their defense. Defense soon became argument and in some cases there were even threats of violence... It occurred to me that what was happening in my classroom was a reflection of what was happening in the community at large. As values were clarified, cultural differences were exposed and magnified, what started as friendly debates became polarized and debaters found themselves defending, not a point of view, but the philosophical core of their very being... [We] must stop debating and start dialoguing. A debate starts from the premise that you know the

---

<sup>388</sup> Mindella Schultz, "Can the Social Studies Survive Consciousness – And If So, How? A Plan for Democratizing the Social Studies Profession and its Classrooms," 25 October 1976, folder "PB Meeting 11/76," box 1, NCSS.

<sup>389</sup> William R. Friedman to Daniel Roselle, 14 April 1973, letter, folder "Letters to the Editor – Roselle," box 27, NCSS.

answer and the other side is wrong. A dialogue starts from the premise that neither side knows the answer, but both sides are concerned enough to pool their insights and to engage in a search for possible answers.<sup>390</sup>

The rigid culture wars that divided society outside of the classroom throughout the 1970s proved that prejudice was seldom alleviated, let alone solved – as many scholars had hoped – by the academic focus on relativism in the classroom, at least not in those cases in which students were made to believe that one side held the true answer while the other did not.

The NCSS had not only to answer to the ‘people,’ but also suffered itself from internal fragmentation on the topic of *implementation* of the NSS in real classrooms. Yet this internal critique arrived in some educational settings just as schools were only *beginning* to experiment with the NSS – further evidence that supported the accusation that the social studies excluded large portions of the nation’s educators and schools. One confused member and teacher from Georgia expressed this criticism in a letter to *Social Education* in 1973: “Would those of you who are suppose [*sic*] to be our leaders in social studies education kindly decide what you want social studies teachers to develop in our students!... We must really be behind in this part of the country. Many of our teachers don’t even know what ‘decision-making’ and ‘concept skills’ and simulations are – and you’re already criticizing them!”<sup>391</sup>

The supremacy of a new moral economy had left the core of the reform movement so heavily criticized that it began to crumble at its weakest points. It accused those involved of treachery, and had banned several of the developed materials. By the late 1970s, federal funds ceased to flow into the NSS programs – by the end of the decade deeming them obsolete. Those materials that were not completely banned were often removed from state approved lists, meaning school districts lost funding to be used for the purchase of such titles. As a result, publishers themselves noted a decrease in demand for books that dealt with “broadening and humanizing the social studies” through “the personalizing of history with a focus on the fears, hopes, and motivations of average people,” and thus responded by supplying less of such materials, according to a study on publishers’ perspectives.<sup>392</sup> As an organization explicitly committed to the advancement and survival of the social studies, the NCSS was similarly forced to indefinitely abandon its endorsement of NSS programs and the distribution of inquiry

---

<sup>390</sup> Mindella Schultz, “Beyond Values Clarification – Intercultural Communication,” 20 April 1976, folder “PB Meeting 11/76,” box 1, NCSS.

<sup>391</sup> Elizabeth O. Daniell to Daniele Roselle, 8 March 1973, letter, folder “Letters to the Editor – Roselle,” box 27, NCSS.

<sup>392</sup> Donald O. Schneider and Ronald L. Van Sickle, “The Status of the Social Studies: The Publishers’ Perspective,” *Social Education*, 43, October 1976, p. 463.

textbooks. Publishers attributed the downfall of the NSS thus primarily to “budget cutbacks” and the emergence of the traditional “Back-to-Basics” movement.<sup>393</sup> Such approaches to the social studies were informed by the supposed ‘reintroduction’ of a “chronological, narrative history of the United States” – and those narrative histories were to retell the noble story of a benevolent superpower.<sup>394</sup>

---

<sup>393</sup> Ibid., p. 465.

<sup>394</sup> Ibid., p. 463.

## 2.2 THE BENEVOLENT SUPERPOWER STRIKES BACK

The aforementioned controversies and cultural developments and their effect on the American textbook market led to changes in textbook content that first became observable around the late 1970s. By the 1980s, representations of war and nation in history textbooks had become essentially indiscernible from those of their counterparts in the Vietnam era. This was because the new moral economy of history education was intentionally built upon total opposition to that which had preceded it. Narratives loaded with moral absolutism and celebratory patriotism had won the battle against relativism and multiple perspectives: the United States and its institutions had once again risen to the status of benevolent superpower, at least in textbooks.

The term “benevolent empire” was first coined to denote groups of Protestant missionary groups from the United States that formed in the nineteenth century and traveled internationally to spread both knowledge of the Bible and the superiority of American ways of life – also referred to as the ‘Christianizing’ and ‘modernizing’ of foreign lands.<sup>395</sup> In the earlier twentieth century, the term came to carry a less *explicitly* religious meaning, but rather became an umbrella term to describe diverse groups who were dedicated, on the one hand, to exporting humanitarian charity and social work for vulnerable peoples and victims of crisis and, on the other hand, to asserting American authority and cultural superiority in foreign nations through these very acts of humanitarianism. Stephen Porter argues in his analysis of the concept of the “benevolent empire” that the “imperial venture” which constantly drove this global humanitarianism was always “at least as much about country as God.” This type of cultural imperialism was viewed by many Americans as having “significantly justified America’s influence over foreign populations by its benevolent intentions.”<sup>396</sup> Furthermore, the benevolent empire, as a fusion of public and private interests – of governmental institutions, as well as of various private associations and individuals – proudly represented an entirely “new type of global hegemon.”<sup>397</sup>

This dissertation, while duly noting the potential usefulness of the term “benevolent empire” to describe the types of narratives we come to observe in U.S. history textbooks, will instead employ the term “benevolent superpower.” While both debate and uncertainty exist on the topic of whether or not the United States actually constitutes an “empire,” this dissertation

---

<sup>395</sup> For more on the origins of the term “benevolent empire,” see Joseph Conforti, “David Brainerd and the Nineteenth Century Missionary Movement,” *Journal of the Early Republic*, 5(3), autumn 1985, pp. 309-329.

<sup>396</sup> Stephen R. Porter, *Benevolent Empire: U.S. Power, Humanitarianism, and the World’s Dispossessed*, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), p. 1.

<sup>397</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

will evade this controversy entirely to attempt to communicate the more likely perspective of textbook authors, publishers, and critics themselves on America's role in the global sphere. "Benevolent superpower" is a more appropriate term for this discussion, since the narratives we observe in textbooks of the late Cold War period describe the United States as a hegemon, which – unlike its Soviet counterpart – acts *not* with the intention of imperial acquisition or the imposition of values upon other nations, but solely for the purpose of humanitarianism and global esteem. Such a narrative was considered indispensable for the fostering of patriotic feelings in American children.

Contrastingly, critical thinking in historical investigation – one of the main components of the social inquiry method – was considered a dangerous hindrance to the promotion of patriotism. In the eyes of critics, the merits of national pride and the actions of government and military should be endorsed rather than questioned. As illustrated in Chapter 1, many social inquiry textbooks in the 1960s and 1970s included chapter exercises that motivated both students and instructors to explore several different points of view to solve a certain problem. In the new moral economy of history education, the nature of such exercises began to change. Keeping in line with the 'textbook is fact' objective of new educational movements, the 1980s witnessed a much larger focus on the memorization of information provided in the chapter. This gave way to a prevalence of exercise headings, such as, "check your memory of the facts" in the 1982 edition of Merrill's *America Is*, or questions, such as, "decide whether each statement agrees or disagrees with what you have read. If the statement disagrees, explain why," in Globe's *The New Exploring American History* in 1984.<sup>398</sup> Naturally, such a question nullified the task of providing an explanation other than the fact that the information was included in the text.

The textbook simultaneously regained its importance as the sole source of information on historical events, which invalidated the importance of outside sources, exemplified in Holt, Rinehart and Winston's *History of the American People*: "Using the information presented in this chapter, what factors were most responsible for the Allied victory in World War II? Explain your answer."<sup>399</sup> An approach that took into account only the viewpoint provided in the textbook necessarily discounted the possibility of any other perspective being valid. This is

---

<sup>398</sup> Henry N. Drewry, Thomas O'Connor, and Frank Freidel, *America Is*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., teacher's annotated ed., (Columbus, O.H.: Merrill, 1982), p. 447; Melvin Schwartz and John O'Connor, *The New Exploring American History*, (New York: Globe Book, 1981), p. 447.

<sup>399</sup> Norman K. Risjord, *History of the American People*, teacher's annotated ed., (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1986), p. 639.

remarkable considering that textbooks themselves, in general, became thinner and included less information overall than the thick, information-packed social inquiry books that preceded them. It is precisely this method of teaching that NSS reformers like Fenton had attempted to dispel. In an interview in 1971, he denounced such textbooks, demurring:

Most social studies books are narratives and analytical accounts – students read 20 pages on the American Revolution, learn the facts and repeat them to the teacher... I think that is terrible and authoritarian teaching... The issue is what social studies teaching is all about. Is it simple indoctrination or should we teach students to think critically about the issues?<sup>400</sup>

Interestingly, Charles G. Sellers, another pioneer inquiry textbook author noticed in Chapter 1, never produced another textbook again after his renowned 1975 text, *As It Happened*.

Coupled with a ‘no questions asked’ approach to history, the promotion of the benevolent superpower narrative in new textbooks required that the treatment of certain historical actors be tweaked – especially of those who historically criticized this very narrative and of those who endorsed it. The leanings of these representations reveal what types of values and ideologies were considered acceptable or desirable by the authors of the new textbooks – or their respective pressure groups – and which were not. To illustrate this point, I will briefly revisit the treatment of two symbolic and highly ideological political movements in the late twentieth century: McCarthyism of the 1950s and the antiwar movement of the 1960s and early 1970s.

The McCarthy era of the early Cold War period was largely recognized as a blemish on American postwar history from all sides of the American political spectrum and was portrayed as such in most textbooks of the late twentieth century. Nevertheless, accounts on this period experienced changes over time in terms of the tone and language used to describe Senator Joseph McCarthy himself and his following. Chapter 1 demonstrated how textbooks of the Vietnam era were unambiguously penal in their descriptions of McCarthy as a reckless narcissist and included long, detailed accounts on his power and the harm he caused. But the McCarthy episode was simply too deleterious a blemish to deserve such attention under a new moral economy based exclusively on righteous depictions of U.S. history. The focus on the evils of McCarthyism in revisionist histories was a targeted complaint of many anti-textbook protestors, as they felt it unfairly portrayed an isolated embarrassment as characteristic of American conservatives at the time – a time during which many of textbook critics themselves

---

<sup>400</sup> Edwin Fenton, quoted in Tom Linthicum, “Fenton Says Teaching Issue is Board’s Main Criticism,” *Atlanta Constitution*, 20 December 1971, p. 16A.

were furthermore alive. Thus, by the 1980s, such unforgiving descriptions of McCarthy and the insanity to which he contributed were diluted, as the topic in general began to lose page space. Two editions of *America Is*, published in 1978 and 1982, respectively, demonstrated this change clearly:

1978: In 1954, McCarthy began making charges that there were Communists in the army. A Senate committee was set up to check into the charges, and the committee hearings were seen by hundreds of thousands of Americans on television. They saw and heard McCarthy claim that government workers had to give him information even if it was classified, or secret. They also saw that McCarthy gave *no evidence* to back up his charges. The Senate voted to condemn McCarthy's actions, and public opinion also turned against him. McCarthy lost much of his influence, but not before thousands of Americans came to feel that the government had taken away or ignored many of the civil rights belonging to American citizens.<sup>401</sup>

1982: During and after World War II, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman ordered government workers checked to be sure they were not Communists. Eisenhower, too, tried to remove Communists from government jobs. Although many Americans favored such steps, some people felt that they violated citizens' rights. Concern grew in the early 1950s. During that time, Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin charged that there were Communists in the State Department and the military. These charges were never proved. But many Americans were frightened by what they heard. In 1954, a Senate committee was formed to look into McCarthy's charges against the army. Millions of Americans watched the hearings on television. McCarthy had *little or no evidence* to back up his charges. Many Americans were angered over the manner in which he treated witnesses. Because of his actions, McCarthy lost most of his support. The Senate voted to condemn his actions, and the public turned against him.<sup>402</sup>

The two passages narrated a similar story. Nonetheless, the two editions devoted a starkly different amount of space to the topic, reducing the discussion on McCarthyism from two full pages and its own section in 1978 to a few paragraphs within a larger Cold War segment in 1982. Similarly, an altered use of language in the 1982 passage communicated a different stance toward the issue than that of the 1978 edition. The mention that "many Americans" supported the government's anticommunist actions (as opposed to the "some" who disapproved of them), taken not only by Republican President Eisenhower but also by the two Democratic presidents that preceded him, emphasized a bipartisan contribution to and acceptance of the 'Second Red Scare.' The added emphasis that "many Americans were frightened" further justified

---

<sup>401</sup> Henry N. Drewry, Thomas O'Connor, and Frank Freidel, *America Is*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., (Columbus, O.H.: Merrill, 1978), p. 467, emphasis added.

<sup>402</sup> Drewry, O'Connor, and Freidel, 1982, p. 611, emphasis added.

McCarthy's efforts. His demand for access to classified governmental information was omitted in the later passage entirely. The same is true for the statement about the government's negligence and violation of citizens' civil rights, implicitly excusing the regime for its mistake. Whereas in 1978, McCarthy had given "no evidence to back up his charges," in 1982, he had suddenly provided "little or no evidence to back up his charges," similarly reducing the severity of his accusations. McCarthy's image in textbooks transformed from that of a vicious egomaniac into that of an "unscrupulous politician," as Ginn's *A History of the United States* described him in 1981, who had "expressed the fears of many Americans and their anger at the world situation," according to Scott Foresman's *Land of Promise* in 1983.<sup>403</sup> He had simply handled the situation incorrectly. A teacher's manual to Glencoe's *History of a Free Nation* included a "critical thinking" activity in 1992 that read: "During the 1950s, the fear of communist subversion hung over the country and was fanned by Senator Joseph McCarthy. Ask students if they think that McCarthyism was a 'necessary evil' in order to protect America's vital interests during the cold war," subtly provoking one response by implanting the 'right' answer into the exercise itself.<sup>404</sup>

On the opposite side of the ideological spectrum, the antiwar protestors of the Vietnam era also gained a unique depiction. While the 'new histories' of the 1960s and 1970s, which were generally critical of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, tended to focus on the achievements of the antiwar movement, as discussed in Chapter 1, the new emerging moral economy perceived protestors in a quite different light. Their anti-government and anti-military ideology posed numerous complications for an increasingly pro-military sentiment in education and society. The honorable image of antiwar activists transformed into one that largely represented violence, anger, and anarchy, accordingly. The widely featured images portraying unarmed students being attacked by the police or the National Guard came to be replaced by images featuring more aggressive actions of the protestors – yelling or jaunting at police officers – their descriptions of similar nature. Discussion on the power of peaceful protest began to disappear as the movement's achievements were overshadowed by a focus on violent incidents, like in Prentice Hall's *American Journey*:

Antiwar protests were simultaneously symbolic and disruptive. Some activists dumped jars of animal blood over draft board records. Others tried to block munition trains. In October 1967,

---

<sup>403</sup> Daniel J. Boorstin, Brooks Mather Kelley, and Ruth Frankel Boorstin, *A History of the United States*, (Lexington, M.A.: Ginn, 1981), p. 597; Carol Berkin and Leonard Wood, *Land of Promise: A History of the United States*, teacher's guide, (Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1983), p. 215.

<sup>404</sup> Henry W. Bragdon, Samuel P. McCutchen, and Donald A. Ritchie, *History of a Free Nation*, teacher's wraparound ed., (Lake Forest, I.L.: Glencoe, 1992), p. 917.

100,000 people marched on the Pentagon and surrounded it with the light of burning draft cards. Some in front stuck flowers in the rifle barrels of the soldiers ringing the building; others kicked and spat. The troops and police cleared the grounds with tear gas and clubs.<sup>405</sup>

Here, the emphasis on violence committed by the antiwar protestors seemed to condone the subsequent police attacks. Harper & Row's *Faces of America* mentioned peaceful protests in 1982, but laid significantly more focus on the aspects of the antiwar movement that were unlawful or unpatriotic:

Early antiwar protests were peaceful, but violence became more common as the war continued. Protestors burned American flags and draft cards and took over buildings on some college campuses. Many men eligible for the draft fled to Canada rather than serve.<sup>406</sup>

This passage also refrained from discussing the movement's political demands and motivations. Such depictions carried on well into the 1990s. In 1998, Prentice Hall's *History of the United States*, for example, described the 1960s as a "time of troubles and struggles." In previous decades, the authors argued, "the nation's young people had been the source of hope and optimism. But now, in the 1960s, many acted as if they had been raised on sour milk."<sup>407</sup> Houghton Mifflin's *America: The Glorious Republic* discussed the antiwar movement in 1990 under the subheading "Antiwar protests threaten to tear the nation apart."<sup>408</sup> Heath's *The Great Republic* mentioned the antiwar activists only fleetingly and derogatively in 1977 – in between sentences describing rebellious, unruly youth, in general, implying that these groups were synonymous: "Some young people wore old-fashioned or unusual clothing. Long hair and beards grew popular. More and more young people took part in demonstrations – for peace and other causes. Many dropped out of school. And some began to use drugs, chiefly marijuana. The use of drugs became a major problem for the nation."<sup>409</sup>

While the anti-textbook protestors of the 1970s demanded the nation's history be depicted in a more 'positive' light and that the 'negative' aspects receive less focus, this clearly did not apply to the antiwar movement of the Vietnam era. This observation makes it clear that both McCarthyism and the antiwar movement were evaluated in textbooks *not* with regards to

---

<sup>405</sup> David Goldfield, *The American Journey: A History of the United States*, combined ed., (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1998), p. 950.

<sup>406</sup> Roland M. Smith, Eugene D. Levy, and Martha H. Brown, *Faces of America: A History of the United States*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1982), p. 660.

<sup>407</sup> Daniel J. Boorstin, Brooks Mather Kelley, and Ruth Frankel Boorstin, *A History of the United States*, (Needham, M.A.: Prentice Hall, 1998), p. 808.

<sup>408</sup> Henry F. Graff, *America: The Glorious Republic*, revised ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990), p. 819.

<sup>409</sup> Bernard Bailyn (ed.), *The Great Republic: A History of the American People*, instructor's manual, (Lexington, M.A.: Heath, 1977), pp. 694-695.

their ‘positivity’ or ‘negativity,’ but to their respective relationship to the story of American patriotism. While Senator Joseph McCarthy was acknowledged as having caused harm to their careers and future of many people, he was portrayed as having acted in the name of establishing a safe, communist-free United States. In doing so – while indisputably going overboard – he spoke for Americans’ fears and attempted to execute their wishes for the sake of the nation, textbooks implied. The antiwar protestors, on the other hand, were depicted *not* as having represented the many voices against the war, but rather as a force that simply stood *against* the military, the government, and the narrative of the benevolent superpower. While both ultimately committed a series of unlawful acts, McCarthy largely accepted the likeness of U.S. interests to ‘goodness,’ while the antiwar protestors clearly rejected this notion and went to great lengths to bring others to question it.

A benevolent superpower is righteous in its foreign affairs by definition. This means that any acts of military aggression committed by the benevolent superpower are morally justified. Such a moral justification of violence requires its rationalization, which is facilitated by the nullification of the meaning of victim suffering. Textbooks of the new moral economy sought to justify acts of violence committed by the U.S. military by adjusting – or omitting – those passages that involved the experiences of its foreign enemies. These changes pertained especially to the depiction of events in World War II, especially the dropping of atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Ethical questions surrounding the event gradually disappeared from textbook pages. Mentions of President Harry S. Truman’s fateful decision were justified through the assertion that the bombs had successfully ended the war and thus prevented more potential (American) casualties. Exercises asking students questions, such as, “how did the dropping of atomic bombs in World War II change the history of the world?” demonstrated the starkly different way in which the atomic bombs were debated in many textbooks from the 1980s onward.<sup>410</sup> They became an unambiguously rational move on the part of the Truman administration. One “critical thinking” activity from McDougell Littell’s *A Proud Nation*, for example, asked students in 1984:

Imagine you are the President of the United States. Write a report on your thoughts the night you made the decision to drop the atom bomb on Hiroshima. Realizing the power of the bomb, tell how you weighed the effects of the bomb against the continued loss of American lives.<sup>411</sup>

---

<sup>410</sup> Schwartz and Connor, 1981, p. 453.

<sup>411</sup> Ernest R. May, *A Proud Nation*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., (Evanston, I.L.: McDougal Littell, 1984), p. 677.

Exercises such as this one no longer incentivized students to contemplate critically on whether or not the bombs *should* have been dropped, but rather on *why* they needed to be dropped – which was already suggested quite clearly by the question itself: to prevent the further “loss of American lives.” The difference in the weight between American and foreign suffering is made even more evident when one compares the tone of this question to the “critical thinking” exercise that preceded it:

You are a naval officer stationed at Pearl Harbor. Describe the events of December 7, 1941. Explain how the island was attacked and why the Americans were so unprepared for the attack. Then describe the destruction and loss the Japanese attack left on the island that morning.<sup>412</sup>

Despite the fact that no corresponding item on the vast “destruction and loss” left by the atomic bombs in Hiroshima or Nagasaki was included to complement this one, the exercise already dramatically implanted the emotions one *should* feel toward this event by asking the students to *describe* the “destruction and loss” in Pearl Harbor.

Textbooks also emphasized strongly that the Allied leaders had warned Japanese leaders about an attack before the bombs fell and that the latter had chosen to ignore the warning, further justifying the innumerable deaths and transferring blame away from the American regime onto the Japanese. *America Is* even suggested in 1982 that stubborn Japanese pride was one of the leading factors in Truman’s decision:

President Truman had to make an extremely difficult decision. Dropping an atomic bomb on a Japanese city would kill thousands of innocent civilians. Yet Truman felt that he had no choice. Without the atomic bomb far more people would have been killed before the war was over. He believed that the only way to convince the proud Japanese that further resistance was useless was to use this revolutionary bomb against them.<sup>413</sup>

Furthermore, the authors repeatedly and objectively asserted that not only did the atomic bombs save lives, they also set an example for the rest of the world and prevented the use of atomic bombs elsewhere later on:

...the bomb did save lives – Japanese as well as American. Far more people would have died in an all-out invasion. There was also the hope that a demonstration of the horrors of atomic warfare would convince the entire world that such a weapon must never be used again. So far none has.<sup>414</sup>

---

<sup>412</sup> Ibid., p. 677.

<sup>413</sup> Drewry, O’Conner, and Friedel, 1982, p. 801.

<sup>414</sup> Ibid., p. 802.

Photographs of the destruction became less common, featuring, if anything, the atomic mushroom clouds over Nagasaki rather than of the local devastation it caused. Mentions of human suffering caused by the bombs became rare – personal accounts even more so. In some books, the bombs were only mentioned fleetingly. Knopf's *A History of the United States* dedicated nothing but one short paragraph to the topic in 1980.<sup>415</sup> Glencoe's *Two Centuries of Progress* managed to sum up the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in six brief sentences in 1991:

Truman now decided to use a new American weapon, the atomic bomb, against Japan. He believed that its use would end the war and save many lives. On August 6, 1945, one atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, a major Japanese city. Three days later a second bomb struck Nagasaki. Both cities were destroyed. On August 14 the war ended. And on September 2, 1945, or V-J Day, the Japanese signed the formal terms of surrender.<sup>416</sup>

The only lives mentioned here were those supposedly 'saved' by the bomb. Evidently, some textbooks failed to mention Japanese casualties or death counts at all. Sections featuring titles like "atomic triumph over Japan," or "atomic weapons end the war" celebrated rather than criticized Truman's decision as the hi-tech move that brought victory and peace to the Americans.<sup>417</sup> Images of the Pearl Harbor attack, on the other hand, remained present and received generous page space. *History of the American People* even mourned in 1986 that the attack on Pearl Harbor had "shocked the American people as they were enjoying a quiet Sunday afternoon."<sup>418</sup> Globe's *Expansion through the 20<sup>th</sup> Century* even featured a photograph of the naval base under siege in 1980 and claimed the image supported "the statement that World War II was the most terrible war in history."<sup>419</sup>

Like the devastation in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the internment of Japanese-Americans on the West Coast of the United States was a wartime event that contradicted the narrative of American goodness and fairness. Indeed, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich's *American History*

---

<sup>415</sup> See Richard Current and Gerald J. Goodwin, *A History of the United States: Since 1895*, (New York: Knopf, 1980).

<sup>416</sup> Jackson L. Carlton and Vito Perrone, *Two Centuries of Progress*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (Mission Hills, C.A.: Glencoe, 1991), p. 584.

<sup>417</sup> Current and Goodwin, 1980, p. 726; Graff, 1990, p. 737.

<sup>418</sup> Risjord, 1986, p. 611.

<sup>419</sup> Kenneth Uva and Shelley Ann Uva (eds.), *United States in the Making*, vol. 3: *Expansion through the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*, (New York: Globe, 1980), p. 74.

innocently labeled the action a simple “blot on the Roosevelt record of civil liberties” in 1982.<sup>420</sup> The event came to experience a loss of page space and descriptive details. Some textbooks granted the topic no more than a short paragraph, like Harper & Row’s *Modern American History: The Search for Identity*, which in 1981 praised the victims for their loyalty to the U.S. military despite its mistake.<sup>421</sup> Silver Burdett’s *One Flag, One Land*, which explained (and justified) the internment by insisting in 1985 that a general public “demand arose for those of Japanese ancestry to be removed” from their homes, also featured an image of General Mark Clark bestowing “awards for heroism to members of the Japanese American 442<sup>nd</sup> combat team” – demonstrating that the military at least tried to compensate for the wrong it had done.<sup>422</sup> Some emphasized the Japanese compliance with the security measures, so as to imply that they did not suffer greatly, but rather prioritized the demonstration of loyalty above all other emotions. This is evident in a claim in Scholastic’s *American Adventures* in 1979 that “in almost every instance, the Japanese accepted the move peacefully. Some simply said, ‘It cannot be helped.’... Many people in the camps decided they must prove their loyalty to the U.S. in whatever way they could. As soon as it became possible, hundreds of men signed up for military service.”<sup>423</sup>

Although most textbooks continued to recognize the affair as a mistreatment of U.S. citizens and legal residents, many tried to create an understanding for the government’s position by emphasizing the fear Americans felt after the attack on Pearl Harbor – namely, the *other* Americans. Others argued that the relocation of Japanese-Americans was carried out to help them, as did *American History* in 1982: “They were forced to move to internment camps in a barren section of the country. The government was afraid that some were disloyal and would try to interfere with the war effort and help Japan. Others were placed in the camps for their own protection.”<sup>424</sup> Some textbooks, like Houghton Mifflin’s *America’s Story*, refrained from using the term “internment camps” at all and used the milder term “relocation centers” in 1990:

After the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor, many Americans feared that Japan might attack the West Coast of the United States. This fear led to the suspicion that some Japanese Americans might be acting as spies and would assist the Japanese in another attack. As a result, a number

---

<sup>420</sup> John A. Garraty, Aaron Singer, and Michael J. Gallagher, *American History*, (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982), p. 787.

<sup>421</sup> Wiltz, 1981, p. 652.

<sup>422</sup> Richard C. Brown and Herbert J. Bass, *One Flag, One Land*, vol. 9 of Val E. Arnsdorf (ed.), *The World and its People*, (Morristown, N.J.: Silver Burdett, 1985), p. 621.

<sup>423</sup> Ira Peck, Steven Jantzen, and Daniel Rosen, *American Adventures*, (New York: Scholastic, 1979), pp. 538-539.

<sup>424</sup> Garraty, Singer, and Gallagher, 1982, p. 787.

of military leaders and others urged that Japanese Americans be moved inland away from the coast. In 1942 President Roosevelt bowed to public pressure. He ordered the army to move about 115,000 Japanese Americans to “relocation centers.”<sup>425</sup>

Here, emphasis on the fear that “many Americans” felt toward the Japanese and the “public pressure” this placed on the president worked to justify the internment. *America Is* similarly and carefully narrated within two paragraphs that the Japanese were “moved to relocation camps,” which was done “under the heat and excitement of the war.”<sup>426</sup> Impersonal, concise paragraphs that retold the basic facts eventually completely replaced the firsthand victim accounts discussed in Chapter 1, which aimed to make students aware of the hardships faced by those affected. With its wrongs represented simply as a fulfillment of the wishes of the American people, the military came one step closer to the image of the benevolent superpower.

### 2.3 PRIDE AND COLD WAR ANXIETY: US VERSUS THEM

The attempt to highlight similarities between the world’s cultures and nations that characterized many inquiry textbooks came to be replaced by an emphasis on cultural differences. This especially called for an omission of two-sided or multiple-sided perspectives. This section will demonstrate that the new emphasis on difference, especially between but not restricted to the United States and the Soviet Union – which stemmed, in part, from the attempt to replace the promotion of mutual understanding and moral relativism with dogmatic moral absolutism – worked to deliver and endorse not only a sense of (national) pride in America’s goodness, but also a fear of the non-goodness in the Other. This fear that permeated the pages of textbooks was not necessarily evoked for the sake of disheartening children. Rather, children were invited to identity with their American national identity through the use of heroic narratives to illustrate what exactly the United States *is* and what it is *not*. Fear, even disdain, of the Other was necessary to help establish the national identity of the benevolent superpower, making possible the transformation of the face and character of U.S. history after a period of thorough revisionism and objective criticism.

---

<sup>425</sup> William J. Jacobs, *America’s Story*, teacher’s annotated ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990), p.673.

<sup>426</sup> Drewry, O’Connor, and Freidel, 1978, p. 451.

### 2.3.1 Who are “They”?

In revisionist versions of U.S. history, the Cold War was considered an ideological battle based on natural misunderstandings and equal displays of military aggression and imperialism, as explained in Chapter 1. Late Cold War textbooks authors, however, displayed little sympathy for this narrative. The United States and the Soviet Union became above all moral opposites, representing freedom and oppression, respectively, as group boundaries became sharper. One slight change of wording in a passage in Houghton Mifflin’s *Freedom’s Trail* on President Carter’s administration in two otherwise identical editions of the same chapter, printed in 1979 and 1981, respectively, clearly demonstrated a change in the tone used to discuss the Soviets. The passage read:

1979: [President Carter] took a strong stand on human rights. He criticized countries that did not allow freedom of speech and press, that denied fair trials, and that did not treat prisoners fairly.<sup>427</sup>

1981: [President Carter’s] strong support for human rights angered the leaders of the Soviet Union. Carter criticized countries that did not allow freedom of speech and press, that denied fair trials, and that did not treat prisoners fairly. Soviet leaders said that the United States had no business criticizing the internal affairs of other countries.<sup>428</sup>

In each passage, President Carter’s stance is the same. The combative, accusative tone and value-based distinction between the American “support for human rights” and Soviet disregard for them was facilitated by the addition of the Soviet Union’s opposition to Carter’s stance. Carter’s values stood out more in 1981 against the backdrop of those of their Soviet counterpart. Communist regimes and ideology were described as “cruel and repressive,” driven by “hatred” and “quasi-religious conviction.”<sup>429</sup> Sharper group comparisons and emphasis on difference were exemplified in passages like this one in Harcourt Brace Jovanovich’s *America: It’s People and Values* in 1985:

As you know, the United States and the Soviet Union have two very different political and economic systems. In the Soviet Union the Communist Party controls both the government and the economy. In the United States the people freely choose their leaders. Americans also live

---

<sup>427</sup> Richard A. Bartlett, Clair W. Keller, and Helen H. Carey, *Freedom’s Trail*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., teacher’s ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979), p. 660.

<sup>428</sup> Richard A. Bartlett, Clair W. Keller, and Helen H. Carey, *Freedom’s Trail*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., teacher’s ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981), p. 659.

<sup>429</sup> John M. Blum, William S. McFeely, Edmund S. Morgan, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., and Kenneth M. Stampp, *The National Experience: A History of the United States*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., vol. 2, (Fort Worth, T.X.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), pp. 716, 725.

under an economic system called capitalism... The goal of the Soviets was to spread their system, communism, throughout the world. They saw their opportunity to do so at the end of World War II... By imposing their system on other nations, the Soviets had broken the agreement made at Yalta (see page 709). They had no intention of allowing free elections in Eastern Europe. Instead they planned to build a communist empire. In observing this disturbing development, Winston Churchill said, “An iron curtain has descended across the continent of Europe.”<sup>430</sup>

While the spread of communism was seen as a “disturbing” imposition of the Soviet “system on other nations,” the U.S. military’s pursuit of establishing regimes sympathetic to free market capitalism worldwide was never described in such terms.

In 1982, Laidlaw’s *The Challenge of Freedom* attributed Cold War tensions to the simple fact of ideological differences, grounded not in the belief in distinct *economic* principles but simply in the communist rejection of freedoms as an “ideal”:

In a democracy, such as that of the United States, all political power rests in the hands of the people. But under communism, the government is all-powerful. Citizens of a Communist government have few political rights and little freedom. Clearly, the two forms of government – democracy and communism – are based upon conflicting ideals. The cold war was, in large part, brought about by this conflict.<sup>431</sup>

This trend in representations continued until well after the end of the Cold War, as more militant images and accusative language described communist leaders and party members in the Soviet Union, China, and Cuba. These depictions helped to define the Cold War as an existential battle against a boundlessly evil adversary. Textbooks no longer included sources written by leaders of both sides and in no way encouraged students to try to understand the communist perspective. The ideals of the communists were unambiguously wrong under a moral economy that propagated absolute values. For this reason, it was superfluous and even treacherous to discuss the other side of the debate.

### 2.3.2 Who are “We?”

Textbooks described and branded the supposed antagonists of the Cold War quite clearly. Yet Cold War anxiety clearly left many Americans uneasy about who and what the United States

---

<sup>430</sup> Leonard C. Wood, Ralph H. Gabriel, and Edward L. Biller, *America: Its People and Values*, heritage ed., teacher’s ed., (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1985), p. 722.

<sup>431</sup> Robert Sobel, *The Challenge of Freedom*, (River Forest, I.L.: Laidlaw, 1982), p. 586.

actually represented in this battle. The attempt of many textbook authors to rewrite or enhance certain periods in U.S. history demonstrates that there was an obvious uncertainty revolving the question of whether or not the United States *was* the best, most advanced, and morally superior nation in the world.

Amending the image of the U.S. military, the defender of freedom, was in many ways the answer to filling in this identity gap and to the question, “who are we?” In general, war passages in textbooks came to include more patriotic images (displaying, for example, flags and parades) and heroic images of soldiers fighting or returning home – from all wars, including the Vietnam War. Other popular textbook images featured emotional scenes of soldiers helping the wounded or mourning their fallen comrades. In many cases, references to the military were made from the perspective of the inclusive pronoun “we,” as in *The Great Republic* in its suspenseful introduction of World War II: “How could our nation fight such a world war? How could it stretch its energies and its resources to meet the powerful forces of nations fully mobilized for war?”<sup>432</sup> The “we” pronoun also stood in contradistinction to other groups. Lippincott’s *Modern American History: The Search for Identity*, for example, gave an explanation for hostile feelings toward the United States in Latin America using “our country” to internalize the description, undermining any attachments some students may feel to the countries of Latin America: “Relations with Latin America have been more difficult than with Canada... The United States acted as a policeman in Latin America for about twenty-five years. However good the reasons for this policy may have seemed at the time, it caused the Latin American nations to fear and dislike our country.”<sup>433</sup> Although students of history may not have been involved in implementing the policies that angered the Latin Americans, here they were nevertheless inherently included in its consequences.

Part of the American national identity was earned and defined through its very involvement in war. “The 4 million men enlisted in the armed forces were withdrawn from the nation’s labor supply,” recalled Ginn’s *A History of the United States* in 1981 and “a million women helped to fill the gap, doing jobs that they had never been allowed to do (nor known that they could do). The war helped them discover themselves as they streamed into mills and factories.”<sup>434</sup> According to the authors, it was *war* that finally enabled women to demonstrate their patriotism in palpable ways and contribute to the nation’s war effort just as much as their

---

<sup>432</sup> Bailyn (ed.), 1977, p. 600.

<sup>433</sup> John Edward Wiltz, *Modern American History: The Search for Identity*, (New York: Harper & Row, 1981), pp. 675-676.

<sup>434</sup> Boorstin, Kelley, and Boorstin, 1981, p. 460.

husbands had done – boldly described here as the act of “discover[ing] themselves.” It was war that made American women realize their own potential. War narratives were also altered to exaggerate military successes, confirming the assumption that they were considered pertinent to the upholding of a positive American identity. *The Great Republic*, for example, provided in their 1977 text the increasingly popular explanation for the Allied victory in World War II: that the United States and United Kingdom would have won the war without the help of the Soviet Union. They narrated the status of the war before the United States and United Kingdom had attacked Germany: “The Russians defended themselves doggedly – yet they were clearly losing... Defense alone cannot win a modern war. The British and Americans, however, were not yet ready to attack,” naturally refraining from mentioning that Nazi Germany suffered three-quarters of its wartime losses on the East Front battling the Red Army.<sup>435</sup>

And then there were the blatant non-successes; even these were tweaked by textbook authors under the emerging moral economy. U.S. involvement in the Korean War, which immediately in its aftermath up until the 1970s was represented mainly as an ineffective and costly feat, transformed into a necessary action that yielded limited results due only to the United States’ limited goals. “The Communists had picked the wrong moment to test the will of American leadership,” the authors of *Modern American History* boasted.<sup>436</sup> Rather than a player in a stalemate, the United States came to be depicted as the force that saved the South Koreans, as *Glorious Republic* recalled:

The Americans and their UN allies had accomplished their objective. Through prompt military action they had turned back Soviet-supported aggression, thus saving the South Koreans from being swallowed up by the Communist world.<sup>437</sup>

Hence a once frustrating war transformed into a worthy accomplishment. Even textbooks in which the war was not recognized as a clear-cut victory nevertheless presented it as having been fruitful. Here, another discrepancy between the 1978 and 1982 editions of *America Is* is observable. Nothing but one sentence in its section on the Korean War was revised in the 1982 edition. The concluding sentence of the section read:

1978: Many Americans were upset by the war because the United States had not won a clear victory after three years of fighting.<sup>438</sup>

---

<sup>435</sup> Bailyn (ed.), 1977, p. 600.

<sup>436</sup> Wiltz, 1981, p. 660.

<sup>437</sup> Graff, 1990, p. 768.

<sup>438</sup> Drewry, O’Conner, and Friedel, 1978, p. 465.

1982: Many Americans were upset that no clear victory had been won. Communist expansion into South Korea, however, had been checked.<sup>439</sup>

The concluding sentence in the 1982 edition alleviated the morose tone of the first edition's reminder of "many Americans'" frustrations and disappointment with the war effort.

The subsequent Vietnam War was treated similarly, although it was undeniably regarded as the nation's largest military failure or "blow to American prestige," as *A History of the United States* awkwardly admitted in 1980.<sup>440</sup> Nevertheless, while some textbooks hardly thematized the topic, like *The Great Republic* which dedicated an entire chapter two World War II and under two pages to Vietnam, others began grappling with alternative explanations for the American loss. Admitting that the communist regime had simply enjoyed vast support among the Vietnamese people would have presumed U.S. intervention to have been illogical and antagonistic, thus some textbooks rejected this explanation. Some texts suggested that the role of news media was especially to blame for publicizing too much gruesome brutality, thereby turning millions of Americans against the war effort. *The Glorious Republic* even suggested that the Persian Gulf War in 1990 was fought successfully because, unlike in Vietnam, the news media remained partial to the U.S. government instead of criticizing it. The Bush administration did not "allow the flow of information from the war zone to erode public support as it had in Vietnam," the authors claimed, "the U.S. military... closely screened what was broadcast so that Americans would not be exposed to the kind of grisly images and grim statistics that fueled the Vietnam antiwar movement."<sup>441</sup> Nevertheless, the Vietnam War was increasingly portrayed as having been supported by a majority of Americans: "Some demonstrated against it, but opinion polls indicated that a majority continued to approve it," claimed *History of the United States* in 1990, without citing any public opinion survey or poll data.<sup>442</sup>

Some books suggested that had the administration increased the war effort and caused more destruction, the war could have been won. Prentice Hall's *America: Pathways to the Present* provoked this thought in its exercise: "Do you think that the United States made every effort to win the Vietnam War?"<sup>443</sup> Reconstructions of the American loss were sometimes counteracted by the claim that the Americans had at least possessed superior technology. The

---

<sup>439</sup> Drewry, O'Conner, and Friedel, 1982, p. 607.

<sup>440</sup> Current and Goodwin, 1980, p. 850.

<sup>441</sup> Graff, 1990, p. 888.

<sup>442</sup> Current and Goodwin, 1980, p. 847.

<sup>443</sup> Andrew Cayton, *America: Pathways to the Present – Modern American History*, (Needham, M.A.: Prentice Hall, 1998), p. 625.

American “search-and-destroy” tactic, highly criticized by opponents of the war at home, was defended in some textbooks that claimed the enemy employed even more ruthless tactics:

The Vietcong guerillas used hit-and-run tactics. Not as well equipped as the Americans, the Vietcong and North Vietnamese used ambushes, boobytraps and small-scale attack. They moved swiftly by night and by day hid in the jungles or in friendly villages. To counter such tactics, American troops adopted a ‘search-and-destroy’ strategy. American forces tried to search out enemy troops, bomb their positions, destroy their supply lines, and force them out into the open for combat.<sup>444</sup>

Such comparisons between the fighting strategies of North and South Vietnamese forces asserted that Americans and their allies had fought humanely and accordingly against a merciless enemy. *Modern American History* used just two pages to discuss the entire war – which had lasted twenty years – including only political specifics and omitting the details of combat altogether. Segments on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial displayed numerous emotionally charged photographs of veterans and citizens mourning at the ‘Wall.’ Soon, the narrative held that the Americans, with the best of intentions, had fought bravely in Vietnam, but due to the forced softness of American tactics, the overly critical news media, and the outbreak of antiwar protests at home, they failed to save the South Vietnamese from succumbing to communism. This time, “the United States could not abdicate its historic role as the hope of free people everywhere,” regretted *A History of the United States*.<sup>445</sup>

Alongside the several narrative changes that came to characterize the moral economy of the late Cold War, a drastic *aesthetic* transformation of textbook covers additionally depicted the push for a coherent American national identity – working to communicate a sense of strength and pride. Many textbook publishers that in the 1970s featured diverse groups of citizens on their covers, presumably to portray the racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity of American society, or other colorful collage-style illustrations, scrapped these images in the 1980s to depict a small array of American national symbols (e.g. the flag, the American bald eagle) and a predominant use of red and blue on the covers of new editions. The use of these symbols attempted to define American identity and history more assertively and less inclusively than images of diverse groups of citizens.

---

<sup>444</sup> Bragdon, McCutchen, and Ritchie, 1992, p. 985.

<sup>445</sup> Boorstin, Kelley, and Boorstin, 1981, p. 735.

## 2.4 HEROIZATION: “SEPARATING THE WAR FROM THE WARRIORS”

As tensions surrounding the Vietnam War began to weaken and the details of the loss were increasingly thematized in public discourse, even conservative news media sources that up until this point had positioned themselves in favor of the war effort were forced to acknowledge the reality of the failure. Nevertheless, newspaper articles revolving around the topic of Veterans Day revealed the emergence of a new, ever-growing recognition for American veterans and service members. While the problems faced by veterans returning to the United States on the job market, in society, and with mental and physical health were left largely unmentioned in textbooks, the news media took the liberty of pointing accusative fingers at the government for its negligence. In 1979, the *Washington Post* published a nearly two-page article featuring interviews with Vietnam veterans on the topic of hardships faced at home. The dozen veterans interviewed expressed their shock at the treatment they received from other citizens when they returned, their difficulties in finding a job due to stereotypes about Vietnam veterans, and the rejection they received from peers. “If I had any idea that I would have gotten this type of reaction once I came back home,” declared one of the veterans interviewed, “I would never have gone. I would never have fought for this country. The war is over and we’re no longer needed. We’ve been thrown in the dump like a pair of shoes... And to think I enlisted... Coming home was worse [than the war].”<sup>446</sup> The growing interest in soldiers’ experiences represented the emergence of a new appreciation for the veterans *and* their feelings – not only for their performance in combat.

The erection of the ‘Wall’ in Washington in 1982 was labeled by many news sources as the first step of reconciliation between Vietnam veterans and the American public, reflected by a comment by Reagan, who in 1984 praised the memorial as the beginning of a healing process in what the *Los Angeles Times* called an “emotional address.”<sup>447</sup> Some critics considered the construction more of an attempt by the regime to “remystify” war and its repercussions through the sentimentalization and personalization of battle as an alternative to questioning the ideology that led to the nation’s involvement in the first place.<sup>448</sup> Notwithstanding, the monument came to mark a turning point in the general trend of American attitudes toward Vietnam veterans

---

<sup>446</sup> Raymond Puller, quoted in Mike Sager, “Sad and Bitter Memories: Nation Honors Veterans, but Some Feel Forgotten,” *Washington Post*, 12 November 1979, p. C1.

<sup>447</sup> David Treadwell, “Reagan Hails Monument as Sign of Healing,” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1984, p. A1.

<sup>448</sup> John Carlos Rowe, “Eyewitness: Documentary Styles in the American Representations of Vietnam,” in John Carlos Rowe and Rick Berg (eds.), *The Vietnam War and American Culture*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), p. 165.

which for the last two decades had been characterized by the shame of loss and anger for having fought in the first place. Veterans Day 1982 was celebrated in the nation's capital with a five-day salute to Vietnam veterans, featuring a homecoming "reenactment" performed by veterans themselves – staged in the way they would have liked to experience it – followed by an "Entertainer's Salute" by famous American celebrities, in which actor, Jimmy Stewart, made his amends: "There's been a lot of controversy and some disappointment. We're going to put that behind us. You went to war, you came home, and you are all heroes."<sup>449</sup>

One year earlier in 1981, the *Washington Post* had published a piece of regret and embarrassment on behalf of the American people for their unfair treatment of Vietnam veterans:

Our treatment of the veterans of Vietnam has provided the final shame of that sad chapter in our history. Upward of 8.7 million people served in Vietnam during the nine years of that bitter conflict. Almost 57,700 died. The survivors returned in virtual silence: no parades for them. They came home to a nation that wanted not to remember, but to forget. The injustice suffered by Vietnam veterans can never be remedied. Those who served in Vietnam did not start the war; it was not their failure that led to the miserable ending... But at least we are now well along in providing deserved tribute to those who did not survive.<sup>450</sup>

Thus collective shame *for* the military turned into shame about *having been* ashamed and having not appreciated. Given this growing regard for their pain, it is no wonder that during this time period, veterans' demands, such as for employment benefits and adequate healthcare, as well as the hurdles they faced in adjusting to society after war, became prominent topics in Veterans Day news stories.

An increasing number of studies related to the physical and mental health issues associated with combat in Vietnam, such as posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), were publicized, as veterans developed illnesses and expressed anger over their exposure to Agent Orange and other harmful chemicals during warfare.<sup>451</sup> Correspondingly, Veterans Day articles increasingly featured more emotional and individualized war stories, instead of focusing solely

---

<sup>449</sup> Lynn Rosellini, "Salute Opening for Vietnam Veterans," *New York Times*, 10 November 1982, p. A16; Jimmy Stewart, quoted in Joe Brown, "Saluting Vietnam Veterans," *Washington Post*, 11 November 1982, p. C15.

<sup>450</sup> James J. Kilpatrick, "Finally, We Honor the Vietnam Dead," *Washington Post*, 11 November 1981, p. A27.

<sup>451</sup> The term "posttraumatic stress disorder" arose in the 1970s and was used to diagnose the high number of trauma-related mental disorders suffered by veterans of the Vietnam War, before it was then officially recognized by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980. For the history and politics of the recognition of PTSD, see Julia Huemer, Sidney Edsall, Niranjana S. Karnik, and Hans Steiner, "Childhood Trauma," in William W. Klyklo and Jerald Kay (eds.), *Clinical Child Psychiatry*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (Chichester, U.K.: Wiley and Blackwell, 2012), pp. 275-294; Wilbur J. Scott, "PTSD in DSM-III: A Case in the Politics of Diagnosis and Disease," *Social Problems*, 37(3), August 1990, pp. 294-310.

on the descriptive report of traditional ceremonies. As Americans came to terms with the loss, the media came to increasingly blame the war on the government rather than on those who fought – “separating the war from the warriors.”<sup>452</sup> While this belated gratitude was accepted by many veterans, some felt that the damage to their dignity had already been done. One veteran published an article in the *Daily Press*, contesting on Veterans Day 1989:

Vietnam veterans are not another minority whose turn it is to be tossed the bone of recognition. Public whims cost America a war and the Vietnamese people their nation. We lost our friends. All for naught. If we weren't cool 20 years ago, then don't pass us through society's fickle consciousness again. Thanks, but no thanks; if you didn't support me then, don't support me now. Keep your recognition. I can get all I need down at the American Legion.<sup>453</sup>

As a result of the new public and media interest in the veteran and his – and only “his” – personal issues, Veterans Day itself regained importance. Simultaneously, war itself – which, in the observance of Armistice Day, the predecessor to Veterans Day, was seen as a horrible, life-destroying force to be avoided at all costs – came to be understood as a self-evident fact by the 1980s. One veteran who participated in the 1988 Veterans Day observance in Southland, California commented:

The interest in Veterans Day is increasing every year. There is more prestige, and more people ask to participate. It's because people realize that it's important that we defended the country and are ever ready to defend. We can't be complacent and say it will never happen again. Because it can.<sup>454</sup>

Once a day to celebrate peace, Veterans Day in due course came to be associated with the inevitability of war and an appreciation of those who sacrificed their lives to fight those wars. It was this inevitability of war that, in turn, enhanced the importance of the military and its troops.

Even the language used to describe the honorees of Veterans Day experienced a transformation: from the simple and pragmatic use of the terms “war dead,” “the fallen,” or “those who gave their lives” of the Armistice Day period, to the more neutral terms “veterans” and “vets” of the Vietnam era, and finally to “heroes,” dead or alive. This change, however,

---

<sup>452</sup> “Tribute to Honor Vietnam Entertainers,” *Los Angeles Times*, 9 November 1984, p. 2.

<sup>453</sup> R. B. Anderson, “A Belated Concern for Vietnam Vets,” *Daily Press*, 11 November 1989, p. A11.

<sup>454</sup> Martin Fishman, quoted in Carol McGraw, “Southland Salutes its Veterans with Flags, Prayer, Taps,” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1988, p. T8-T9.

was much less apparent in the local, conservative newspapers which had referred to veterans as “heroes” regularly throughout the examined time period. This new identity and semantic heroization of the military applied to servicemen of all wars, notably excluding, however, female service members, who began receiving official recognition only in the 1990s, as Chapter 3 will illustrate. The soldier’s new hero status signified something more than losing one’s life in war – it was the acceptance of American goodness, despite its mistakes, and the *willingness* to sacrifice one’s life for this goodness.

Veterans Day became not only more festive, but articles covering the occasion in general enjoyed more space in newspapers and were written with a new enthusiasm. This festiveness was accompanied by talk of a rebirth and new beginning of American patriotism. Similar to the aesthetic transformation observable in textbook covers of the 1980s that exploited the colors of the flag and patriotic symbols, as Veterans Day parades enjoyed their ‘comeback,’ it became expected to wear clothing and display decorations in the nation’s colors for the occasion and on other patriotic holidays. The display of colors was perceived as a demonstration of support for the military. The *New York Times* even equated support for and participation in the Veterans Day Parade in New York City in 1980 with patriotism itself: “Patriotism paraded down Fifth Avenue yesterday, draped in bunting and brave with ribbons.”<sup>455</sup> New trust in the military rested upon the reestablishment of the narrative of the benevolent superpower. Now, the military and its soldiers were no longer a threat to – but rather the defenders of – world peace and the American Dream.

## 2.5 CONCLUSION: AN IDENTITY IS BORN

Over the late Cold War period we observe a general urgency to define American national identity in both politics and the educational realm. The very *idea* of a coherent national identity was inherently linked to the contra-identification with other groups – it was especially the communists overseas, who allegedly despised the United States for its freedom and free-market capitalism, whose defining characteristics assured Americans of that for which *they* stood. Thus the ‘we’ was partially defined through the ‘they’ – the ‘good’ through the ‘bad.’ As Evans notes, the heated culture wars of the late twentieth century surrounding education can be seen as a

---

<sup>455</sup> Anna Quindlen, “A Cold Veterans Day of Marchers and Memories, ‘Patriotism is Coming Back,’” *New York Times*, 12 November 1980, p. B1.

“struggle for identity” to answer the question “what does it mean to be an American?”<sup>456</sup> Such questions were left unanswered by textbook authors of the 1960s and 1970s.

When we take into account the vehement demands for displays of patriotism in textbooks by anti-textbook movements, the corporate desire to have the American free enterprise system portrayed more positively in comparison to communism, and the general turn of the tide toward an approach to Americanism through the lens of moral absolutism amplified by Reagan’s late Cold War rhetoric of apocalyptic character, the emergence of this discursive duality comes as little surprise. The military and its undertakings became an integral component of this newfound identity. Although many of the largest textbook riots spawned from objections related to questions of religion, a positive depiction of the U.S. military was equally considered to inherently belong to an evangelical-approved brand of patriotism that equated American global interests with God’s will. The critics of ‘liberal’ textbooks and social inquiry considered the unambiguously positive portrayal of the military, indeed, to be the only valid, patriotic approach to history. America could no longer afford to believe in the cries of Vietnam veterans like John Kerry, who had warned in 1971 that in training young men to kill and hate, the nation had “created a monster.”<sup>457</sup> As the textbook analysis reveals, this more positive portrayal of the military manifested itself in several forms: from exaggerating military successes to downplaying failures – in some cases through a slight change of wording in the altered editions of a certain text. While journalists incorporated soldiers’ personal experiences and hardships into their Veterans Day stories at the expense of the image of the federal government and the upholding of the benevolent superpower narrative, textbooks flattened such conflicts to place both soldiers and the military on a moral pedestal, leaving most injustices suffered by soldiers unspoken. This can be interpreted as an attempt to hinder negative feelings toward the actions of government that would compromise loyalty.

Perhaps this chapter is less about a moral economy based on pride than it is about a system based on the fear of what happens when people are *not* proud – a fear inseparable from the emotional events and tensions of the Cold War. As exemplified by the allegations of some textbooks that implied the antiwar demonstrations were to blame for the military loss in Vietnam, there arose a general skepticism of civil protest and disobedience, as it was seen as

---

<sup>456</sup> Evans, 2020, p. 184.

<sup>457</sup> John F. Kerry, “Vietnam Veterans against the War, Speech before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations,” in *Legislative Proposals Relating to the War in Southeast Asia, United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations*, 92<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 22 April 1971, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

possessing the capability to tear apart the imagined coherence of the nation. This is also telling, as it suggests a change in the acceptance of groups who vociferously challenged and criticized the narrative of the benevolent superpower. The step away from critical thinking, the exclusion of conflicting viewpoints, less emphasis on mutual understanding and compassion, and an exaggeration of military successes all served to strengthen a nationalistic war discourse in the moral economy of history education.

Critical thinking and the consideration of other viewpoints were perceived by textbook critics as threatening to the preservation of the image of the national community, precisely because a nation's past must be constructed upon absolute ideals reproduced within one, 'true' historical framework. With the erasure of this teaching strategy and the less critical nature of chapter exercises by the 1980s, students were expected to rely on the information provided in the text alone to solve problems rather than to refer to diverse sources. The refusal to draw parallels between the United States and other nations also replaced a sense of human sameness with an emphasis on difference and incompatibility. Perceived intergroup differences can fuel support for military action.<sup>458</sup> A national community's exposure to the suffering endured by its enemies at the hands of its own military during wartime is equally crucial to shaping the way its individuals perceive war and soldiers. The failure to expose readers to outgroup suffering in intergroup conflict can dampen feelings of empathy toward members of that group. The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki experienced the most significant transformation in its representation in textbooks over time. Not only were graphic images of the destruction gradually replaced in number by large to full-page photographs of the Pearl Harbor attack, but morally charged critical discussions on the bombs became essentially absent. This should not be interpreted as a targeted animosity toward the Japanese per se, but as a vindication of the administration's use of such a calamitous weapon at the expense of tens of thousands of civilian lives. This omission of enemy suffering cannot be separated from its late Cold War context. In the struggle to define the United States as the morally superior world power, it was necessary

---

<sup>458</sup> Many scholars have studied the relationship between collective identity, or 'social identity,' and intergroup conflict using *social identity theory* (SIT). SIT postulates that group memberships influence an individual's behavior and self-esteem, especially when individuals compare themselves to members of other groups, see Henri Tajfel and John C. Turner, "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict," in William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel (eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, (Monterey, C.A.: Brooks/Cole, 1979), pp. 33–47. Social identities have been shown to hold implications for intergroup relations and can be used to explain – even violent – intergroup conflict. See, for example, Neil Ferguson and Shelley McKeown, "Social Identity Theory and Intergroup Conflict in Northern Ireland," in Shelley McKeown, Reeshma Haji, and Neil Ferguson (eds.), *Understanding Peace and Conflict through Social Identity Theory*, (New York: Springer, 2016), pp. 215–227; Adrian Lüders, Eva Jonas, Immo Fritsche, and Dimitrij Agroskin, "Between the Lines of Us and Them: Identity Threat, Anxious Uncertainty, and Reactive In-Group Affirmation: How Can Antisocial Outcomes Be Prevented?" in *ibid.*, pp. 33–53.

for textbooks to distinguish the military's harm of others from the Soviet militarism and imperialism that were perceived to have caused so many people pain and suffering. The stimulation of pride in the nation's military and its members also requires pride in the military's feats. In many ways, the moral economy of the 1980s seemed to resemble the "implacable, seamless" U.S. histories of the 1950s that Frances Fitzgerald observed in her textbook critique, *America Revised*, in 1979.<sup>459</sup>

Certainly, there were critics of the aforementioned developments in education and instructional materials. One of the most popular critiques of American history textbooks since Fitzgerald's account was published in 1995 by historian and sociologist, James W. Loewen. In, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong*, Loewen put twelve U.S. history textbooks commonly used in classrooms of the 1980s on trial by evaluating the accuracy of their historical narratives, scrutinizing their treatment of various virtuous figures from Helen Keller to Woodrow Wilson to Christopher Columbus. Loewen himself had co-authored and co-edited an inquiry state history textbook titled *Mississippi: Conflict and Change*, published by Random House's Pantheon in 1974, which was banned by the state of Mississippi in 1980 for its critical stance on slavery and racism, causing the dismissal of teachers who expressed interest in working with the textbook.<sup>460</sup> Fifteen years later in his textbook review, Loewen criticized the "trouble-free approach" textbook authors employed to breeze through a blemish-free history without the thematization of conflict and struggle.<sup>461</sup> He argued that "no *real* emotion seeps into these books, not even real pride. Instead, heroic exceptions to the contrary, most American history courses and textbooks operate in a gray emotional landscape of pious duty in which the United States has a good history, so studying it is good for students."<sup>462</sup>

Perhaps it is true that the pride communicated in these textbooks was not "real" – to employ Loewen's terminology. This does not discount, however, the presence of any emotion in the texts at all. As the data in this study have shown, many textbooks of the time were written

---

<sup>459</sup> Frances Fitzgerald, *America Revised: What History Textbooks Have Taught Our Children about Their Country, and How and Why Those Textbooks Have Changed in Different Decades*, (New York: Random House, 1979), p. 11.

<sup>460</sup> See Herbert Mitgang, "Mississippi Textbook Dispute Revived," *New York Times*, 29 March 1981, p. 36. For more on the history of the Mississippi state textbook controversy and the court cases that followed, see Charles W. Eagles, *Civil Rights, Culture Wars: The Fight over a Mississippi Textbook*, (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2017).

<sup>461</sup> James W. Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong*, (New York: Touchstone, 1995), p. 260.

<sup>462</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 301.

against a backdrop of fear and anxiety: of not truly being superior to other nations, of not truly being the benevolent superpower “we” were supposed to be. This fear is significant. It was emphasized that fear led the United States to drop atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and to intern the Japanese-Americans during World War II. It was fear that led Americans to tolerate and even accept McCarthy’s unsubstantiated claims against other citizens. And it would be fear – now, in this late Cold War period – that would justify the apocalyptic destruction of the earth in self-defense against the Soviet Union, the “evil empire” – should it be necessary.

Loewen blamed the uncritical and inaccurate textbook narratives he observed largely on an “ideology of progress,” or the propagation of the myth that every aspect of American society is always improving and thus merits little or no critique. This overly optimistic portrayal of national history shielded textbooks from potential “attacks by ultrapatriotic critics in Texas and other textbook adoption states,” because after all, Loewen argued, publishers simply “hope[d] that nationalist optimism [would] get their books adopted.”<sup>463</sup> Not only did publishers sell the ideology of progress for profit, but most Americans in general, simply “want[ed] to believe that their society has been, on balance, a boon and not a curse to mankind and to the planet.” In 1995, several years after most of his sample textbooks were published, he claimed, “this is the America in which most textbook authors grew up and the America they still try to sell to students today.”<sup>464</sup> As Chapter 3 will show, however, the succeeding moral economy of history education that dominated textbook narratives in the 1990s – while demonstrating a similar focus on patriotism and whitewashing of war – had several unique characteristics facilitated by the end of the Cold War. While it is difficult to measure the influence of Loewen’s publication on the minds of parents or students regarding textbooks of the 1980s, it is worth noting that the critique became a national bestseller and won both an American Book Award and the Oliver Cromwell Cox Award for Distinguished Anti-Racist Scholarship.<sup>465</sup>

Regardless of the fervent debate that has continually surrounded textbook content, consuming a textbook is always an active experience. Whether or not the attempts to implant patriotism into the minds of students were successful is a question beyond the scope of the present study. In 1994, Terrie L. Epstein published a reception study from the perspective of history students in *Social Education*. The study attempted to capture student attitudes toward a

---

<sup>463</sup> Ibid., pp. 258, 270.

<sup>464</sup> Ibid., p. 257.

<sup>465</sup> See Valerie Strauss, “It’s Back in the Age of ‘Alternative Facts’: ‘Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong,’” *Washington Post*, 26 July 2018, (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2018/07/26/its-back-in-the-age-of-alternative-facts-lies-my-teacher-told-me-everything-your-american-history-textbook-got-wrong/>; accessed 22 October 2020).

widely used and highly esteemed history textbook, Ginn's *A History of the United States*, published in 1986, dubbed as "one of the most well-written and appealing textbooks on the market" by adult textbook critics.<sup>466</sup> When asked about the perceived objectivity of the textbook, one student told Epstein in an interview: "I have to believe the facts but sometimes they present them in a way that America is always right and never makes mistakes. They make it sound like whatever we did was for the right reasons. Sometimes I disagree with this."<sup>467</sup> Although all of the seventeen students in the study reported to have believed what the authors had written, when asked to elaborate on their approval, three of seventeen students gave specific examples of pro-government bias on the topics of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, the Electoral College, and the treatment of figures like President Eisenhower, respectively. "For example, the way they dealt with Eisenhower when he sent troops to Vietnam," the last student declared, "and then promised to take them out but didn't. They [the textbook] said he showed courage. If he said he would withdraw the troops and then didn't, don't tell me it was a great American decision." Another protested, "it's just written history. It doesn't get into how it really was." While some of the students demonstrated an indifference or acceptance of the information in the textbook simply because it was a book, there was similarly talk of a "'pro-government' or 'pro-American' or 'nationalistic' stance of the authors.'" Clearly, in this particular suburban, eleventh-grade classroom in the "metropolitan area of a large northeastern city," the moral economy of history education based on the proliferation of uncritical patriotism and glorification of the military's endeavors was not blindly accepted by all students everywhere.<sup>468</sup> How this group of narratives and definitions of morality fared in another type of educational setting has not been studied extensively. Based on the survival of some aspects of this moral economy into the post-Cold War decade, as covered in the following chapter, we can infer that this new, optimistic moral economy of history education enjoyed – despite critique – a considerable deal of success.

---

<sup>466</sup> Terrie L. Epstein, "America Revised Revisited: Adolescents' Attitudes towards a United States History Textbook," *Social Education*, 58(1), 1994, p. 41.

<sup>467</sup> All following student respondent quotes on *ibid.*, p. 43.

<sup>468</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41.

## War for the Thrill of It: Post-Cold War Confidence and the Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism

*That which we remember is, more often than not, that which we would liked to have been; or that which we hope to be. Thus our memory and our identity are ever at odds; our history ever a tall tale told by inattentive idealists. – Ralph Ellison<sup>469</sup>*

---

“This is an historic moment,” President George H. W. Bush swore sternly and confidently in his televised pep talk to the American people from inside the Oval Office on 16 January 1991. In rejoicing over recent American successes in foreign policy, Bush was sure to utilize inclusive and unifying language: “We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and cold war.”<sup>470</sup> Just two years earlier, Bush had been criticized, especially by his conservative colleagues, for failing to deliver a jubilant victory address to the nation or to display any celebratory emotions in wake of the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. On that day, Bush calmly and monotonously answered the questions of enthusiastic reporters who circled his desk in the Oval Office. When asked by one reporter about why he did not seem to be “elated,” Bush countered calmly: “I am not an emotional kind of guy.” To the reporter’s response, “well, how elated are you?” Bush confirmed, “I’m very pleased.”<sup>471</sup>

Now, in 1991, Bush couldn’t afford to address the nation with puzzling indifference. He was faced with a new challenge: to convince the American people that Operation Desert Storm, the first full-fledged combined arms operation involving hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops since Vietnam, would end quickly, fairly, and in the nation’s favor: in essence, the very antithesis of Vietnam. To do so, he needed to communicate emotional flare and a tone of confidence. “When we are successful – and we will be – we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill

---

<sup>469</sup> Ralph Ellison, “The Golden Age: Time Past,” *Esquire*, 51, 1 January 1959, p. 107.

<sup>470</sup> George H. W. Bush, “Address to the Nation Announcing Allied Military Action in the Persian Gulf,” 16 January 1991, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1991*, book 1: *January 1 to June 30*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992), p. 44.

<sup>471</sup> George H. W. Bush, “Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session with Reporters on the Relaxation of East German Border Controls,” *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1989*, book 2: *July 1 to December 31*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), p. 1489.

the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders."<sup>472</sup> Aerial and naval bombardment of enemy targets in Iraqi-occupied Kuwait began the next day and continued for five weeks until an Allied ground assault expelled Iraqi forces from the area and ended the war.

Bush's justification for the sending U.S. troops to the Middle East was two-fold, as revealed in his remarks to the Department of Defense on the morning of 15 August 1990. On the one hand, Bush stressed the unnaturalness of Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait by endlessly emphasizing that his "ruinous policies of war" were not an act of mere outgroup-targeted aggression, but a twisted and abnormal transgression against his fellow Muslims and Arabs: Hussein "lied to his Arab neighbors," "invaded an Arab State," and threatened "the Arab nation." From this point of view and based on these statements alone, the affair came across as an internal conflict among 'like groups.' Thus Bush needed to stress, on the other hand, the relevance of fighting Hussein for people around the world, and especially for the American people. Here, he turned to economics. The American intervention, he assured, was *not* about differences in religion or culture. It was about:

...access to energy resources that are key, not just to the functioning of this country, but to the entire world. Our jobs, our way of life, our own freedom and the freedom of friendly countries around the world would all suffer if control of the world's greatest oil reserves fell into the hands of that one man – Saddam Hussein.

Bush managed to combine both of these arguments to convince Congress and observers around the world that battling Hussein was about America's "own national security interests" *and* "ensuring the peace and stability of the world."<sup>473</sup>

After the war ended, however, the conscious pursuit of American economic interests in having undertaken military action against Iraq seemed to have been erased from the dialogue on the war. Bush, no longer having to answer to the few critical voices of the war effort, depicted the U.S. military intervention in retrospect as a purely humanitarian endeavor, never forgetting to make use of the all-encompassing 'we.' "We went halfway around the world to do what is moral and just and right," Bush told Congress weeks after the end of the conflict, "and we fought hard, and – with others – we won the war. And we lifted the yoke of aggression and tyranny from a small country that many Americans had never even heard of, and we ask nothing

---

<sup>472</sup> Bush, "Address to the Nation Announcing Allied Military Action in the Persian Gulf," 1991, p. 44.

<sup>473</sup> George H. W. Bush, "Remarks to Department of Defense Employees," 15 August 1990, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1990*, book 2: *July 1 to December 31*, (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991), p. 1139. This speech contains one of Bush's first public mentions of his goal to establish the so-called "new world order."

in return.”<sup>474</sup> This narrative dovetailed tidily with the administration’s legitimization of its previous undertakings in Panama under the so-called Operation Just Cause in 1989, named precisely to convince critics of the operation’s quest for moral justice.<sup>475</sup> Despite being a violation of international law and denounced by the United Nations and the Organization of American States, the U.S. invasion of Panama granted Bush the opportunity to present himself to the nation as a strong and determined global leader, which helped his cause and credibility when it came to defending Operation Desert Storm months later.

Rather than for his foreign policy, however, presidential candidate Bush declared to his voters in 1988 that he wanted to be known as the “education president.”<sup>476</sup> After taking office, he ultimately came to pass the educational reforms targeted at sinking test scores that consequentially affected the flux of influences on the content of instructional materials. These developments, coupled with the highly emotional reaction to recent events in international politics – particularly the end of the Cold War, the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and the swift American victory in the Persian Gulf – provided not only American leaders but also textbook writers with new opportunities to sharpen American national identity when discussing war. Although the patriotic revival that characterized the 1980s had already drastically altered the tone of many war narratives compared to those of the previous moral economy, these new political victories of the early 1990s allowed for the undertones of anxiety to be replaced with a more aggressive, nationalistic spirit. This more self-assured strand of patriotism most starkly affected the treatment of conflicts in which the United States and its allies were deemed unambiguously victorious – most notably the Persian Gulf War.

This chapter concerns itself with post-Cold War American history textbooks, focusing particularly on their new representation of war as a thrilling action story, in which the skilled and technologically advanced heroes emerge decidedly victorious in the battle against evil. Such narratives did not, however, receive unanimous support in the academic realm. The following section will analyze, firstly, the debate on multiculturalism and global perspectives that arose in the 1990s and the strong opposition – although limited in influence – of some historians against the continuation of a moral economy of history education built upon the

---

<sup>474</sup> George H. W. Bush, “After the War: The President, Transcript of President Bush’s Address on End of the Gulf War,” *New York Times*, 7 March 1991, p. A8.

<sup>475</sup> General and then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Colin Powell, admitted in retrospect that the choice of codename for Operation Just Cause was moral persuasion: “Even our severest critics would have to utter ‘Just Cause’ while denouncing us.” Colin Powell, quoted in Christopher D. O’Sullivan, *Colin Powell: American Power and Intervention from Vietnam to Iraq*, (Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009), p. 83.

<sup>476</sup> George H. W. Bush, quoted in Reagan Walker, “Bush: Capturing the ‘Education’ Moment?” *Education Week*, 19 October 1988, p. 8.

uncritically patriotic narratives that dominated the Reagan era. These historians proposed a return to many of the aspects of social inquiry and inclusive history and, like their predecessors, largely failed in their efforts. I will then scrutinize the specifics of an increasingly homogenized textbook market that further pushed publishers to produce the most marketable – and thus most patriotic – content, rather than the most accurate or varied in perspective, despite heated debates. This chapter will, secondly, delve into the post-Cold War textbooks, an examination which primarily reveals the preference for a nationalist form of Americanism over the revisionist or multiculturalist approaches pushed for by many academics.<sup>477</sup> An exception to this homogenous history was the diversification of war stories to include the experiences of more diverse groups of U.S. soldiers (e.g. Black and female). While many textbooks sought to completely omit deleterious episodes in U.S. history, a very small number of textbooks tried to apply the social inquiry method to re-revise biased reconstructions of war. The chapter will, thirdly, explore the textbooks' appeal to specific emotions. We come to observe a narrative style similar to that of an action story that seeks to arouse thrill over empathy for the Other. Finally, to complete the discussion of representations of, and conversation on, the U.S. military in the 1990s, this chapter will examine the coverage of Veterans Day in newspapers and demonstrate that increased news reporting on the needs and experiences of certain discriminated groups in the military paralleled the diversifying and personalization of soldier experiences in textbooks.

---

<sup>477</sup> In this debate, the term “Americanism” refers to a uniquely American form of patriotism, a “loyalty to [the American] nation, rooted in a defense of its political ideals” or democratic values. Michael Kazin and Joseph A. McCartin, “Introduction,” in Michael Kazin and Joseph A. McCartin (eds.), *Americanism: New Perspectives on the History of an Ideal*, (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), p. 1. Kazin and McCartin’s volume explores shifting understandings of Americanism as an ideology throughout U.S. history. Here, the term will also denote the rejection of multiculturalist approaches to history. In 1988, Leonard and Patricia Davidman defined and clearly differentiated the concepts of “multicultural education,” “multicultural curriculum,” “multicultural perspectives,” and “multicultural setting.” The term *multiculturalism* discussed in this dissertation refers to *multicultural perspectives* in the teaching and reconstruction of history, or the recognition and inclusion of the perspectives of diverse groups into historical narratives. Davidman and Davidman put forth that instructional materials that employ a multicultural approach “will... lead teachers to focus on the achievement of greater amounts of inter-ethnic and cross-cultural understanding and harmony.” Leonard Davidman and Patricia Davidman, “Multicultural Teacher Education in the State of California: The Challenge of Definition and Implementation,” *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 15(2), spring 1988, p. 62.

### 3.1 AMERICANISM VERSUS MULTICULTURALISM: THE ROAD TO HOMOGENIZATION

Ideologically speaking, the strongest cultural and political influences on education and the teaching of history in the 1990s differed minimally from the most influential movements that characterized the late Cold War period. It is not without reason that the 1990s are often considered a continuation of the conservative resurgence that began in the late 1970s, and thus it is wise not to observe this moral economy as entirely separate.<sup>478</sup> By the 1990s, however, multiculturalist approaches to history gained greater significance within and beyond academia, a phenomenon that eventually contributed to the establishment of a newer, less powerful, competing moral economy of historical education that stood in opposition to the prevailing values of non-inclusive, homogeneous Americanism.

The growing recognition of transnational interdependence worldwide and the need to globalize American education had long been salient topics among educationists and curriculum developers. In fact, as we have seen in Chapter 1, with the emergence of the New Social Studies (NSS), many scholars had begun emphasizing the importance of cultivating global thinking and an interest in intercultural cooperation in students in the 1960s and 1970s. Nationwide projects that produced new instructional materials, developed curricula, and organized workshops for educators, such as the Global Education Project by the Center for War/Peace Studies or the Multiethnic Education Project by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), sought to integrate intercultural awareness into the social studies to both dampen Cold War tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union and promote a healthy sense of self in students, according to a NCSS policy manual in 1975.<sup>479</sup> These projects were nevertheless limited in terms of their lasting impact on the content of instructional materials, as the patriotic turn of the 1980s deemed many such materials invalid and un-American, as discussed in Chapter 2. Nevertheless, with the sweeping demographic changes that historically altered the racial and ethnic composition of U.S. society in the 1990s, cultural diversity in American classrooms became impossible to deny in most corners of the country. These changes included not only an

---

<sup>478</sup> For an account on the negotiations in the educational sphere that characterized the conservative resurgence or ‘conservative restoration’ of the late 1970s until the 1990s, see Ronald W. Evans, *The Tragedy of School Reform: How Curriculum Politics and Entrenched Dilemmas Have Diverted Us from Democracy*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), esp. pp. 99-147, 149-182.

<sup>479</sup> The NCSS considered a “multiethnic” education and curriculum indispensable, not only for the fostering of mutual understanding and acceptance between students of various cultures, but for the provision of “continuous opportunities to develop a better sense of self” in individual students, adding an individualistic incentive. See James A. Banks, Carlos E. Cortés, Geneva Gay, Ricardo L. Garcia, and Anna S. Ochoa, “Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education: Position Statement,” October 1976, folder “NCSS Policy Manual 1975,” box 10, accession #840925, NCSS.

increase in the African American population, but a drastic increase in groups with Asian and Latin American roots.<sup>480</sup>

Echoing the founders of the NSS movement, many educational reformers in the 1990s saw a reintroduction or reemphasis of cultural relativism in the social studies to be the key to enabling students to “see the world from another group’s point of view” and to prepare them to “live in a society that will continue to be characterized by cultural differences,” peacefully and competently, as anthropologist, Lawrence B. Breitborde, avowed in 1993.<sup>481</sup> In fact, the NCSS revised its Multiethnic Education Program of 1976 to create a Multicultural Education Curriculum in 1991 to “reaffirm its commitment to educational programs and curricula that reflect the racial, ethnic, and cultural diversity within the United States and the world.”<sup>482</sup> Nevertheless, the negotiation on how to incorporate multiculturalist approaches into the teaching of history occurred not without controversy. Mirroring the complaints of the anti-textbook protestors in the 1970s, those who were opposed to such approaches contested that in highlighting the accomplishments of non-Western cultures, cultural relativists contradicted their own plea for the acceptance of various cultural views, by “invariably end[ing] up heavily criticizing a particular [culture] (usually Western culture),” which they could not “accept... on its own terms,” as voiced by critics like educationist, Jeffrey T. Fouts, in *Social Education* in 1993.<sup>483</sup> Interestingly, unlike the grassroots movement of the 1970s, now, revolt against multiculturalist and inclusive approaches to history would originate from *within* academia, rather than from those suspicious of educational elites.

Several test runs of multiculturalist approaches to history in the 1990s were repeatedly met with fury – and not only in the classroom. In the case of military history, critics claimed that multiculturalist war narratives clashed with and compromised the memory of soldiers themselves. In 1994, for example, when the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum in Washington D.C. planned its exhibition on the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, *The Last Act: The Atomic Bomb and the End of World War II*, scheduled to open the following year, the American Legion, the Air Force Association, and other veterans groups accused those involved

---

<sup>480</sup> For more on the demographic changes and increasingly diverse racial and ethnic composition of U.S. society in the 1990s, see Cinzia de Vita and K. M. Pollard, “Increasing Diversity of the U.S. Population,” *Statistical Bulletin* (Metropolitan Life Insurance Company), 77(3), July-September 1996, pp. 12-17.

<sup>481</sup> Lawrence B. Breitborde, “Multiculturalism and Cultural Relativism after the Commemoration,” *Social Education*, 57(3), March 1993, p. 107.

<sup>482</sup> NCSS Task Force on Ethnic Studies, “Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education,” *Social Education*, 56(5), September 1992, p. 274.

<sup>483</sup> Jeffrey T. Fouts, “Multicultural Education and the Idols of the Mind: Why Multicultural Education is under Attack,” *Social Education*, 57(7), December 1993, p. 356.

with the exhibition of unrightfully compelling its visitors to morally analyze President Harry S. Truman's decision to drop the bomb by displaying, for example, photographs of women and children in flames in Hiroshima. The exhibition of these images and passages, what the *Washington Post* called "a nationwide orgy of revisionism," was suspected by critics to give the impression that the Japanese were only victims in World War II, rather than the perpetrators, thus nullifying the decency of the U.S. military's actions – "a depressing demonstration of a generation that lacks even the nerve to honor the nerve of its fathers."<sup>484</sup>

A heated controversy between the weight of memory versus history escalated to reach Congress, where a Republican-controlled Senate, angered by the alleged anti-American concept of the exhibit, threatened its curators to hold hearings on the matter, later voting unanimously to take down the exhibition. In the resolution, Republican Senator Nancy Kassebaum's described the project as "revisionist, unbalanced, and offensive."<sup>485</sup> Eighty-one members of the Senate then called for the exhibit's director, Martin Harwit, to be ousted from the museum. Harwit readily resigned in May 1995, four months after the exhibit was cancelled entirely and replaced with an exhibit on the fuselage of the Enola Gay, the B-29 bomber that released the first atomic bomb over Hiroshima.<sup>486</sup> In the *Los Angeles Times*' declaration of a "victory for World War II veterans," we see that the exhibition of the perspective and experience of America's then wartime enemy would have been interpreted as a *loss* for veterans, rather than an addition to their story.<sup>487</sup> William M. Detweiler, National Commander of the American Legion, claimed the controversy to have "inflicted grave damage" on the reputation of the museum.<sup>488</sup> Ira Michael Heyman, the institution's secretary, attempted to compensate for this loss in esteem among veterans in his announcement to cancel the original program, regretting, "veterans and their families were expecting, and rightly so, that the nation would honor and commemorate their valor and sacrifice... They were not looking for analysis and, frankly, we did not give enough thought to the intense feelings such analysis would evoke."<sup>489</sup> *A New York*

---

<sup>484</sup> Charles Krauthammer, "The Cold War Memorials," *Washington Post*, 4 August 1995, p. A23.

<sup>485</sup> Nancy Kassebaum, quoted in Ken Ringle, "At Ground Zero," *Washington Post*, 26 September 1994, p. A1.

<sup>486</sup> Harwit, who was convinced that World War II veterans would not have found *The Last Act* offensive but rather "informative and inspiring," unapologetically defended the exhibition in a book dedicated to retracing the details of the project in the making and the resulting political controversy, published one year after its cancellation. See Martin Harwit, *An Exhibit Denied: Lobbying the History of Enola Gay*, (New York: Copernicus, 1996), p. vii.

<sup>487</sup> Richard A. Serrano, "Smithsonian Says It Erred, Scraps Exhibit on A-Bomb: Museum: Critics Charged that it Portrayed the U.S. as Aggressors; Controversy Hurt Institution's Funding," *Los Angeles Times*, 31 January 1995, p. A1.

<sup>488</sup> William M. Detweiler, quoted in *ibid.*, p. A1.

<sup>489</sup> Ira Michael Heyman, quoted in Karen de Witt, "Smithsonian Scales Back Exhibit of B-29 in Atomic Bomb Attack," *New York Times*, 31 January 1995, p. 1.

*Times* editorial titled “Hijacking History” criticized the controversy, rebuking that “the real betrayal of American tradition” was the contention that there existed one “single version of history” that could be made “the property of the state or any group,” arguing that history is rather “based on freedom of inquiry and discussion.”<sup>490</sup>

Simultaneously, other developments in the realm of educational reform demonstrated similar debates and disagreement on the purpose of history. Most notably the establishment of nationwide history curricula in 1994, the conservative attack and revision of these curricula – also known as the ‘history war’ – as well as the establishment of stricter criteria for textbook adoption in Texas in 1995, involved debates of such nature. The outcomes of these developments mirrored the outcome of the battle over *The Last Act*. As the view of history as citizenship education continually triumphed over the view of history as inquiry and discussion, the unwillingness to value the perspectives of other peoples and cultures also came to triumph over multiculturalism. These conflicts worked to not only homogenize instructional materials at the expense of smaller school districts and their independence to determine their own curricula, but also worked to confirm the existence of one, true American history: positive and trouble-free. Given the controversy involved with inclusive history, few textbook authors felt prompted to significantly revise the nationalist – yet less disputed – material they had produced in the 1980s.

### 3.1.1 The History War

One of the most fervent debates on the role of multiculturalism in the history classroom and the depiction of American and Western vis-à-vis non-Western cultures began in the fall of 1994, when the NCSS and the National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) undertook the first step to finalize a national curricula for the teaching of history in the United States. The impetus for the project took place in 1990, when President Bush in his State of the Union Address announced six education goals that were compiled at a meeting between himself and the nation’s governors with the objective of improving the state of American public school education. They were to specifically improve American education to be able to compete with the several Western nations that throughout the 1980s came to excel and surpass the United States in student achievement.<sup>491</sup> Bush declared

---

<sup>490</sup> “Hijacking History,” *New York Times*, 30 January 1995, p. A18.

<sup>491</sup> The most influential document on the decrease in international competitiveness of American education in the 1980s was *Nation at Risk* by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, discussed in Chapter 2. The

proudly that by the year 2000, American students would be number one in math and science. With the motivation of a sports coach, he continued, “I know this about the American people: we welcome competition. We’ll match our ingenuity, our energy, our experience and technology, our spirit and enterprise against anyone. But let the competition be free, but let it also be fair. America is ready.”<sup>492</sup>

The following year in 1991, Bush launched the corresponding “America 2000” plan, a long-term strategy to achieve the six objectives that came to be known as the National Education Goals through actions on the federal, state, and local levels. Echoing the Sputnik era, growing fear of underachievement and falling behind came once again to serve as the spur for sweeping change and federal government action. One of the strategies recommended in Bush’s plan was the development of “world class standards” for educators and students in the five “core subjects,” namely, “math and science, English, history, and geography.”<sup>493</sup> In 1992, the Department of Education funded the seeds for the first national standards movement in these fields. Over the next two years, commissioned teachers, school administrators, scholars, and parents would collaborate to draw up the new National History Standards (NHS) that were to serve as a voluntary framework to guide American educators in developing their own social studies curricula.

Corresponding to developments in academia, many contributors to the NHS expressed strong preferences to incorporate multiculturalist perspectives into American and world history. Sixty-one-year-old Gary B. Nash and sixty-seven-year-old Charlotte Crabtree, co-directors of the project, together with coordinating editor, fifty-three-year-old Ross E. Dunn, described a multicultural approach to history as one in which “no one’s social and cultural experience is off limits to investigation.”<sup>494</sup> A multicultural history curriculum must thus necessarily incorporate the “new history of women, laboring people, religious and racial minorities.”<sup>495</sup> The directors of the standards believed, furthermore, that only with a varied perspective can a student learn

---

report found that based on nineteen different tests administered internationally, American students never reached first or second place, and on seven occasions even ranked last. See National Commission on Excellence in Education, *Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, report to the U.S. Department of Education, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983).

<sup>492</sup> George H. W. Bush, “State of the Union Address,” printed in “State of the Union: Transcript of Bush’s State of the Union Message to the Nation,” *New York Times*, 1 February 1990, p. D22.

<sup>493</sup> George H. W. Bush, “Remarks by the President at Presentation of National Education Strategy,” 18 April 1991, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1991*, book 1: January 1 to June 30, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992), p. 397.

<sup>494</sup> Gary B. Nash, Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross E. Dunn, *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*, (New York: Random House, 1997), p. 77.

<sup>495</sup> Gary B. Nash, “The History Standards Controversy and Social History,” *Journal of Social History*, 29(issue supplement), November 1995, p. 44.

true historical thinking: one “cannot study any nation’s history as a whole without understanding the parts in all their variety.”<sup>496</sup> The introduction of the compiled U.S. history standards declared thus directly that the guidelines would grant students the “opportunity to learn about the history of their nation and of the peoples of all racial, religious, ethnic, and national backgrounds who have been a part of that story.”<sup>497</sup> This approach would cultivate useful skills for operating in an “increasingly pluralistic society,” namely “mutual patience, respect, and civic courage.”<sup>498</sup> Furthermore, in response to the widespread fear of underachievement, they were designed to be “intellectually demanding” and to place a strong focus on historical investigation.<sup>499</sup> Thus resembling in many ways the methodology and objectives of the NSS – although the directors shied away from making explicit references to it – the standards claimed to emphasize an “awareness of, appreciation for, and the ability to utilize a variety of sources of evidence from which historical knowledge is achieved,” to help students “consider multiple perspectives.”<sup>500</sup>

As a result, the final compiled standards highlighted the traditionally overlooked achievements of not only discriminated groups in the United States, but also of non-Western cultures, paired with a revisionist perspective of American and European (especially colonial) history. Each chapter of the standards was accompanied by several sample teaching exercises, amounting to over one thousand examples. These example exercises were designed to help teachers stimulate thorough, independent investigation, such as student exploration of the “religious practices, dances, songs, holistic medicine, work chants, cuisine, and marriage and burial ceremonies” of African American slaves, or to ask questions, such as “how did pro-slavery Americans justify their defense of slavery with their espousal of inalienable rights to freedom?”<sup>501</sup> These exercises and objectives would prove to be at odds not only with critics’ conceptions of ‘true’ American history, but also with those of textbook authors and publishers who experienced outward economic pressure to produce a specific type of product: non-controversial, single-perspective histories.

A month before the release date of the guidelines, conservatives and ‘traditional’ historians who had been involved with the project came out to express their fervent opposition

---

<sup>496</sup> Nash, Crabtree, and Dunn, 1997, p. 77.

<sup>497</sup> NCHS, *National Standards for United States History: Exploring the American Experience*, original expanded ed., (Los Angeles: Author, 1994), p. v.

<sup>498</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>499</sup> Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>500</sup> Ibid., pp. 3, 19.

<sup>501</sup> Ibid., pp. 69, 75.

to the standards. This opposition was led by fifty-three-year-old former chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), Lynne V. Cheney, who, as former head of the organization, had worked together with the Department of Education to fund the very history standards she came to preemptively attack in her op-ed article “The End of History” in the *Wall Street Journal* on 20 October 1994. Cheney had assigned the NCHS at UCLA herself to draw up the curriculum guidelines. After a council – of whom a large proportion of the members were appointed by Cheney herself – compiled and approved the standards, Cheney, disturbed by the final result, due to its alleged anti-American and anti-Western biases, dismissed the standards and immediately published “The End of History.”<sup>502</sup> In this article, she condemned the standards for presenting an unfairly “grim and gloomy” American history, a blasphemy she attributed to a takeover of the project by revisionist historians, who only wished to implement their “great hatred for traditional history.”

According to Cheney, the standards promoted anti-American attitudes by treating certain historical actors and events in a biased manner. Cheney felt, for example, that the standards concentrated too much on figures like the Ku Klux Klan and Harriet Tubman, only to cheat honorable, “white males,” such as Ulysses S. Grant or Robert E. Lee, of their proper recognition. In her rigid plea, she warned the nation that should the history standards be established, “much that is significant in our past will begin to disappear from our schools.” Cheney plainly equated the most “significant” events in history to those in which White Americans, especially male, made positive contributions to nation and society. She ended her attack with a morally righteous call to arms against the “academic establishment” and its “politicized history,” declaring that “the battle is worth taking on. We are a better people than the National Standards indicate, and our children deserve to know it.”<sup>503</sup>

Cheney’s chilling critique, positively received by conservatives especially, managed to spawn a public debate on the standards project that became the crystallization of the heated negotiation between Americanist and multiculturalist thought in the social studies of the 1990s. Proponents of the standards argued that teaching controversy and conflict in history would “uplift” students, by teaching them, for example, how episodes like the rise of the Ku Klux Klan and McCarthyism did not doom society but rather were surmounted: “This is not gloomy history but gloomy history overcome,” Nash and Dunn responded to Cheney in *Social*

---

<sup>502</sup> For more on Cheney’s involvement in the making of the standards project, see Gary B. Nash, “In the Matter of History,” in Nash, Crabtree, and Dunn, 1997, pp. 3-24.

<sup>503</sup> Lynne V. Cheney, “The End of History,” *Wall Street Journal*, 20 October 1994, p. A22.

*Education* in 1995.<sup>504</sup> Opponents, such as professor of education, David Warren Saxe, on the other hand, charged the curriculum of being the harshest self-critique of a nation's own history yet, reprimanding the project leaders in *Social Education* in 1996:

Whether the NCHS critiques are valid or not, no nation has ever endorsed curricula that have been so critical about its own past. If the aim of a significant part of history curricula is to contribute to the development of citizens, then there is not much in these standards that reflects or points to the grandeur of the United States, or that focuses attention on the achievements that have led to its current world leadership role... No one disputes 'perspectives,' no one disagrees that we have problems, but to place before children a 'doom and gloom' revision of history is both ahistorical and foolish.<sup>505</sup>

Thus according to some critics, the curriculum failed to serve the purpose of conditioning students into *citizens*, something that they considered to be the principal function of history class, disputing the child-as-a-historian notion of the 1960s and 1970s. As the so-called 'history war' increasingly attracted media attention, opponents of the standards from around the country publicly expressed their support for Cheney. On 28 October 1994, just eight days after Cheney's attack appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, prominent, far-right radio and television host, Rush Limbaugh, commented on his evening television show that the standards should be flushed "down the sewer of multiculturalism," as they represented nothing but an attempt of radical liberals to push their agenda of political correctness onto the American people: "a bunch of P.C. crap."<sup>506</sup> He furiously tore several pages out of a history textbook at his desk, finally contending that if the standards were to be adopted, none of the topics covered on the discarded pages would be taught in history class.

This supposed denigration of American culture was said to be coupled with a "romanticizing of 'the Other' (non-whites)" in exchange for a "trashing" of European culture, as the *U.S. News & World Report* complained in 1995.<sup>507</sup> These harsh critiques in the public sphere were all but inconsequential. Arnita A. Jones, then executive director of the Organization of American Historians (OAH), which had generally supported the standards, admitted almost two decades later in a memoir that the organization and other allies had been "poorly prepared" and unequipped to compete against such vociferous opposition: "Our attempts to place op-ed

---

<sup>504</sup> Gary B. Nash and Ross E. Dunn, "History Standards and Culture Wars," *Social Education*, 59(1), 1995, p. 6.

<sup>505</sup> David Warren Saxe, "The National History Standards: Time for Common Sense," *Social Education*, 60(1), January 1996, p. 45.

<sup>506</sup> Rush Limbaugh, *Rush Limbaugh Show*, 28 October 1994, quoted in Nash, Crabtree, and Dunn, 1997, p. 5.

<sup>507</sup> John Leo, "History Standards are Bunk," *U.S. News and World Report*, 6 February 1995, p. 23.

pieces were in vain whereas Cheney's columns were reprinted in newspapers all over the country, as others took up her cause."<sup>508</sup> The *Wall Street Journal*, for example, published four letters to the editor in November 1994 under the headline "The History Thieves" – all four voicing strong, emotional opposition to the standards. One reader expressed fear, claiming:

We learn that the 'standards' are nothing more than a cynical ploy to indoctrinate children with their own *hatred* of America; to steal the American birthright from the children of our country; to teach our children to feel *guilt* over their own heritage.<sup>509</sup>

Here we see that one of the critics' fears was that the standards would foster schools to administer another type of emotional conditioning contrary to the development of a sense of national identity and pride and instead induce self-hatred and guilt. Such arguments strongly resembled the fears of being robbed of national identity voiced by the Gabler's in the 1970s. Indeed, the very title "History *Thieves*" implied that truth could be stolen and given to another. Nash's description of the standards as an attempt "to bring to life large portions of American society about which most textbooks said little," was thus interpreted as a *loss*, in a zero-sum game, for those with whom textbooks usually dealt a great deal.<sup>510</sup> Like the NSS of the 1960s, the NHS project represented a revised way of thinking and feeling about dominant and marginalized groups, as well as certain historical actors and events, and thus those that had enjoyed the privilege of identifying with a noble and guiltless collective identity in traditional histories came to fear the loss of this privilege for their children and future generations.

Republican politicians, compliant with the wishes of their constituents, eventually brought the issue to the Senate. In January 1995, Senate members voted ninety-nine to one to reject the proposed standards on the grounds that they – agreeing with Cheney's allegations – depicted Western and American civilization and history in a negative light.<sup>511</sup> Republican Senator Slade Gorton had even proposed an amendment to the Republicans' Contract Unfunded Mandates Bill to completely defund the NCHS, forbid the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP) and the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC) – which were both involved with the project – from approving the revised standards, and prohibit the NCHS from contributing to any future history standards project. Finally, should any federal

---

<sup>508</sup> Arnita A. Jones, "The OAH in Troublesome Times, 1980-2000," in Richard S. Kirkendall (ed.), *The Writing and Teaching of American History*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 56.

<sup>509</sup> "Letter to the Editor: The History Thieves," *Wall Street Journal*, 8 November 1994, p. A23, emphasis added.

<sup>510</sup> Gary B. Nash, "Reflections on the National History Standards," *National Forum*, 77, summer 1997, p. 15.

<sup>511</sup> "Multicultural History Standards Rejected by Senate in 99-1 Vote," *Los Angeles Times*, 19 January 1995, p. A4.

funding be allotted to an agency to develop new standards, this agency should “have decent respect for United States history’s roots in western civilization.”<sup>512</sup>

While Gordon’s radical amendment was ultimately turned down, the final resolution did commission the non-profit Council for Basic Education (CBE) to establish two committees that would review and revise the standards in the fields of world and American history, respectively. After each committee revisited the curricula in search of anti-Western bias, the CBE resolved to have all example exercises removed from the standards and a greater emphasis placed on the positive influence of Europe on American and world culture. One very significant distinction between the post-Sputnik NSS and the NHS of 1994 was that the latter had been shot down almost immediately after having reached the classroom, although the original standards were allowed to be purchased and circulated while they were being revised. What remained of the original project in the revision, however, was a compilation of voluntary curriculum guidelines stripped of any stimulation of critical thinking or class discussion that could have resulted in controversy or stark differences of opinion, a pattern that was starkly reflected in textbooks, as well.

### **3.1.2 What Happens in Texas Doesn’t Stay in Texas**

While the national controversy over the NHS was in full throttle, new legislation for textbook adoption at the state level was being discussed in Texas, the nation’s largest textbook client. What at first seemed like a strictly local issue ultimately came to pose decisive consequences for schools around the country. Conservatives’ prayers seemed to be answered in 1995 as the Texas State Board of Education (SBOE) established a strict set of criteria for the statewide selection of social studies textbooks. In the 1970s, when conservative religious lobbyists grew increasingly upset by the thematization of evolution and alleged liberal bias in textbooks of the 1960s, as discussed in Chapter 2, not only were publishers pressured to alter their content, but the state of Texas responded by adopting its first set of guidelines for evaluating the suitability of textbooks in 1974 – especially for the science classroom. In 1995, the Texas Education Code (TEC) now expanded these guidelines to pertain to social studies and history textbooks, as well.<sup>513</sup>

---

<sup>512</sup> U.S. Senate. “Gorton Amendment No. 31,” *Congressional Record*, 104<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 18 January 1995, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995), p. S1026.

<sup>513</sup> The TEC denotes a grouping together of all Texas state legislation that directly pertains to education. The revisions of 1995 are said to be the most drastic changes to the code in its history. See Jim Walsh, Frank

While the new code stripped the SBOE of its power to directly demand publishers to change the content of their books – a privilege it had openly exercised since the 1970s – the code nonetheless empowered the Board to implement its own set of criteria for textbook adoption and to vote on each publisher submission by approving it as “conforming” to its standards, or rejecting it as a “nonconforming” text.<sup>514</sup> These criteria, known as the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), placed an all but obscured focus on the emotional conditioning of students of all grades – starting in kindergarten. The cultivation of patriotism, loyalty to the American community, and faith in the free enterprise system through the presentation of positive aspects of U.S. history and society counted among the main objectives advanced by the guidelines. Furthermore, textbooks were to explicitly denounce civil disorder and law-breaking. The introduction of the TEKS for the social studies read:

The study of our state and national heritage begins with an examination of the celebration of patriotic holidays and the contributions of historical people... Students learn customs, symbols, and celebrations that represent American beliefs and principles and contribute to our national identity... The content... enables students to understand the importance of patriotism, function in a free enterprise society, and appreciate the basic values of our state and nation as referenced in the Texas Education Code, §28.002(h).<sup>515</sup>

Thus textbooks that failed to explicitly stress the importance of American patriotism in history were completely rejected by the SBOE. Those that made the cut and complied with the TEKS, on the other hand, became part of the Texas school curriculum for five to ten years – and, consequently, the curricula of many other states.

The specific market characteristics of the industry and the establishment of the SBOE’s adoption criteria contributed to the further homogenization of history materials in the United States, as textbook entrepreneurs, already wary of Texas preferences, were now given a tangible set of do’s and don’ts for their work. As the next section will demonstrate, the result was a

---

Kemerer, and Laurie Maniotis, *The Educator’s Guide to Texas School Law*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005).

<sup>514</sup> The Texas SBOE was the first state school board ever in the United States to impose fines on publishers for failing to revise debated portions in their submissions, from incorrect dates to more serious fallacies. See Debra Viadero, “Texas Board Fines Publishers over Error-Filled Textbooks,” *Education Week*, 11(18), 22 January 1992, p. 5. Professor and sociologist, James W. Loewen, claimed in 1995, however, that many of the supposed “5,200” errors found were “trivial or arguable,” and that some were not even errors at all. James W. Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong*, (New York: Touchstone, 1995), p. 364. For the definition of “conforming” or “nonconforming” texts as determined by the TEA, see Robert H. Leos to administrator addressed, “Conforming and Nonconforming Textbooks,” 24 November 1999, (<http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/taa/text991124.html>; accessed 26 January 2019).

<sup>515</sup> SBOE, 19 Texas Administrative Code (TAC), 113 TEKS for Social Studies (1998), §2a(1)(4). These passages remained unchanged in the 2010 overwrite of the original 1995 TEKS.

continuation of patriotic reconstructions of American military history, combined, however, with a newfound tone of confidence and adventure confined to the post-Cold War era, with some significant – but few – exceptions.

## 3.2 MCCARTHY WHO? EMPHASIS AND OMISSIONS IN TROUBLE-FREE TEXTS

### 3.2.1 No Details, No Problems

Textbooks of the 1990s had the ‘fortune’ of the Reagan years behind them and were now handed the opportunity to report on this period with a dazzled intrigue – as uncritical as these reports may have been. The most notable difference in narratives between late and post-Cold War textbooks was the self-assured *tone* used to recount American successes and strengths. The reconstruction of these strengths nevertheless needed to be adjusted to conform to the values of the day. As human rights entered the public discourse and became an utmost salient topic for the realm of international politics in the 1990s, textbooks responded to reflect this new importance by propagating a depiction of the United States not only as a powerful hero, but as an altruistic hegemon driven selflessly by humanitarian concerns. Houghton Mifflin’s 1990 publication, *America’s Story*, for example, featured the following “critical thinking” exercise at the end of its chapter on the 1980s: “In the 1980s the United States has played a number of different roles in international affairs. What has the United States done to promote world peace? To promote human rights and democracy? To help developing countries?”<sup>516</sup> Such texts presented the image of the United States as a peacemaker as an absolute truth, by simultaneously disregarding alternative perspectives entirely, such as those critical of global democratization that suggested, for example, that American political and military leaders did *not* contribute to world peace in the 1980s but rather, in many cases, exacerbated war and suffering.

It is no wonder, however, that *America’s Story* was able to put forth such an uncomplicated and indisputable point of view, given it breezed through U.S. foreign policy of the 1980s in but a few brief paragraphs free of any historical background, with headings such as “Conflicts develop in Latin America” or “The United States seeks peace in the Middle East.”<sup>517</sup> The conclusion of the Falkland Conflict of 1982, for example, was summed up as

---

<sup>516</sup> William J. Jacobs, *America’s Story*, teacher’s annotated ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990), p. 764.

<sup>517</sup> All quotations in this paragraph in *ibid.*, p. 761.

fleetingly as it was introduced: “The Falkland Islands, off the coast of Argentina, had been held by Great Britain since 1771. Argentina, however, also claimed the Falklands, and invaded them in 1982. War soon broke out between Britain and Argentina. The British, with American help, quickly defeated the Argentinians.” Then, two sentences later, new “trouble” arose in 1983, when the socialist government of Grenada built an airstrip suitable for carrying combat aircraft on the island. “In December,” and pretty inexplicably based on information provided in the text alone, “Caribbean forces and American troops jointly invaded Grenada and drove out the Communists.” The text then inserted a swift, happy ending into the next sentence to dampen any open questions and quickly end the matter: “In a free election held in 1984, the people of Grenada gave overwhelming support to pro-American candidates.” *Fin*. The authors dedicated the next few paragraphs to covering Reagan’s commitment to keeping communism out of El Salvador (without any mention of *how* he achieved this) and his aid to the anti-communist contras in Nicaragua – once disputed but eventually approved by Congress, the text claimed, thus transforming a savage controversy into a painless arrangement, justified in just a few sentences.

Glencoe’s *Two Centuries of Progress* employed a similar narrative style in 1990 by summing up the Vietnam War, the longest military conflict in U.S. history, in one, solitary page. Negative topics in American history, or “blot[s] on the country’s record,” as Houghton Mifflin’s *America: The Glorious Republic* apathetically denoted the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II in 1990 – a term we observed being employed in the 1980s – continued to lose page space and emphasis.<sup>518</sup> While authors in the 1980s, however, felt obliged to either make excuses for contemporary American faults and failures or to use suggestive language that made certain actions of American leaders appear reasonable, publishers in the 1990s had the freedom granted by a few years of distance to simply fleetingly mention – if not completely omit – such embarrassments or “blots.” And while some textbooks recounted the era of McCarthyism, for example, in a few short paragraphs, some now refrained from mentioning the topic at all. Indeed this alone demonstrated the attempt of publishers to solely present positive aspects of U.S. history, as the SBOE criteria stated.

Other topics – however, rarely the “blots” – received disproportionately generous amounts of page space and thematic attention. Prentice Hall’s *America: Pathways to the Present*, for example, dedicated an entire page to reminding readers that draft registration for the military, which was a heatedly debated topic during the Vietnam War, was still required to

---

<sup>518</sup> Henry F. Graff, *America: The Glorious Republic*, revised ed., (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990), p. 724.

the present day in 1998.<sup>519</sup> The textbook's inclusion of this passage is quite telling since it, on the one hand, created a sense of obligation among students to the military; it connected the past with the present and history with history students by promoting the reader's active involvement in the work of the military. On the other hand, the text simultaneously denied these same students the precise details of some of the military's least heroic or more controversial moments.

### 3.2.2 Critical Analysis and Vietnam: Social Inquiry's Brief Comeback

As the Vietnam era concluded in the mid-1970s and the wounds of war and shame remained still fresh in the minds of most Americans, textbook authors had no option but to treat the war for what it was: an irrefutable failure – whatever the reasons provided for the loss. By the begin of the 1990s and the end of the Cold War, however, with the final withdrawal of U.S. troops buried deeper into the past, many authors began to change their narrative strategy, depicting the conflict neither as a victory, nor a *true* loss, but simply as an unfortunate incident that ended with Nixon's praiseworthy decision to withdraw.

Of the examined textbooks, only McGraw Hill/Glencoe's *American Odyssey*, an inquiry textbook published in 1994, made the first extensive efforts since the end of the Vietnam era itself to break the silence on what was widely perceived as one of America's most humiliating failures and thus distinguished itself as evidence for the existence of an alternative moral economy. *American Odyssey* dedicated over fifty pages of space to evaluating the causes, events, and results of the conflict, beginning with French colonization and moving onto the various sides of debate in the United States on whether or not to intervene. Detailed descriptions of combat then illustrated the effects of the war on the native population and its villages. Aside from exposing the horrors on the battlefield in text, quotes, and photographs, *American Odyssey* extensively covered the rise of the antiwar movement at home – its motivation, methods, arguments, and sentiments. The text expressed, for example, that those opponents of the war felt "betrayed" by President Johnson's decision to expand the war effort in 1964, setting the scene for when "angered" student protestors rallied against the war at the Democratic National Convention (DNC) in Chicago and clashed with members of the National Guard in 1968. The story was accompanied by one of the most famous photographs of the incident – an image that had hardly enjoyed textbook fame since the 1970s – featuring members of the Chicago police

---

<sup>519</sup> Andrew Cayton, *America: Pathways to the Present*, (Needham, M.A.: Prentice Hall, 1998), p. 639.

force attacking the unarmed students with clubs.<sup>520</sup> Another photograph in the same section depicted protestors, described as “startled and angry,” running frantically from white clouds of smoke when the National Guard attacked them with tear gas during the Kent State Massacre in 1970.<sup>521</sup> These images constituted two of the few graphic depictions of police violence against student protestors that survived to appear in the Vietnam segments of the 1990s. Only Prentice Hall’s *The United States* treated the rise of the antiwar movement in a similar manner in 1991 by explaining the widespread uproar and demonstrations through emotional responses to the administration’s handling of the war through “confusion, secrecy, and deceit.”<sup>522</sup>

*American Odyssey*, however, thematized not only the *antiwar* movement, but even a smaller, *pro-war* protest that took place in Florida. The treatment of these movements took up several pages and included various primary sources, including an excerpt out of the 1976 autobiography, *Born on the Fourth of July*, by Ron Kovic, an amputee Vietnam veteran who eventually became a passionate antiwar activist, and lyrics from Bob Dylan’s 1964 song, “The Times They Are-A Changin’.” After covering the back-and-forth of domestic politics and the “war at home” from Johnson to Nixon to FBI harassment of the New Left, the text reconstructed the war itself through personal accounts of soldiers and nurses, and images of destruction and villagers mourning. Finally, *American Odyssey* illuminated Nixon’s final bombing of North Vietnam in 1972 that “hammered away” at Vietnamese villages, killing “thousands of civilians” and destroying “homes, hospitals, and factories,” with text, graphs, and statistics, and continued with a quote from the *New York Times* that called the incident “diplomacy through terror.”<sup>523</sup> Final death tolls of the South Vietnamese, the North Vietnamese, and of U.S. troops concluded a gruesome account that invited the reader to evaluate and question the actions and motives of the United States throughout. Although Cambodian and Laotian losses in the conflict remained largely uncounted, the authors of *American Odyssey* highlighted that the civilians of these nations suffered considerable casualties, as well. While books like *Pathways* summed up the conflict by offering one, indisputable explanation: “The war lasted from 1955 to 1975 and was fought to protect South Vietnam from being taken over by Communists,” *American Odyssey*

---

<sup>520</sup> Gary B. Nash, *American Odyssey: The United States in the Twentieth Century*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1994), p. 669. Interestingly, in the 2005 edition of *American Odyssey*, this image was no longer included in the chapter but replaced with a photograph of demonstrators sitting on top of and around the General John Logan Memorial in Chicago, conveying neither conflict, nor violence. See Gary B. Nash, *American Odyssey: The Twentieth Century and Beyond*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 2005), p. 781.

<sup>521</sup> Nash, *American Odyssey*, 1994, p. 682.

<sup>522</sup> Winthrop D. Jordan and Leon F. Litwack, *The United States*, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1991), p. 810.

<sup>523</sup> Nash, *American Odyssey*, 1994, p. 699.

concluded its thorough account with an explanation quoted from the Pentagon Papers, in which the Department of Defense confidentially admitted that “the real reason for pouring troops into Vietnam” was simply to ““avoid a humiliating defeat.””<sup>524</sup>

Alongside presenting Vietnamese experiences and suffering during the war, the authors of *American Odyssey* sought to highlight the suffering endured by U.S. soldiers, as well – on the battlefield and at home. Differing from inquiry textbooks of the 1960s and 1970s that illuminated the experience of the enemy without explicitly addressing the hardships suffered by U.S. troops, *American Odyssey* – with the reconciliation period of the Reagan era behind it – consistently separated the soldiers involved from the blame for the war’s failures and injustices. This was achieved through the inclusion of quotes, poems, and stories by soldiers and veterans who revealed their motives and beliefs to often differ from those offered by the administration. More specifically, these personal accounts demonstrated that many soldiers became wary of the war effort and that their experiences mobilized them to question their loyalty to the military. The authors highlighted, for example, an excerpt from the 1981 book, *Everything We Had*, a collection of personal experiences in Vietnam written and edited by a volunteer veteran himself, to illustrate this separation clearly:

Ever since the American Revolution my family had people in all the different wars, and that was always the thing – when your country needs you, you go. You don’t ask a lot of questions, because the country’s always right. This time it didn’t turn out that way.<sup>525</sup>

Other textbooks, such as Holt, Rinehart and Winston’s 1999 text, *American Nation*, dedicated considerable focus to the hardships suffered by Vietnam veterans, especially those endured upon their return to the United States, however, without mentioning the antiwar sentiments many of the soldiers came to develop. Like *American Odyssey*, *American Nation* featured a quote from Kovic’s *Born on the Fourth of July* to illuminate the soldier’s experience and his coping with the mistreatment he experienced at home. The authors underlined Kovic’s initial disappointment with other young Americans who protested the war effort in a quote from the years *before* he became an activist, on which he desolately recalled, “I didn’t want to believe it at first – people protesting against us when we were putting our lives on the line for our country... How could they do this to us?”<sup>526</sup> That Kovic later on, in the same autobiography,

---

<sup>524</sup> Cayton, 1998, p. 617; Quoted in Nash, 1994, p. 698, emphasis added.

<sup>525</sup> David Ross, quoted in Nash, *American Odyssey*, 1994, p. 661.

<sup>526</sup> Paul Boyer, *The American Nation*, (Austin: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1999), p.888.

eventually changed his stance on the war effort to become one of the most well-known antiwar activists of his time won, however, no acknowledgment in *American Nation*. The tendency to neglect antiwar sentiments and activism among U.S. service members during the Vietnam era by completely omitting them seemed to reflect an attempt to deny opposition to the actions of government of any valor, and thus discourage civil disobedience. Soldiers now enjoyed a heroic, role-model status in many textbooks and were not to simultaneously display or represent acts of anti-Americanism. Most textbooks continued to focus instead on their bravery *given* their loyalty, as well as on the hardships they faced despite this loyalty.

It was during this period that textbooks began to provide the first reports of mistreatment of U.S. soldiers *at home* during the Vietnam War. The controversy on this abuse gained particular salience in the public sphere when Bob Greene published a collection of veterans' personal accounts in 1989, titled *Homecoming: When the Soldiers Returned from Vietnam*. Motivated primarily by the question of whether or not the notorious stories of civilians spitting on soldiers were true, Greene submitted a classified advertisement in the *Chicago Tribune* asking Vietnam veterans to share their homecoming stories and any experiences of being spat upon or facing any other form of abuse, receiving over one thousand responses.<sup>527</sup> The collection sparked a national debate on the legitimacy of the veterans' stories.<sup>528</sup> Some textbooks contributed to the conversation by mentioning this abuse in their Vietnam sections. The blame for veteran suffering and hardships, however, was often given to the American citizens alone, such as in *The Glorious Republic*, which neglected any role governmental institutions may have played in alienating or belittling service members:

Most Americans seemed eager simply to put the sad subject of the war out of their minds. As a result, many veterans felt devastated by the neglect they experienced at the hands of fellow citizens. While most veterans returned to their normal pursuits, some fell victim to the effects of their military service, experiencing trouble with alcohol and drugs and with finding and holding jobs. A turning point came with the decision to build a war memorial in Washington.

---

<sup>527</sup> See Bob Greene (ed.), *Homecoming – When the Soldiers Returned from Vietnam*, (New York: Ballantine Books, 1989).

<sup>528</sup> Some who claimed that the stories of soldiers being spat upon were myths claimed that this was a tactic used by conservatives under Bush's terms to discredit the antiwar movement. See, for example, Jerry Lembcke, "The News and Myth of Spat-Upon Vietnam Vets," *Humanity & Society*, 27(4), 1 November 2003, pp. 630-641. Many veterans in Greene's *Homecoming* collection, however, reported experiencing abuse from individuals *other* than so-called 'hippies,' exemplified aptly in one story of abuse by an older, well-dressed woman: "This 'lady' was no hippie. I sort of get the feeling it has been easy to 'blame' hippies for things like this because they were easily identifiable, and because they did dramatically, in many cases, communicate their opposition to the Vietnam War. But the verbal and physical abuse of returning Vietnam veterans took place in all levels of American society." Frederick H. Giese, quoted in Greene, 1989, p. 16.

When the unique V-shaped monument was dedicated and opened to the public in 1982, sincere attention was focused at last on the sacrifices that the Americans in Vietnam had made.<sup>529</sup>

Thus the only role the government played in this account was in the erection of the Vietnam War Memorial in Washington D.C. in 1982, which was implied to have ended and corrected the injustices faced by veterans of the war. Widespread alcoholism, depression, and unemployment were also suggested to have been remedied, as well. Emotionally laden images of the memorial appeared ever more frequently in the 1990s, significantly sentimentalizing Vietnam passages. While most textbooks remained silent on the topic of institutional indifference on the part of the government that failed to provide Vietnam veterans with the G.I. benefits that World War II veterans had received, textbooks tried to compensate for this apathy by exposing their emotional suffering through images of their mourning in the nation's capital.

As we have seen, while acknowledging the traumatic experiences faced by soldiers on and off the battlefield of Vietnam, *American Odyssey* took their reconstruction of the Vietnam War a step further than other textbooks to illustrate with similar conviction – in both words and images – that the Americans were by no means the only ones who had suffered in the war. It was implied that this suffering was the result of ignorance. The text suggested that the lack of mutual understanding between the U.S. military and the Vietnamese people posed dire consequences for both soldiers and civilians alike. An exercise in the book's add-on called "Recognizing Bias" asked readers to deliberate on "how U.S. military planners fail[ed] to understand the Vietnamese culture."<sup>530</sup> However, despite the considerable extent to which *American Odyssey* attempted to cover the major events related to the conflict in Southeast Asia and to present various interpretations of these events, it failed to dedicate more than one short paragraph to the catastrophic Mỹ Lai massacre of 1969. Although the authors labeled the instance as "one of the most shocking incidents of the war," and included a quote by Private Paul Meadlo who recalled: "We huddled them up. We made them squat down... I poured about four clips into the group... The mothers were hugging their children... Well, we kept right on firing," the text failed to quote any of the victims themselves or elaborate upon the lasting consequences for the village.

---

<sup>529</sup> Graff, 1990, pp. 821-822.

<sup>530</sup> Nash, 1994, p. 663.

### 3.3 SHOWDOWN IN THE GULF: WAR AS ENTERTAINMENT

Despite their affinity for significant omissions, the authors of post-Cold War textbooks hardly produced unemotional products. Not only did they attempt to stimulate patriotism and loyalty in the texts – as was customary since the fall of the NSS – but they began to reconstruct contemporary periods of war in a manner that conveyed a sense of excitement associated with combat and destruction of the enemy. This was achieved through a retelling of war as a battle between the United States – a strong, well-equipped, skilled, and “good” protagonist – and some clumsy force of unambiguous evil led by gravely misinformed leaders. The latter was usually a nation or culture robbed of its side of the conflict. The details of combat were narrated in a way that produced a type of suspense. This sharpened emotional approach pertained especially to the treatment of the Persian Gulf War, which by the mid-1990s had made its action-filled debut into the pages of history textbooks.

#### 3.3.1 Aggression and Selective Inclusion

Both the end of the Cold War and the American victory in the Persian Gulf presented textbook writers with a unique opportunity to redeem and assert a strengthened – at times, aggressive – pride, as many publications of the era demonstrate. *Pathways* kicked off its discussion of the Persian Gulf War with a brief, three-paragraph account on the end of Cold War tensions in 1998: “Clearly the United States was now the world’s lone superpower.”<sup>531</sup> Recognizing both this new role as a self-assured hegemon, self-perceived as unrivaled and unchallenged, and the desperate need to eradicate the “ghosts” of Vietnam, as *American Nation* described the popular sentiments of the era, is necessary to understand the sometimes hostile and insensitive tone in which the Persian Gulf War was narrated.<sup>532</sup>

Presented as the “greatest setback to the worldwide movement toward freedom and decency,” as Prentice Hall’s *A History of the United States* claimed in 1999, the necessity of swift American world-saving action against Saddam Hussein’s aggression in Kuwait appeared self-evident.<sup>533</sup> Texts, such as Glencoe’s 1992 publication, *History of a Free Nation*, in introducing the topic, set a fearful and suspenseful atmosphere for the evildoer’s entrance into

---

<sup>531</sup> Cayton, 1998, p. 716.

<sup>532</sup> Boyer, 1999, p. 888.

<sup>533</sup> Daniel J. Boorstin, Brooks Mather Kelley, and Ruth Frankel Boorstin, *A History of the United States*, (Needham, M.A.: Prentice Hall, 1998), p. 932.

the drama: “While the world prayed for peace, Saddam prepared for war.”<sup>534</sup> Given the alleged global concern, textbooks presented U.S. entrance into the Persian Gulf War as a game-changing event that would finally restore the nation’s status as a global superpower – the climax of the story. As *American Journey* recalled in 1998, equating Hussein with the Iraqi people: “The Iraqis gave Bush a golden opportunity to assert America’s world influence.”<sup>535</sup> Rather than providing details on the emergence of the conflict itself, many textbooks placed greater importance on the effect of the American and allied victory on America’s global reputation. Given the “ghosts” of Vietnam, this was of course an utmost concern. Unlike the military’s undertakings in Grenada and Latin America in the 1980s, the intervention in the Persian Gulf, with its real-time live media coverage around the clock on all major American news networks, provided the dialogue on the United States at war with a new full-fledged, salient conflict and larger stakes for the military’s image. Some textbook authors felt compelled to use this victory to redeem actions taken in Vietnam – some even comparing the two conflicts to “explain” the reasons why Americans had lost the previous military engagement. The authors of *American Journey*, for example, continued their account on the Persian Gulf War:

The Persian Gulf itself offered an equally golden opportunity to the American and allied armed forces. Here were no tangled jungles, invisible guerillas, or civilians caught in a civil war. The terrain was open and nearly uninhabited. The enemy had committed regular forces to traditional battles, where the superiority of American equipment and training would be telling.

Thus such accounts suggested that the American loss in Vietnam had been due to none other than the harsh conditions, the tropical climate, and the savageness of a jungle-competent enemy.

The tone used to cover the Persian Gulf War was especially proud and combative. No longer troubled by the ‘loser’ status or the Cold War uncertainty that had dominated the nation’s self-image for decades, the victory in the Gulf allowed for textbooks to boast aggressively about the events of combat, focusing especially on America’s technological superiority. *American Journey* continued:

Americans found the new war fascinating. They bought millions of Middle East maps to follow the conflict. They watched CNN’s live transmission of Baghdad under bombardment and stared in fascination at pictures of Patriot missiles presumably intercepting Iraqi Scud missiles. They read about Stealth fighter bombers that were invisible to radar and precision-guided missiles

---

<sup>534</sup> Henry W. Bragdon, Samuel P. McCutchen, and Donald A. Ritchie, *History of a Free Nation*, teacher’s wraparound ed., (Lake Forest, I.L.: Glencoe, 1992), p. 1059.

<sup>535</sup> All subsequent quotations in this paragraph in David Goldfield, *The American Journey: A History of the United States*, combined ed., (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1998), p. 1023.

that could home in on specified targets (although most of the damage came from traditional bombing and low-tech A-10 antitank aircraft).<sup>536</sup>

Here the American “fascination” with the new, high-tech conflict took precedence before any human loss or the realities of the war itself. Indeed, the mention of widespread purchasing of Middle Eastern maps implied that this region of the world only now came to enjoy any relevance – as a site of amusement for Americans. The “damage” mentioned was so unspecific that it offered the reader the impression of having had no victims at all.

The attempt to excite the reader with the technological details of combat thus eclipsed any debate surrounding the morality of the conflict. The result was an outwardly human-less war in which high-tech missiles and bombs – shot like fireworks in the name of world peace by Americans and allies – landed upon faceless, inhuman targets to eventually drive out the despicable and brutal Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. *American Nation* attributed the thrill of the action to exciting television news reporting:

Operation Desert Storm was different from previous American military engagements. It was won almost entirely by the use of high-tech weaponry. Television reporters also provided unprecedented coverage of the war, including live coverage of the air war. Millions of Americans sat glued to their television sets as news correspondent Bernard Shaw reported the first allied bombings of Iraq.

Thus war became a form of entertainment, leaving American spectators amazed, even “glued to their television sets,” as Allied bombs fell over Baghdad. The text even featured a vivid quote on the top of the page by Bernard Shaw, as he reported on the imagery of the bombing: “This is [pause] something is happening outside... The skies over Baghdad have been illuminated. We’re seeing bright flashes going off all over the sky.” The text went on to claim that America’s high-tech weaponry “quickly became the star of the show,” speaking of the destruction as if it were a performance or a work of art.<sup>537</sup>

Other descriptions of the bombings were less aesthetic and more aggressive with a prideful undertone. “For 38 days the allies pounded the Iraqis with rockets, with ‘smart’ bombs that were so precisely guided they could go down chimneys, and with a variety of regular, or ‘dumb,’ bombs. It was the most massive air attack in history,” bragged *A History of the United States*.<sup>538</sup> Even accounts on Reagan’s attack on Grenada came to be narrated with a certain tone

---

<sup>536</sup> Ibid., p. 1023.

<sup>537</sup> Boyer, 1999, p. 939.

<sup>538</sup> Boorstin, Kelley, and Boorstin, 1998, p. 933.

of aggression, as it, too, came to be associated with America's 'comeback.' In this conflict, the Reagan administration, *History of the United States* narrated, "wanted to prove to friend and foe... that our nation had not been paralyzed by Vietnam. We still could and would use force, if needed."<sup>539</sup>

A more powerful form of victor's pride was reflected in textbooks that celebrated not only the American victory but also the men and women who fought the war. If these texts made any effort to acknowledge and integrate multiculturalism and diversity into their war narratives, it was done so to the benefit, not of other nations and cultures, but of diverse members of the U.S. military. Images of U.S. soldiers in textbooks of the 1990s, especially of those serving in the Persian Gulf, increasingly portrayed African American and female soldiers to praise them for their achievements and contribution to the military. Alongside granting these groups their overdue appreciation, these images simultaneously attempted to stimulate an appreciation of the U.S. military through a stronger means of in-group pride in students belonging to traditionally disadvantaged or excluded groups.

### 3.3.2 Exclusion: New Enemies

While female and non-White soldiers came to earn more acknowledgment in war stories, the experiences of those who lived in nations considered to be America's enemies remained in these stories, for the most part, a mystery. As we have seen, most accounts of the Persian Gulf War in textbooks published in the mid-1990s omitted any indications of enemy casualties, or only vaguely mentioned them without a real headcount. *American Nation* included a side bar in its Persian Gulf chapter with the intriguing title, "Through Others' Eyes." This paragraph focused, however, not on the enemy's losses or hardships, but on the Israeli perspective of Iraq's attacks against Israel. "Although the Persian Gulf War was brief," the authors declared, "many people were caught in the crossfire, including the residents of Israel."<sup>540</sup> Thus only the suffering of Americans and their allies was thematized. But the Iraqis were not the only enemy group who suffered brief and unsympathetic accounts of their losses. When *Glorious Republic* discussed Libya's "brutal terrorist attacks" on the airports of Rome and Vienna in 1985, the American response of bombing Tripoli and Benghazi in 1986, killing dozens, was plainly denoted as America's "return address."<sup>541</sup> Indeed, given the way aggression against the United States and

---

<sup>539</sup> Ibid., p. 910.

<sup>540</sup> Boyer, 1999, p. 939.

<sup>541</sup> Graff, 1990, p. 866.

U.S.-friendly regimes was portrayed in most textbooks – cruel, unfair, and free of any context – it seemed only logical that students should regard any act of counter-aggression committed by the U.S. military as a simple act of vengeance: self-evident, and justified – no matter how many ended up killed.

We observe that with new pride in the forces of ‘good’ came new enemies, or ‘bad’ figures and groups in history – a symbolic order quite distinctly illustrated in post-Cold War textbooks. As the communist Soviet faded away as the antithesis of and major threat to American freedom and values, new conflicts, particularly in the Middle East, provided textbook writers with new faces to represent anti-American and anti-Western hostility. This pertained not only to leaders like Saddam Hussein, but also to groups in conflict with American allies. The Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), for example, which in the early 1970s was described in textbooks objectively as a group that claimed to represent the interests of the Palestinian people but which was considered by the Israelis to be a terrorist organization, was introduced by *Glorious Republic* in 1990 plainly as a “terrorist group pledged to the destruction of Israel,” with no guiding principles or set of beliefs other than the takedown of a Western ally.<sup>542</sup> The Iranians were depicted as equally brutal, driven solely by their hatred for Americans in textbook reports on the Iranian hostage crisis. Omitting any details on the historical background behind the overthrow of the last Shah, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, on the societal conditions in Iran under his rule, or on the role trade with the United States and other Western nations played in contributing to public uproar, textbooks began their accounts on Iran with the spontaneous dethroning of an American ally and the rise of the oppressive Islamic Republic. President Jimmy Carter’s admission of the Shah into the United States for refuge and medical treatment, “in what was intended to be a humanitarian gesture,” as *Pathways* proclaimed, was met with the brutal kidnapping of American citizens in the U.S. embassy in Tehran. Depicted as a harsh, irrational, even random act of violence against a nation with only good intentions, textbooks like *Pathways* also emphasized how the incident upset and frightened “frustrated and impatient” Americans.<sup>543</sup> “Every night,” *Glorious Republic* narrated, “Americans watched as television news programs showed Iranian mobs chanting ‘Death to America!’”<sup>544</sup> Identification with an insulted United States was made stronger through the sharing of hostages’ stories.

---

<sup>542</sup> Ibid., p. 863.

<sup>543</sup> Cayton, 1998, p. 687.

<sup>544</sup> Graff, 1990, p. 857.

*Pathways* quoted one of the hostages in an add-on titled “American Voices,” highlighting her feelings during the experience:

And the sounds outside the embassy were nerve-wracking.... There seemed to be a continuous crowd of people shouting anti-American slogans... As I sat confined in my chair I thought, I can’t take this, I just can’t take this.<sup>545</sup>

Descriptions of hate-ridden, “anti-American Iranians” and images of Iranian mobs burning the American flag dominated reconstructions of the conflict.<sup>546</sup> Other than “Death to America,” these accounts failed to quote any Iranian actors on the matter.

The one-sidedness of such emotional accounts enforced a sensation of frustration for American and allied victims, on the one hand, and fear of “anti-American” forces on the other. They promoted and increased social distance between groups, specifically between Americans and allies versus cultural opposites, and narrated acts of war in way that justified a sense of vengeance in the case of American return attacks against an enemy. Against such an emotionally charged background, military action taken against groups presented in such a manner appeared unequivocally necessary. The devaluation of groups supposedly ‘opposed’ to American ideals became thus an essential component in the reconstruction of war.

### **3.4 THE ORDINARY HEROES: MORE SOLDIERS WIN APPRECIATION**

While textbooks began to include more images of female and minority members of the U.S. military and acknowledge their contribution in contemporary wars, Veterans Day discussions on 11 November tended to increasingly revolve around the topic of diversity in the military. News stories granted newfound attention to topics of controversy related to previous wars, especially regarding the discrimination of certain groups within the military. These pieces increasingly thematized the new efforts made by the military to commemorate those service members who had been overlooked in the past, especially Black, female, and Latino soldiers. As in textbooks, images of female and non-White soldiers, on the field or participating in patriotic ceremonies, became ever more frequent in newspapers. The persona of the courageous hero soldier finally began to expand to include not only the White servicemen of all wars, but also servicemen and servicewomen of all races, exemplified in headlines, such as “Forgotten ‘Angels’: Black Soldiers Helped Free Nazis’ Victims” and “Statue Honors America’s Female

---

<sup>545</sup> Cayton, 1998, p. 687.

<sup>546</sup> Ibid, p. 687.

Vietnam Veterans... About 11,000 women served during the war,” referring to the erection of the Vietnam Woman’s Memorial in Washington D.C. in 1993.<sup>547</sup> Veterans of the Korean War, which came to be referred to as the ‘forgotten war’ for its having been quickly overshadowed by the events in Vietnam, similarly came to enjoy increased media acknowledgment, a commemorative silver dollar coin, and in 1995 the erection of a new war memorial in the nation’s capital dedicated specifically to their service and experiences.

News media demonstrated increasing interest especially in the topics of prisoners of war, veteran homelessness, and illnesses associated with warfare – both physical and mental – discussing them at length as the most emotional and relevant Veterans Day topics for service members themselves. Unlike the silence most textbooks demonstrated on the failure of government to adequately compensate many groups of veterans for their service, newspapers engaged themselves openly with the provocative topic to challenge the actions of current and past administrations. Ruth Baja Williams, for example, in her 1998 *Washington Post* article, “Veterans Betrayed,” brought to light the government’s failure to recognize Filipino veterans who fought for the U.S. army in the Spanish-American War for their service. These veterans, she lamented, never received the benefits that were promised to them by President Franklin D. Roosevelt: “What a pathetic tale of promises made and broken.”<sup>548</sup> The decade witnessed a new emphasis not only on equality within the military, but also on the lack of appreciation for those service members who by the end of the 1980s had still largely remained undiscussed, unrecognized, or uncompensated.

That the nation continued to cope with the shame of Vietnam by offering amends with its veterans was evident in the construction of hundreds of smaller replicas of the official Vietnam Veterans Memorial around the country throughout the 1990s. One seemingly unlikely Veterans Day celebration was especially considered a sign of the times and made headlines around the country. Berkeley, California – known for its atmosphere of intellectual antimilitarism and as the site of some of the largest antiwar protests during the Vietnam era – shocked Americans with its Veterans Day ceremony in 1995. The *New York Times* reported on the event with the headline, “Berkeley Makes Peace with Its Veterans.” This ‘making peace’ with soldiers and veterans, some of which claimed to have experienced extreme mistreatment in Northern California during the years of the Vietnam War, was assumed to have indicated

---

<sup>547</sup> Fern Shen, “Forgotten ‘Angels’: Black Soldiers Helped Free Nazis’ Victims,” *Washington Post*, 11 November 1992, p. D1; Mark Bousian, “Statue Honors America’s Female Vietnam Veterans: Memorial,” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1993, p. WA1.

<sup>548</sup> Ruth Baja Williams, “Veterans Betrayed,” *Washington Post*, 11 November 1998, p. A23.

that the “times have changed” – that even the space that once represented the most vociferous antiwar and ‘anti-military’ sentiments could transform into a place of patriotism, loyalty, and gratitude.<sup>549</sup>

The growth of these ceremonies around the United States was often attributed to the overall more positive reception of the new generation of veterans that fought the Persian Gulf War, who unlike veteran groups of the past decades, had been received with pride and appreciation. More than that, they were received with a sigh of relief, as they enabled Americans to feel once again victorious and powerful. In 1991, President Bush professed that the Gulf veterans had “freed a captive nation and set America free by renewing our faith in ourselves.”<sup>550</sup> Some newspapers also scrutinized the difference in the reception of Vietnam and Gulf veterans by interviewing the veterans of each war and comparing their stories. Many veterans acknowledged the improvement in societal appreciation themselves, attributing it directly to the victory in the Persian Gulf. Not only the image of Persian Gulf veterans, but that of Vietnam veterans benefited from this shift in attitude. Vietnam veterans interviewed by the *Daily Press* in 1992 were reportedly “happy to talk of the better treatment that Vietnam veterans... received in recent years... since Desert Storm pumped new pride into the nation’s military.”<sup>551</sup> Another veteran of the Signal Corps operations in New Guinea in 1944 told the *Los Angeles Times*:

Not enough people, until Desert Storm, remembered our veterans. But now I see flags in the houses, see them in the streets, and see them on the cars... I have one son who was a veteran of Vietnam. I can see the difference now. They were truly forgotten men... Desert Storm has brought a little peace to them, but it’s long overdue.<sup>552</sup>

Thus despite the wave of patriotism that dominated the Reagan era, the decisive victory in the Persian Gulf assured Americans that this pride had substance in the wake of Cold War uncertainty. That the war in the Gulf thus brought peace to Americans at home by once again bestowing upon them the title of victor was a reoccurring theme throughout Veterans Day stories in the 1990s, which seemed to be an even more salient topic than the background and

---

<sup>549</sup> “Berkeley Makes Peace with Its Veterans,” *New York Times*, 12 November 1995, p. 32.

<sup>550</sup> George H. W. Bush, “Remarks at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier,” 11 November 1991, *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1991*, book 2: *July 1 to December 31*, (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992), p. 1435.

<sup>551</sup> Charles Cook, quoted in “Vietnam War Dominates Veterans Day Observance: Thousands Migrate to D.C. Memorial,” *Daily Press*, 12 November 1992, p. A5.

<sup>552</sup> Irene Porter, quoted in Bob Elston, “Veterans and Remembrance,” *Los Angeles Times*, 11 November 1991, p. OCB1.

details of the conflict itself. Vietnam veterans remained nevertheless a heavily discussed topic throughout the decade and continued to dominate Veterans Day discussions.

Some articles concretized the ‘soldier hero’ image by emphasizing the distinction between soldiers and other citizens. The *Daily Press*, for example, published a Veterans Day poem in 1999 titled “What is a Vet?” The poem accentuated that many different people were considered veterans, but that which made an individual a “savior” who stood out from the rest of the citizenry was the sacrifice for the nation’s wellbeing. Although veterans were, indeed, “ordinary,” relatable American citizens who led everyday lives and were not necessarily outwardly recognizable, they were no longer considered to count among the *many* citizens affected by war, but were rather the very *few* selfless enough to risk their lives to ensure that others may enjoy their freedom, for which the public owed its indebted gratitude. The last stanza highlighted this very indebtedness:

He is a soldier and a savior and a sword against the darkness, and he is nothing more than the finest, greatest testimony on behalf of the finest, greatest nation ever known. So remember, each time you see someone who has served your country, just lean over and say ‘Thank you.’ That’s all most people need, and in most cases it will mean more than any medals they could have been awarded or were awarded.

Two little words that mean a lot: “THANK YOU.”<sup>553</sup>

Poems written by individual soldiers and veterans became prevalent in Veterans Day articles. A weekly advice column in the *Washington Post* published a poem written by a veteran on Veterans Day 1999, who similarly contrasted soldiers with others – this time with student protestors (alluding ostensibly to the Vietnam War protests):

It is the soldier, not the campus manager,  
Who has given us the freedom to demonstrate.  
It is the soldier who salutes the flag,  
Who serves beneath the flag and whose coffin is draped by the flag,  
Who allows the protestor to burn the flag.<sup>554</sup>

In contradistinction to the veteran who sacrifices himself or herself for the common good, dishonorable antiwar protestors abused their freedoms to condemn the very individuals who supposedly granted them the right to protest. As exemplified in such poems, Veterans Day articles and expressive texts in the 1990s placed emphasis not only the heroism, but also the

---

<sup>553</sup> Phil Rivera, “What is a Vet?” printed in “Veterans Day,” *Daily Press*, 11 November 1999, p. 20.

<sup>554</sup> Published in Ann Landers column, *Washington Post*, 11 November 1999, p. C10.

*ordinariness*, of modern soldiers – the ‘everyday heroes’ – and the indebtedness inherited by the citizenry for their service. Indeed, “What is a Vet?” even referred to a set of expected behaviors regarding *how* one should interact with and thank soldiers – ultimately implying a reversal and discrediting of the opinions and behaviors of some critics of the military during the Vietnam era. Here the sacredness of the soldier’s sacrifice and experience was clear, which indeed illuminates why many critics of multiculturalism were reluctant to deny soldiers – at least the loyal, pro-military soldiers – their version of history in times of war: it would obstruct their heroiness.

### 3.5 CONCLUSION: AMERICANISM PREVAILS

The 1990s witnessed a heated discussion on the role of multiculturalism and diverse perspectives in historical narratives and war discourse that spanned and connected the realms of academia, K-12 education, and the media. This discussion mirrored, in many ways, the debate on social inquiry and cultural and moral relativism in the 1960s and 1970s. The original NHS of 1994 demonstrated stark similarities to the NSS approach to the teaching of history. It is little surprise that some of those working on the project had been involved with the NSS in the 1960s, such as its co-director, Charlotte Crabtree.<sup>555</sup> With the dissipation of Cold War aggression between the United States and the Soviet Union, however, the multiculturalist approach of the 1990s focused more on cooperation and understanding between various racial, ethnic, cultural, and religious groups in the United States and the world. The vicious debates and grassroots critique of ‘questionable values’ in textbooks in the 1970s and 1980s, however, set a difficult stage for the incorporation of multiculturalist methods into a history curriculum, even after the end of the Cold War. As Loewen observed in 1995, “many parents want children to concentrate on the 3 R’s [reading, writing, arithmetic], not on multicultural history.”<sup>556</sup>

Most history textbooks revealed multiculturalist approaches to have generally lost the battle against a moral economy of traditionalist and nationalistic reconstructions of war. Yet the strand of patriotism that prevailed in this battle was not necessarily identical to Reagan’s patriotic Cold-War conservatism of the 1980s. The mere *conversation* that took place on multiculturalism’s role within, or vis-à-vis, Americanism in history textbooks and curriculum

---

<sup>555</sup> See, for example, Crabtree’s 1966 argument for the use of the inquiry method in social studies classrooms: Charlotte A. Crabtree, “Inquiry Approaches to Learning Concepts and Generalizations in Social Studies,” *Social Education*, 6(30), October 1966, pp. 407-414.

<sup>556</sup> Loewen, *Lies My Teacher Told Me*, p. 296.

in the 1990s proved that the negotiations of narratives in the post-Cold War decade differed to some extent from the “new consensus” of the Reagan era, during which such a dialogue of that scale would have hardly been possible.<sup>557</sup> The willingness of top publishers like McGraw Hill/Glencoe to publish books like *American Odyssey* in 1994, seldom as it was, would have nevertheless been less likely to occur on the textbook market of the 1980s. This suggests the simultaneous existence of *another* moral economy of history education in the 1990s: one that was, in fact, based on multiculturalist perspectives, revisionism, and inquiry – despite its limited success compared to other, ‘less controversial’ approaches to history. Not surprisingly, *American Odyssey* was authored by Gary B. Nash from UCLA, the co-director of the multicultural tragedy that became the NHS. The debate on the NHS constituted the largest attempt of historians involved with curriculum development to reintroduce relativism and revisionism into history, which came with – or essentially necessitated – critical assessments of war and military intervention overseas. However, unlike textbooks of the Vietnam era, the few books that maintained a critical stance toward military conflicts in U.S. history nevertheless explicitly separated soldier involvement from the questionable intentions of the respective administrations. The compromise set on the recognition of multiculturalism seemed to apply primarily to the illumination of the experiences of heretofore excluded members of the military, rather than the perspectives of other groups on war and intergroup conflict, as demonstrated in Veterans Day discussions in the news, as well.

Nonetheless, most textbook authors continued to propagate narratives of war that painted the United States as a morally superior force and presented only one – supposedly uncontested – perspective. This time, however, the certainty awarded by the end of the Cold War and the first large-scale military operation involving hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops since Vietnam had allowed for a new tone to emerge in these reconstructions. This chapter sought to illustrate how in the wake of U.S. military successes in the early 1990s, textbook authors presented events in foreign affairs with a slightly different strand of pride. No longer troubled by the fear of losing the Cold War or the collective shame of Vietnam, as inferable from the discussions on Veterans Day in the newspapers examined, the nation’s new, self-proclaimed label as the world’s ‘sole superpower’ allowed for a newfound confidence to seep through textbook narratives to more confidently assert American moral superiority than in

---

<sup>557</sup> For Reagan’s use of the term “new consensus” to describe his platform, see Ronald W. Reagan, “Acceptance of the Republican Nomination for President,” 17 July 1980, (<https://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/speeches/rhetoric/rraccept.htm>; accessed 7 February 2019); For more on the effects of this so-called “consensus” on the educational realm, see Chester E. Finn Jr., “Toward a New Consensus,” *Change*, 13(6), 1981, pp. 16-63.

previous decades. Furthermore, the culture wars triggered by Norma and Mel Gabler's attacks on textbooks in Texas in the 1970s and 1980s, analyzed in Chapter 2, posed severe and expensive consequences for textbook publishers who produced materials that were rejected or banned by the Texas SBOE. The establishment of the Board's strict social studies textbook adoption standards in 1995 only further pressured publishers to produce desirable materials – portraying national history from a patriotic and celebratory angle, although a few chose not to comply.

Understanding the threat that a moral economy based on a more comprehensive and inclusive approach to history posed for one based on the propagation of unconditional national pride and a celebration of American institutions is essential to make sense of the former's failure to survive in history textbooks against the background of strict private controls. The 1990s thus came to represent the aftermath of the heated battles of the 1970s and 1980s, which had already deemed 'non-controversial' – rather than inclusive – products as the most adoptable. The results were vast. The sharper reconstructions of human-less warfare in post-Cold War textbooks depicted the U.S. military's destruction of the enemy as a form of entertainment for the American people, and thus readers were less drawn to critically examine the morality behind the judgment of their leaders. A war of only bright rockets and high-tech weaponry, devoid of human faces or contrary perspectives, confirmed the existence of one truth to be learned and internalized by students – a morality in which one must become desensitized to the experiences of others and in which one is expected to take pride.

## Conclusion

### Conflict, Dialogue, and Change

*This idea of education as a performance of civic duty, or rather a performance of affection for country, constitutes a positioning of subjects vis-a-vis objects of emotion in such a way as to make intuitive how one would go about loving one's country. — Kolson Schlosser<sup>558</sup>*

---

The introduction of this dissertation referred to a predominantly quantitative study on the treatment of war in U.S. history textbooks published between 1970 and 2009 conducted by two sociologists, Lachmann and Mitchell. Based on their data, which was collected using word counts and coded paragraph descriptions, the authors concluded that:

The shift since the 1970s to more negative portrayals of war, combined with textbooks' continuing inclusion of items that glorify combat... suggest[s] a return to a tradition of authors, educators, and mobilized publics using textbooks and classrooms as terrain for ideological conflict. This, in turn, means textbooks have become ever more useful tools for teachers who want to... engage in critical pedagogy. Most textbooks now have elements that can support teachers who are critical of militarism and who want to show the dark side of war.<sup>559</sup>

It is certainly intriguing to observe how differing methods of investigation can lead to such wildly differing conclusions. One continuous shortcoming Lachmann and Mitchell noticed in their sample of textbooks throughout was the supposed lack of attention paid to enemy suffering:

We need to remember that textbooks' emphasis on U.S. soldiers' pain and death does not extend to the soldiers or civilians of America's enemies or allies. Textbooks continue to ignore or slight the atomic and conventional bombs targeted on Japanese and German civilians and to give short shrift to My Lai and other atrocities committed by the United States in Vietnam. Students who read U.S. textbooks can come away thinking that only Americans suffer in war.<sup>560</sup>

---

<sup>558</sup> Kolson Schlosser, "Education and Intimate War of Position," *Political Geography*, 60, 2017, p. 73.

<sup>559</sup> Richard Lachmann and Lacy Mitchell, "The Changing Face of War in Textbooks: Depictions of World War II and Vietnam, 1970-2009," *American Sociological Association*, 87(3), 2014, p. 201.

<sup>560</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 202.

Chapter 1 of this dissertation, however, provided several examples of how textbooks thematized enemy suffering – in images, words, and statistics. When we understand *why* these (social inquiry) textbooks were developed and the intentions of the authors and curriculum developers, it becomes clear that dealing with enemy suffering was an essential component of the moral economy of history education they wished to establish, namely one based on critical thinking and relativism. Such an observation cannot be reached by coding textbook paragraphs and counting the change in the frequency of each category. The NSS was mostly a product of the 1960s and thus emerged before the beginning of Lachmann and Mitchell's examined timeframe. Nevertheless, the circulation of social inquiry textbooks continued well into the mid-1970s – Sellers' *As It Happened*, the most quintessential social inquiry textbook, for example, having been published in 1975.

While the authors, using a count of “antiwar words,” concluded in their study that the newer textbooks in their sample tended to deal with antiwar activism during the Vietnam War more than textbooks of the 1970s, Chapter 2 of this research employed a deeper, qualitative look at the treatment of the antiwar movement.<sup>561</sup> It was revealed that much of the attention paid to the movement was devoted to emphasizing the violence that took place at antiwar demonstrations and how the movement, supposedly based on anarchy and hatred of American traditionalism, defied the foundations upon which the American nation and identity were supposedly based. Lachmann and Mitchell do acknowledge that “most recent textbooks still ignore the substance of activists' criticisms of U.S. policies in Vietnam,” yet still inferred that the increased use of “antiwar words” suggested a general “unhappiness with the course and outcome of the Vietnam War.”<sup>562</sup> There is little reason to dispute that unhappiness with the events of the Vietnam War likely increased with time within society. Yet the failure of newer textbooks to concern themselves with the arguments and achievements of the antiwar movement, as well as the tendency to dismiss protestors as a group of ill-mannered outcasts, should be interpreted as an increased disapproval of the expression of *opposition* to the military, not of the military's involvement in Vietnam.

Lachmann and Mitchell also observe a “shift in the relative proportion of textbook attention to the hellish, rather than glorious, aspects of both” World War II and the Vietnam War, and interpret this as evidence that disputes the hypothesis that textbooks represent a hidden

---

<sup>561</sup> Ibid., p. 193.

<sup>562</sup> Ibid., pp. 200, 201.

patriotic curriculum.<sup>563</sup> Here is it unfortunate that the authors only examined the treatment of these two specific wars while omitting, for example, the Persian Gulf War. As Chapter 3 has shown, the victory in the Persian Gulf and the end of the Cold War allowed for authors to narrate war in a new, aggressive tone that not only glorified combat but presented it as a thrilling action story.

Clearly, there are several advantages to employing a deep reading of textbooks and a historical analysis of the reforms that led to their production – especially when dealing with a highly emotional topic such as war and soldiers. This research, in its exploration of American history textbooks, uncovered the emotions that were supposed to be felt regarding certain historical events and actors, as prescribed by the official knowledge under the moral economy of history education. With respect to the U.S. military, service members, and enemy identities, the appropriate emotional responses have shifted throughout the reign of various moral economies. During the Vietnam era, when scholars – committed to the propagation of ‘brotherly love’ and mutual understanding to remedy Cold War tensions – took control of public school social studies curricula, many textbooks tried to counteract blind patriotism with critical thinking and moral relativism. Reformers believed this approach would encourage students to question the actions of their own government and its institutions (especially the military), as well as to develop respect for differences in opinion and moral convictions within and between groups. The data reveal textbooks to have diligently promoted a feeling of empathy toward America’s enemies and the victims of American military violence. This was achieved in part by a thematization of the destruction caused by the military abroad, coupled with statistics and firsthand accounts on the suffering endured by civilians in those nations. Those who felt offended and excluded by this moral economy demonstrated vehement opposition through protests, school strikes, and the deliverance of testimonies before state textbook selection committees. Conservative critics of social inquiry textbooks claimed that secular humanism was the ‘religion’ of the educational elites and was winning in a battle against Christianity for the power to influence students’ values and feelings. They especially felt children were being robbed: robbed of pride and self-esteem, and robbed of the truth that was informed by the absolute values of the Bible. Children were not supposed to think about or discuss their values in the classroom – and they were certainly not to renegotiate them. The actions of the United States and its military were similarly not to be questioned, textbook critics held, as they were supposed to be endorsed. Children were to feel pride and loyalty when reading about their

---

<sup>563</sup> Ibid., p. 200.

national history, not shame or skepticism. The pressure placed on private publishing companies was so great that they were forced to comply with the several states that rose objections to their materials – most notably: the large state of Texas. The textbooks that were produced as a result were not only exceedingly patriotic, they omitted the viewpoints of other governments and citizens of the world in accounts on conflict (or simply dismissed them as evil), leaving the impression of one, coherent American perspective on each event. Textbooks published after the end of the Cold War attempted to amplify the sense of pride by delivering the details of combat in an entertaining manner, signifying that children should not only feel proud of their military but also astounded and amazed at its superior technology and abilities.

This research also uncovered the emotions that worked to *stabilize* various moral economies, and to dismantle others: most notably, fear. Fear was a constant motivating force behind the various reforms discussed in this dissertation. This included fear of nuclear decimation, fear of American underachievement and failure, and fear of children learning to think for themselves and draw their own conclusions. Another important fear accompanying the story of history textbooks was the fear of losing power. This is best illustrated by the anti-textbook riots of the 1970s and 1980s. The assertion that this revolt was a ‘bottom-up’ movement is not to imply that the textbook protestors were *completely* powerless – although they claimed to be. These actors, despite their humble socioeconomic standing, had *enough* power – as White Christians – to convince those with decision-making power that their conceptions of morality and views of history were not only worthy of being acknowledged, but were superior to other views. The moral absolutism and single-perspective history they advocated were eventually adopted by textbook publishers at the expense of the revisionist histories that shone light on the voices of other marginalized groups in history. The inclusion of those voices was a threat to the hierarchal symbolic order that anti-textbook rioters perceived as a safety net – namely, American and White supremacy. The voices crowded out by the calls to ban ‘multiethnic’ textbooks included not only those of cultural groups around the world, but especially Black voices. While Chapter 3 revealed post-Cold War textbooks to increasingly thematize the involvement of non-Whites and women in the military, it is pertinent to refrain from concluding that Blacks fared better in new textbooks altogether. While it did not constitute the subject of this research, the discussion of slavery in United States history textbooks has long been a hotly debated topic which has been awarded considerable scholarly attention. Historians, social scientists, and activist organizations have tediously examined modern textbooks for their treatment of slavery and heavily criticized their failure to accurately communicate the severity

of hardships endured by slaves or the cruelty of tactics used by White slave owners.<sup>564</sup> The attempts to portray slavery more accurately in revisionist accounts published especially in the 1960s and 1970s composed part of what Alice Moore anxiously labeled “racist anti-White” literature, and the rise of her and the Gablers’ followers was the reason books like Edwin Fenton’s *The Americans*, which extensively treated and criticized slavery, were removed from state approved lists. Thus despite representing a bottom-up movement itself, the anti-textbook revolution did not originate on the *very* bottom of the power structure of American society, and essentially worked to push those members further down.

Despite their plea for relativism, empathy, and modest patriotism, which became visible in many textbooks, the reformers of the 1960s also failed to exude inclusivity and diversity within themselves. Despite the diversity of their research interests, this group of scholars and experts was almost exclusively White, male, and occupied at Northeastern universities. It is easy to see why some citizens in Southern and rural areas felt that revisionist history and social inquiry was being imposed on them from above by ‘outsiders.’ And in truth, many reformers did demonstrate biases in their assumptions about American society. This history demonstrated how scholars and educators, with honest intentions of reducing intergroup and international conflict, can nevertheless hold prejudices that can blind them to prevalent moral convictions in society and prove to be harmful to their cause. It reflects what could happen in a diverse society when those who preach and enforce inclusion are themselves, exclusive and elite – and, most importantly, widely perceived as such. For this reason, this history provides an example of failure to be considered for the planning of future educational reforms – in the United States or in any other democratic society – by exposing the importance of inclusion and representation in decision making processes that affect education. The National History Standards of 1994 was the greatest attempt to revive an educational culture of tolerance and understanding with a strong focus on multiculturalism – an approach that presupposes a commitment to cultural

---

<sup>564</sup> See, for example, Peter Kolchin, “Slavery in United States Survey Textbooks,” *Journal of American History*, 84(4), March 1998, pp. 1425-1438; Kate Shuster, “Teaching Hard History: American Slavery,” Southern Poverty Law Center, 2018, ([www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/tt\\_hard\\_history\\_american\\_slavery.pdf](http://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/tt_hard_history_american_slavery.pdf); accessed 15 April 2020); Johnathan Zimmerman, “Brown-ing the American Textbook: History, Psychology, and the Origins of Modern Multiculturalism,” *History of Education Quarterly*, 44(1), Special Issue on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the “Brown v. Board of Education” Decision, spring 2004, pp. 46-69; This is not to imply that textbooks before the NSS and the Civil Rights Movement depicted slavery more accurately than the ones that succeeded them. On the contrary, textbooks in the first half of the twentieth century often included disturbingly positive portrayals of slave life in the South. See, for example, Dan B. Fleming, “A Review of Slave Life in Fourteen United States History Textbooks,” *Journal of Negro Education*, 56(4), autumn 1987, pp. 550-556. Although Fleming, an author of a Virginia state textbook himself, claimed that textbooks of his day (the 1980s) tried “to make sure that minorities are included” in order get adopted, the previously cited studies on slavery in textbooks, all which postdate Fleming’s analysis and concern themselves with newer textbooks, prove his statement to have been somewhat too optimistic (p. 552).

relativism. Yet this time, opposition already erupted from within the team involved itself, leading to the project's demise. The powerful period of recovering pride and raising U.S. history to the tale of the benevolent superpower had left multicultural history little room to grow. Many Americans, desperately clinging on to the confidence spurt brought to them by the end of the Cold War and the Persian Gulf War to eradicate the shameful 'ghosts' of Vietnam, were reluctant to accept a national history curriculum – and thus accept a new moral economy of history education – that celebrated so much the achievements of people in the rest of the world.

The newspaper analysis of Veterans Day observances reveals that in most cases, the moral economy of history education was not an entirely independent advancement and often mirrored to some extent developments in the political arena. We see that already a few years following the end of the Korean War, in the late 1950s, the military began to struggle with its popularity. Throughout the 1960s, national Veterans Day celebrations continually lost participants and enthusiasts, and news stories on the occasion tended to increasingly gravitate toward discussing the horrors occurring in Vietnam. By the early 1970s, Veterans Day was considered the 'forgotten holiday.' There is no reason to dispute the role of the Vietnam War in this loss of esteem. However, there is also reason to believe that it was not the *only* reason people grew more skeptical of the military. The history of the birth of the NSS also reveals that there existed a tendency, at least among scholars, to question the merits of blind patriotism already in the 1950s. News pieces on Veterans Day in the late 1970s started to question the trend of waning patriotism in the United States. By the 1980s, with the election of Ronald Reagan, the erection of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, and the revival of festive and well-attended Veterans Day observances nationwide, it was clear that the military and its service members had regained substantial admiration from the public. This trend echoed the new moral economy of history education that held pride was supposed to be felt in connection with U.S. institutions, military, and soldiers. The increased media attention granted to the inclusion of especially Black and female troops, and also of veterans of the Korean War – the 'forgotten war' – into Veterans Day commemoration in the 1990s also corresponded to a new emphasis on the contributions of diverse U.S. soldiers in contemporary wars in textbooks. Yet while news media increasingly blamed and criticized the government for the hardships faced by veterans while readjusting back into society and the illnesses from which they came to suffer, textbooks refrained from making such statements and focused instead only on the mistreatment they received from other citizens. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to infer that the moral economy of history education was in some way intertwined with a larger moral regime in society. Yet the incessant debates and controversies related to textbooks and social studies

curricula prove that the teaching of history in some way held its own power apart from the influences of society. Actors on all sides of these debates were determined that textbooks and history instruction, to some extent, *created* social reality. They believed what children learned would become the official truth – regardless of its relation to *their* truth – that determined discourse, and in turn, would affect both student values and power relations in society.

Two significant types of history textbooks that were not dealt with for this research were world history and state history textbooks. I suspect both of these types of textbooks to hold as much as significance and power over knowledge as national history textbooks. Both of these types of textbooks were also included in the textbook controversies of the 1970s, such as Loewen's 1974 critical, anti-racist history, *Mississippi: Conflict and Change* – banned by the state of Mississippi in 1980. Since this research was concerned with representations of the U.S. military and foreign policy during times of war, U.S. history textbooks were the most useful types of publications to examine. To more broadly examine the construction of national identity and its negotiation with other political identities, both world and state history textbooks should be included for a meaningful analysis. A historical analysis of state history textbooks for a specific state would additionally enrich the dialogue on various moral economies over time. Today, the conventional textbook is losing significance in the modern classroom and increasingly being replaced with digital media, similarly opening up several new research possibilities for those interested in the moral economy of history education, as well.

This research has shown that official truth and knowledge is relative and malleable, and that analyzing instructional materials historically affords us a glimpse into the types of truths that prevailed in a society at any given moment. At the same time, these instructional materials and their content shape and stabilize (or challenge) prevailing truths. As we have seen, those who influenced textbook content also sought to influence the emotional lives of their readers. By now, the relevance of studying the moral economy of history education – especially its affective dimensions – should be apparent. The present day is constantly witnessing violent conflict that is fueled by emotion and stems, in part, from differences in conceptions of morality and truth. It also often stems from contempt and disdain – something we have seen to be very much connected with fear: especially fear of loss of power. I have specifically studied the representations of war and soldiers in the moral economy because war is the most escalated type of hostility and those who fight it are seen as each side's uniformed representatives in this destructive encounter. Studying the teaching of history is extremely useful for deconstructing hostilities between groups – or from one group to another – in a given society. The root of

hostilities needs to be understood before hostilities can be combatted. We have seen that, for example, the social studies reformers of the 1960s had the strong *ambition* – and even the funds – to help combat hostilities, but did not fully *understand the root* of ultra-patriotism and xenophobia, which was largely fear. While the reformers feared the likelihood of nuclear decimation *due to* arrogant and ignorant American patriotism, the anti-textbook critics, for example, feared the likelihood of nuclear decimation due to a *lack* of display of strong patriotism, as well as the loss of power discussed earlier. But research is only the first step in uncovering the underlying emotions driving a specific – perhaps undesirable – behavior or attitude. The next step is *dialogue*, rather than ostracism, because the latter only leads to an *exacerbation* of these attitudes, rather than their elimination. The Southern anti-textbook critics, to continue with this example, steadfastly held onto their beliefs – despite apparent traces of exceptionalism and racism – because they felt excluded from the American education system, which had historically been dominated by minds in the Northeast from the beginning. To them, the valor of anti-racism and ‘brotherly love’ between nations was not apparent – these ideologies came from ‘outside’ and thus their imposition was an act of aggression. It is naturally an utmost demanding challenge to ‘unify’ such large, populous, and multicultural societies; conflict is inevitable, but it is dialogue that sparks awareness. A dialogue on history is the most indispensable type in this process.

In the present day we are observing the disastrous effects of a grave lack of historical knowledge and diverse perspectives. Critics of the #BlackLivesMatter movement who compare its proponents to criminals and terrorists demonstrate a dire misunderstanding of the historical roots that today’s racism and inequalities have in racial segregation, slavery, and colonialism. Debates on the rights of indigenous peoples in the United States similarly account for little when representatives of certain positions do not possess knowledge of the genocidal past of the United States. When students learn that the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II was necessary and that socialism equates to evil, they will not even be interested in learning any other viewpoint. With the death of dialogue, comes the death of curiosity, as well – both of which are necessary to “do” history. Naturally, some students may choose, for example, to pursue studies or a career in the humanities or social sciences, where they will likely learn to approach social problems more objectively. Nevertheless, it must be noted the vast majority of citizens never engage with such issues in a formal context after finishing grade school. This is somewhat unsurprising, since the dictation of lists of non-disputed facts and dates to be memorized for an examination, before being eventually forgotten, is simply unstimulating and uninteresting.

These trends are then reflected in the rest of society. Current U.S. politics is characterized by severe polarization and the remarkable absence of dialogue. Internet memes posted by supporters of President Donald Trump in the 2020 election claiming that 60 to 80 million people (due to varying degrees of acceptance) ‘voted for communism,’ as well as those posted by supporters of President Joseph Biden claiming that some 74 million people ‘voted for White supremacy,’ show the high degree of unwillingness of so many Americans to hear the convictions of so many millions of other Americans – on both sides. Under a system where hundreds of millions of children learn at an early age that there is always only one right answer to every question, this conflict also appears somewhat unsurprising.

This is not only true in the United States. With the present rise of right-wing populism and extremism in essentially all reaches of the globe, the aim for achieving a dialogue on history should be of utmost importance to most societies today. This study in particular has focused on the United States, especially due to the peculiarities of the private American textbook enterprise and the characteristically democratic manner of shaping textbook content, which offers an interesting angle for the field of textbook research. Yet one should not conclude that textbook and history conflicts do not or cannot occur elsewhere. The history deconstructed in this research can serve as a useful reference point for educational reformers and activists in any society that harbors heated conflict surrounding history education. And where there is conflict, debate, and dialogue, there is at least the hope for change.



## List of Examined Textbooks

---

- Abramowitz, Jack. *American History* [Follett Social Studies Program], 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Chicago: Follett, 1983.
- *American History* [Follett Social Studies Program], 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Chicago: Follett, 1979.
- Anderson, Vivienne and Laura M. Shufelt (eds.). *Your America*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.
- Bailyn, Bernard (ed.). *The Great Republic: A History of the American People*, instructor's manual. Lexington, M.A.: Heath, 1977.
- Baldwin, Leland D. and Marry Warring. *History of Our Republic*. Princeton, N.J.: van Nostrand, 1965.
- Bartlett, Irving. *A New History of the United States: An Inquiry Approach* [Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Curriculum], teacher's guide. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Bartlett, Richard A., Clair W. Keller, and Helen H. Carey. *Freedom's Trail*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., teacher's ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981.
- *Freedom's Trail*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., teacher's ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.
- Bass, Herbert J., George A. Billias, and Emma Jones Lapsansky. *Our American Heritage*. Morriston, N.J.: Silver Burdett, 1983.
- Bedford, Henry F., Trevor Colbourn, and James H. Madison. *The Americans: A Brief History*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., vol. 2: *A Brief History Since 1865*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1985.
- Berkin, Carol and Leonard Wood. *Land of Promise: A History of the United States*, teacher's guide. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1983.
- Blum, John M., William S. McFeely, Edmund S. Morgan, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., and Kenneth M. Stampp. *The National Experience: A History of the United States*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., vol. 2. Fort Worth, T.X.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- Boorstin, Daniel J., Brooks Mather Kelley, and Ruth Frankel Boorstin. *A History of the United States*. Needham, M.A.: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- *A History of the United States*. Lexington, M.A.: Ginn, 1981.
- Boyer, Paul. *The American Nation*. Austin: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1999.
- Bragdon, Henry W., Samuel P. McCutchen, and Donald A. Ritchie. *History of a Free Nation*, teacher's wraparound ed. Lake Forest, I.L.: Glencoe, 1992.

- Brown, Richard C. and Herbert J. Bass. *One Flag, One Land*, vol. 9. Val E. Arnsdorf (ed.). *The World and its People*. Morristown, N.J.: Silver Burdett, 1985.
- Buggey, L. Joanne. *America! America!*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1982.
- *America! America!* Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1980.
- Carlile, Clancy. *America at Mid-Century*. Collection Donald Dunning (ed.). *Our Nation's Heritage: A Living History Lab*. Los Angeles: Bowmar, 1976.
- Cayton, Andrew. *America: Pathways to the Present - Modern American History*. Needham, M.A.: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- Cuban, Larry and Philip Roden. *Promise of America* [Scott Foresman Spectra Program], vol. 2: *Struggling for the Dream*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1975.
- *Promise of America* [Scott Foresman Spectra Program], vol. 1: *Teacher Tactics*. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1971.
- Current, Richard and Gerald J. Goodwin. *A History of the United States: Since 1895*. New York: Knopf, 1980.
- Drewry, Henry N., Thomas O'Connor, Frank Freidel. *America Is*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., teacher's annotated ed. Columbus, O.H.: Merrill, 1982.
- *America Is*. Columbus, O.H.: Merrill, 1978.
- Dunning, Donald (ed.). *Our Nation's Heritage: A Living History Lab*, students' resource book, vol. 2. Los Angeles: Bowmar, 1976.
- Feder, Bernard (ed.). *Viewpoints in World History*, vol. 7: *The Arab-Israeli Conflict: Where Is It Heading?* New York: American Book Company, 1974.
- *Viewpoints in World History*, vol. 3: *How Did Islamic Civilization Arise and Spread?* New York: American Book Company, 1974.
- Fenton, Edwin and John M. Good (eds.). *The Shaping of Western Society*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Frost, William B., James A. Brown, Ralph Adams Ellis, and David M. Fink. *A History of the United States: The Evolution of a Free People*. Chicago: Follett, 1969.
- Garraty, John A. *The American Nation: A History of the United States*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- *A Short History of the American Nation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

- Garraty, John A., Aaron Singer, and Michael J. Gallagher. *American History*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.
- Goldfield, David. *The American Journey: A History of the United States*, combined ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- Graff, Edward and Harold E. Hammond. *Southeast Asia: History, Culture, People*. Collection Harold E. Hammond (ed.). *The Regional Studies Series*. New York: Globe Book Comp, 1981.
- Graff, Henry F. *America: The Glorious Republic*, revised ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990.
- Gruver, Rebecca Brooks. *An American History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley, 1976.
- Jackson, Carlton L. and Vito Perrone. *Two Centuries of Progress*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., teacher's annotated ed. Mission Hills, C.A.: Glencoe, 1991.
- Jacobs, William J. *America's Story*, teacher's annotated ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990.
- Jones, Peder. *America in World War II*. Collection Donald Dunning (ed.). *Our Nation's Heritage: A Living History Lab*. Los Angeles: Bowmar, 1976.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. and Leon F. Litwack. *The United States*, combined ed., 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1991.
- Kavunedus, Thomas G. and Harold E. Hammond. *The Middle East: History, Culture, People*. Collection Harold E. Hammond (ed.). *The Regional Studies Series*. New York: Globe Book Comp, 1981.
- Maier, Pauline. *The American People: A History*, teacher's annotated ed., (Lexington, M.A.: Heath, 1986).
- May, Ernest R. *A Proud Nation*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Evanston, I.L.: McDougal Littell, 1984.
- Nash, Gary B. and Christopher L. Salter. *American Odyssey: The United States in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1994.
- Peck, Ira, Steven Jantzen, and Daniel Rosen. *American Adventures*. New York: Scholastic, 1979.
- Platt, Nathaniel and Muriel Jean Drummond. *Our Nation from Its Creation: A Great Experiment*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- Powell, Daniel (ed.). *Ideas in Conflict*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1975.
- Risjord, Norman K. *History of the American People*, teacher's annotated ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1986.

- Risjord, Norman K. and Terry L. Haywoode. *People and Our Country*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982.
- Ritchie, Donald A. *Heritage of Freedom: A History of the United States*. New York: Scribner Educational, 1985.
- Robinson, Donald W. (ed.). *As Others See Us: International View of American History*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.
- Schwartz, Melvin and John O' Connor. *The New Exploring American History*. New York: Globe Book Company, 1981.
- Sellers, Charles G. (ed.). *As It Happened: A History of the United States*, annotated teacher's edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Shafer, Boyd C., Richard A. McLemore, and Everett Augspurger. *United States History: for High Schools*. River Forest, I.L.: Laidlaw, 1966.
- Smith, Lew. *The American Dream: A United States History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1983.
- *The American Dream: A United States History*, teacher's handbook, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1983.
- Smith, Roland M., Eugene Levy, and Martha H. Brown. *Faces of America: A History of the United States*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Sobel, Robert. *The Challenge of Freedom*. River Forest, I.L.: Laidlaw, 1982.
- Uva, Kenneth and Shelley Ann Uva (eds.). *United States in the Making*, vol. 3: *Expansion through the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. New York: Globe, 1980.
- Ver Steeg, Clarence L. *American Spirit: A History of the United States*. Chicago: Follett, 1985.
- *American Spirit: A History of the United States*, teacher's guide. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1984.
- *American Spirit: A History of the United States*, teacher's guide. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1982.
- Wade, Richard C., Howard B. Wilder, and Louise C. Wade. *A History of the United States*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Weinstein, Allen R. and Jackson Wilson (eds.). *Freedom and Crisis: An American History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., vol. 2. New York: Random House, 1978.

- Wiltz, John Edward. *Modern American History: The Search for Identity*, teacher's manual. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.
- *The Search for Identity: Modern American History*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1978.
- Wood, Leonard C., Ralph H. Gabriel, and Edward L. Biller. *America: Its People and Values*, teacher's ed., heritage ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1985.



## Bibliography

---

- Abramowitz, Jack. *American History* [Follett Social Studies Program], 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Chicago: Follett, 1979.
- Allen, Henry. "Vietnam: Hazy Images and Searing Memories: The Drama of the Absolutely Ordinary Soldier." *Washington Post*, 11 November 1992, p. B1.
- "American Flag Kits." Printed advertisement. *Daily Press*, 9 November 1982, p 21.
- Anderson, Vivienne and Laura M. Shufelt (eds.). *Your America*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* revised ed. New York: Verso, 1991.
- Anderson, R. B. "A Belated Concern for Vietnam Vets." *Daily Press*, 11 November 1989, p. A11.
- "Ann Landers Column." *Washington Post*, 11 November 1999, p. C10.
- "Announcement for Project Social Studies." *Social Education*, 26, 1962, p. 300.
- "Another Armistice." *Los Angeles Times*, 11 November 1949, p. A4.
- The Anti-Vietnam Agitation and the Teach-In Movement: The Problem of Communist Infiltration, prepared for the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws to the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate*. 89<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 22 October 1965. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965.
- Anyon, Jean. "Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Legitimizing Knowledge." *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 6, 1978, pp. 40-55.
- Apple, Michael W. *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: Psychology Press, 1979.
- "Regulating the Text: The Socio-Historical Roots of State Control." Philip G. Altbach, Gail P. Kelly, Hugh G. Petrie, and Louis Weis (eds.) *Textbooks in American Society: Politics, Policy, and Pedagogy*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991, pp. 12-26.
  - "Textbook Publishing: The Political and Economic Influences." *Theory into Practice*, 28(4), autumn 1989, pp. 282-287.
- Apple Jr., R. W. "New Stirrings of Patriotism." *New York Times*, 11 December 1983, p. 70.

- Archibald, George H. Speech at NCSS Wingspread Conference. 16 May 1976. Transcript. Folder "Wingspread Conference." Box 2. NCSS.
- Bach, George L. "What Economics Should We Teach?" *Challenge* (The Magazine of Economic Affairs, Institute of Economic Affairs at New York University), March 1964. Reprinted in Edwin Fenton (ed.). *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966, pp. 333-339.
- Bailyn, Bernard (ed.). *The Great Republic: A History of the American People*, instructor's manual. Lexington, M.A.: Heath, 1977.
- Baker, James T. "Jimmy Carter's Religion." *Commonweal*, 103, 1 July 1976, pp. 430-433.
- Baldwin, James. "A Talk to Teachers." *Saturday Review*, 21 December 1963. Reprinted in James Baldwin. *The Price of the Ticket: Collected Non-Fiction, 1948-1985*. New York: Saint Martin's Press, 1985, pp. 325-332.
- Baldwin, Leland D. and Marry Warring (eds.). *History of Our Republic*. Princeton, N.J.: van Nostrand, 1965.
- Banas, Casey. "A Mother's War on Textbooks." *Chicago Tribune*, 19 August 1979, pp. 1, 14.
- Banks, James A., Carlos E. Cortés, Geneva Gay, Ricardo L. Garcia, and Anna S. Ochoa. "Curriculum Guidelines for Multiethnic Education: Position Statement." October 1976. Folder "NCSS Policy Manual 1975." Box 10. Accession #840925. NCSS.
- Bartlett, Irving. *A New History of the United States: An Inquiry Approach* [Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Curriculum], teacher's guide. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Bartlett, Richard A., Clair W. Keller, and Helen H. Carey. *Freedom's Trail*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., teacher's ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981.
- *Freedom's Trail*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed., teacher's ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.
- Beale, Howard K. *Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of Restraints upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools*, report of the Commission on the Social Studies, American Historical Association. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.
- "Berkeley Makes Peace with Its Veterans." *New York Times*, 12 November 1995, p. 32.
- Berkin, Carol and Leonard Wood. *Land of Promise: A History of the United States*, teacher's guide. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1983.
- Birkner, Michael J. *McCormick of Rutgers: Scholar, Teacher, Public Historian*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001.

- “Bishop Fulton Sheen: The First ‘Televangelist.’” *TIME*, 59(15), 14 April 1952, pp. 133-135.
- Blum, John M., William S. McFeely, Edmund S. Morgan, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., and Kenneth M. Stampp. *The National Experience: A History of the United States*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., vol. 2. Fort Worth, T.X.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- Boorstin, Daniel J., Brooks Mather Kelley, and Ruth Frankel Boorstin. *A History of the United States*. Needham, M.A.: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- *A History of the United States*. Lexington, M.A.: Ginn, 1981.
- “Born Again! The Year of the Evangelicals.” *Newsweek*, 25 October 1976, pp. 68-70, 75-78.
- Bousian, Mark. “Statue Honors America’s Female Vietnam Veterans: Memorial.” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1993, p. WA1.
- Boyer, Paul. *The American Nation*. Austin: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1999.
- Boys, Donald. “Supporting Book Banning.” *Daily Journal*, 20 July 1978, p. 4.
- Bragdon, Henry W., Samuel P. McCutchen, and Donald A. Ritchie. *History of a Free Nation*, teacher’s wraparound ed. Lake Forest, I.L.: Glencoe, 1992.
- Brandt, Ronald S. “On Moral/Civic Education: An Interview with Edwin Fenton.” *Educational Leadership*, April 1977, pp. 486-494.
- Breitborde, Lawrence B. “Multiculturalism and Cultural Relativism after the Commemoration.” *Social Education*, 57(3), March 1993, pp. 104-108.
- Brennan Jr., William J. Speech to the Irish Charitable Society in Boston. 17 March 1954. Reprinted in *Nomination of William Joseph Brennan Jr.: Hearings before the Senate Commission on the Judiciary*. 85<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 26 and 27 February 1957. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957.
- Breu, Giovanna. “A Worried Indiana Professor Says More and More U.S. Schools Are Censoring and Banning Books.” *People*, 1 September, 1980, pp. 75-77.
- Brodinsky, Ben. “Basic to the Basics: The Movement and its Meaning.” *Phi Delta Kappan*, 58(7), March 1977, pp. 552-527.
- “The New Right: The Movement and Its Impact.” *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(2), October 1982, pp. 87-94.
- Brown, Carolyn A. “The Struggle to Be Seen.” James H. Williams and Wendy D. Bokhorst-Heng (eds.). *(Re)Constructing Memory: Textbooks, Identity, Nation, and State*. Rotterdam, N.L.: Sense, 2016.

Brown, Joe. "Saluting Vietnam Veterans." *Washington Post*, 11 November 1982, p. C15.

Brown, Richard C. and Herbert J. Bass. *One Flag, One Land*, vol. 9. Val E. Arnsdorf (ed.). *The World and its People*. Morristown, N.J.: Silver Burdett, 1985.

Brownfeld, Allan C. "Forums for Subversive Doctrine." *Christian Economics*, 2 November 1965. Reprinted in *The New Left: Memorandum Prepared for the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary*. 90<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> session, 9 October 1968. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968, pp. 167-168.

Bruner, Jerome S. "The Act of Discovery." *Harvard Educational Review*, 31(1), 1961, pp. 21-32.

— *Actual Minds, Possible Worlds*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1986.

— *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Buckley Jr., William F. "John Kerry's America." Commencement address to the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y. 8 June 1971. Reprinted in William F. Buckley Jr. *Let Us Talk of Many Things: The Collected Speeches*. New York: Basic Books, 2008, pp. 179-183.

Buggey, L. Joanne, Gerald A. Danzer, Charles L. Mitsakos, and C. Frederick Risinger. *America! America!* Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1980.

— *America! America!* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1982.

Bush, George H. W. "Address to the Nation Announcing Allied Military Action in the Persian Gulf." 16 January 1991. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1991*, book 1: *January 1 to June 30*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992, pp. 42-45.

— "After the War: The President, Transcript of President Bush's Address on End of the Gulf War." *New York Times*, 7 March 1991, p. A8.

— "Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session with Reporters on the Relaxation of East German Border Controls." *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1989*, book 2: *July 1 to December 31*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), pp. 1488-1490.

— "Remarks at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier." 11 November 1991. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1991*, book 2: *July 1 to December 31*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992, pp. 1435-1436.

- “Remarks by the President at Presentation of National Education Strategy.” 18 April 1991. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1991*, book 1: *January 1 to June 30*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1992, pp. 365-397.
  - “Remarks to Department of Defense Employees.” 15 August 1990. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George H. W. Bush, 1990*, book 2: *July 1 to December 31*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991, pp. 1138-1139.  
 “State of the Union: Transcript of Bush’s State of the Union Message to the Nation.” *New York Times*, 1 February 1990, p. D22.
- Bush, George W. Proclamation “Human Rights Day, Bill of Rights Day, and Human Rights Week, 2001.” 9 December 2001. <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/12/text/20011209.html>.
- “Remarks on Arrival at the White House and an Exchange with Reporters.” 16 September 2001. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: George W. Bush, 2001*, book 2: *July 1 to December 31*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002, pp. 1114-1117.
- Butler, Brandon M., Yonghee Suh, and Wendy Scott. “Knowledge Transmission versus Social Transformation: A Critical Analysis of Purpose in Elementary Social Studies Methods Textbooks.” *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 43(1), 2015, pp. 102-134.
- Buursma, Bruce. “Evangelicals Give Reagan a ‘Non-Partisan’ Stump.” *Christianity Today*, 19 September 1980, p. 50.
- “California Tragedy.” *Washington Post*, 1 October 1950. Reprinted in *Democracy’s Defense through Education*. “Free Men Cannot Be Taught Properly by Slaves. Courageous Citizens Cannot Be Well Educated by Scared Hired Men.” 36, November 1950. Folder “NCSS – Attacks on Education National Commission for Defense of Democracy through Education Bulletins 1950 – March-May 1957.” Box 343. NCSS.
- Carlton, Jackson L. and Vito Perrone. *Two Centuries of Progress*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Mission Hills, C.A.: Glencoe, 1991.
- Carter, Jimmy. “Remarks to the Southern Baptist Brotherhood Commission.” 16 June 1978. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Jimmy Carter, 1978*, book 1: *January 20 to June 24*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1979, pp. 1113-1117.

- “Veterans Day Remarks at Ceremonies at Arlington National Cemetery.” 24 October 1977. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Jimmy Carter, 1977*, book 2: *June 25 to December 31*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978, pp. 1900-1902.
  
- Cayton, Andrew. *America: Pathways to the Present – Modern American History*. Needham, M.A.: Prentice Hall, 1998.
  
- Cheney, Lynne V. “The End of History.” *Wall Street Journal*, 20 October 1994, p. A22.
  
- “Cincinnati Group Doesn’t Burn Dog.” *New York Times*, 12 November 1968, p. 30.
  
- Clifford, Clark. *Counsel to the President: A Memoir*. New York: Random House, 1991.
  
- Clinchy, Evans. “The New Curricula.” Ronald Gross and Judith Murphy (eds.). *The Revolution in the School*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964, pp. 220-240. Reprinted in Edwin Fenton (ed.). *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966, pp. 498-514.
  
- Clodfelter, Michael. *Warfare and Armed Conflicts: A Statistical Encyclopedia of Casualty and Other Figures, 1492-2015*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co. Publishers, 2017.
  
- Conant, James B. Baccalaureate Sermon to the Harvard Class of 1950. 18 June 1950. Cambridge, M.A. Reprinted in Democracy’s Defense through Education. “Free Men Cannot Be Taught Properly by Slaves. Courageous Citizens Cannot Be Well Educated by Scared Hired Men,” 36, November 1950. Folder “NCSS – Attacks on Education National Commission for Defense of Democracy through Education Bulletins 1950 – March-May 1957.” Box 343. NCSS.
  
- Conforti, Joseph. “David Brainerd and the Nineteenth Century Missionary Movement.” *Journal of the Early Republic*, 5(3), autumn 1985, pp. 309-329.
  
- Conlan, John B. “Foreword.” James C. Hefley. *Textbooks on Trial: The Informative Report of Mel and Norma Gabler’s Ongoing Battle to Oust Objectionable Textbooks from Public Schools – and to Urge Publishers to Produce Better Ones*. Wheaton, I.L.: Victor Books, 1977, pp. 5-7.
  
- Conlan, John B. and Peter B. Dow. “The MACOS Controversy.” *Social Education*, October 1975, pp. 388-396.
  
- Council on Civic Education. *A Program for the Development of a Breakthrough in Civic Education in Our Schools*. New York: Author, 1966. Folder “Civic Ed. – Council on Civic Ed. Miscellaneous – Draft Gov’t Guidelines for Ed. Labs, Budget 1956-6, Chapter Draft, n. D.” Box 202. NCSS.

- Crabtree, Charlotte A. "Inquiry Approaches to Learning Concepts and Generalizations in Social Studies." *Social Education*, 6(30), October 1966, pp. 407-414.
- Cuban, Larry and Philip Roden. *Promise of America* [Scott Foresman Spectra Program], vol. 1: *Teacher Tactics*. Glenview, I.L.: Scott Foresman, 1971.
- Cunningham, Frank D. "Harry S. Truman and Universal Military Training, 1945." *The Historian*, 46(3), May 1984, pp. 397-415.
- Current, Richard and Gerald J. Goodwin. *A History of the United States: Since 1865*. New York: Knopf, 1980.
- Cutts, Beau. "Educators Won't Finance Textbook, But 'Americans' is not Banned." *Atlanta Constitution*, 19 May 1972, p. 6A.
- Dallek, Robert. *Flawed Giant: Lyndon Johnson and His Times, 1961-1973*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- "Lyndon B. Johnson." Alan Brinkley and Davis Dyer (eds.). *The American Presidency*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004.
- Daniell, Elizabeth O. to Daniele Roselle. 8 March 1973. Letter. Folder "Letters to the Editor – Roselle." Box 27. NCSS.
- Daunt, Tina. "Hurt, Hopes on the Home Front." *New York Times*, 11 November 1991, p. VCB1.
- Davidman, Leonard and Patricia Davidman. "Multicultural Teacher Education in the State of California: The Challenge of Definition and Implementation." *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 15(2), spring 1988, pp. 50-67.
- Davis, Rennard Cordon. Testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, 3 December 1968. *Subversive Involvement in Disruption of 1968 Democratic Party National Convention*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- "A Day to Remember the Nation's Heroes." *Daily Press*, 12 November 1999, p. 26.
- De Onis, Juan. "Nixon Puts 'Bums' Label on Some College Radicals." *New York Times*, 2 May 1970, p. 1.
- De Vita, Cinzia and K. M. Pollard. "Increasing Diversity of the U.S. Population." *Statistical Bulletin* (Metropolitan Life Insurance Company), 77(3), July-September 1996, pp. 12-17.
- De Witt, Karen. "Smithsonian Scales Back Exhibit of B-29 in Atomic Bomb Attack." *New York Times*, 31 January 1995, p. 1.

- Deakin, James. "The U.S. Presidency: War's Worst Casualty." *Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees of the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate*. 94<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 15, 25, and 30 April 1975. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975, pp. 177-181.
- DeBenedetti, Charles. "A CIA Analysis of the Anti-Vietnam War Movement: October 1967." *Peace and Social Change*, 9(1), spring 1983, pp. 31-41.
- Demaret, Kent. "The House of the Two Gablers Helps Decide What Johnny Can't Read in Texas Schools." *People*, 5 October 1981, pp. 86, 88-89.
- Democracy's Defense through Education. "Defending the Cause of Education against Unjust Attack." Defense Bulletin, 38, February 1951. Folder "NCSS – Attacks on Education National Commission for Defense of Democracy through Education Bulletins 1950 – March-May 1951." Box 343. NCSS.
- "Profession Takes Firm Stand against Groups Unfairly Attacking Public Education." Defense Bulletin, 39, October 1951. Folder "NCSS – Attacks on Education National Commission for Defense of Democracy through Education Bulletins 1950 – March-May 1951." Box 343. NCSS.
- "Device is 8 Times Heavier than One Planned by U.S." *New York Times*, 5 October 1957, p. 1.
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1916.
- Divine, Robert A. *The Sputnik Challenge, Eisenhower's Response to the Soviet Satellite*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Dorn, Charles. "Treason in the Textbooks: Reinterpreting the Harold Rugg Textbook Controversy in the Context of Wartime Schooling." *Paedagogica Historica*, 44(4), 2007, pp. 458-479.
- Dorr, Aimée. *Television and Children: A Special Medium for a Special Audience*. New York: Sage, 1986.
- Dow, Peter B. *Schoolhouse Politics: Lessons from the Sputnik Era*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Dowland, Seth. *Family Values and the Rise of the Christian Right*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.
- Drewry, Henry N., Thomas O'Connor, and Frank Freidel. *America Is*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., teacher's annotated ed. Columbus, O.H.: Merrill, 1982.
- *America Is*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Columbus, O.H.: Merrill, 1978.

- Drutman, Lee. *The Business of America is Lobbying: How Corporations Became Politicized and Politics Became More Corporate*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Eagles, Charles W. *Civil Rights, Culture Wars: The Fight over a Mississippi Textbook*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2017.
- Eaton, Robert E. L. "A Few Words on Patriotism." *American Legion Magazine*, April 1974, p. 14.
- Educational Services Incorporated. *Basic Generalizations for a Program of Curriculum Development in Social Studies*. Cambridge, M.A.: Author, 1963.
- Edwards, Lee. *The Power of Ideas: The Heritage Foundation at 25 Years*. Ottawa, I.L.: Jameson Books, 1997.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. "Proclamation 3071 – Veterans Day, 1954." 12 October 1954. *Federal Register*, 19(198).
- "Special Message to the Congress on Education." 28 January 1958. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1958*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959, pp. 127-132.
- Ellison, Ralph. "The Golden Age: Time Past." *Esquire*, 51, 1 January 1959, pp. 107-110.
- Elston, Bob. "Veterans and Remembrance." *Los Angeles Times*, 11 November 1991, p. OCB1.
- Epstein, Terrie L. "America Revised Revisited: Adolescents' Attitudes towards a United States History Textbook." *Social Education*, 58(1), 1994, pp. 41-44.
- Erskine, Hazel. "The Polls: Is War a Mistake?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 34(1), spring 1970, pp. 134-150.
- Evans, Ronald W. *Fear and Schooling: Understanding the Troubled History of Progressive Education*. New York: Routledge, 2020.
- *The Hope for American School Reform: The Cold War Pursuit of Inquiry Learning in Social Studies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- "National Security Trumps Social Progress: The Era of the New Social Studies in Retrospect." Barbara Slater Stern (ed.). *The New Social Studies: People, Projects, and Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- *Schooling Corporate Citizens: How Accountability Reform has Damaged Civic Education and Undermined Democracy*. Routledge: New York, 2015.
- *The Tragedy of American School Reform: How Curriculum Politics and Entrenched Dilemmas Have Diverted Us from Democracy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

- Farber, Daniel. "Introduction." Daniel Farber (ed.). *Security v. Liberty: Conflicts Between Civil Liberties and National Security in American History*. New York: Russell Sage, 2008, pp. 1-26.
- Fassin, Didier. "Compassion and Repression: The Moral Economy of Immigration Policies and France." *Cultural Anthropology*, 20(3), August 2005, pp. 362-387.
- *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
  - "Moral Economies Revisited." *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 64(6), 2009, pp. 1237-1266.
- Fenton, Edwin. "Preface." Edwin Fenton (ed.). *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966, pp. v-ix.
- *The New Social Studies*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967. *32 Problems in World History: Source Readings and Interpretations*. Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1964.
  - "Structure as an Objective in the Social Studies." Edwin Fenton (ed.). *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966, pp. 81-82.
  - "Teaching about Values in the Public Schools." Edwin Fenton (ed.). *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966, pp. 41-45.
  - "Textbooks and 'Americanism.'" *Atlanta Constitution*, 4 January 1972, p. 4A.
- Fenton, Edwin and John M. Good. "Project Social Studies: A Progress Report." *Social Education*, 29(4), 1965, pp. 206-208.
- (eds.). *The Shaping of Western Society*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Ferguson, Neil and Shelley McKeown. "Social Identity Theory and Intergroup Conflict in Northern Ireland." Shelley McKeown, Reeshma Haji, and Neil Ferguson (eds.). *Understanding Peace and Conflict through Social Identity Theory*. New York: Springer, 2016, pp. 215-227.
- Finn Jr., Chester E. "Toward a New Consensus." *Change*, 13(6), 1981, pp. 16-63.
- FitzGerald, Frances. *America Revised: What History Textbooks Have Taught Our Children about Their Country, and How and Why Those Textbooks Have Changed in Different Decades*. New York: Random House, 1979.

- Fleming, Dan B. "A Review of Slave Life in Fourteen United States History Textbooks." *Journal of Negro Education*, 56(4), autumn 1987, pp. 550-556.
- Flowers, Ronald B. "President Jimmy Carter, Evangelicalism, Church-State Relations, and Civil Religion." *Journal of Church and State*, 25(1), winter 1983, pp. 113-132.
- Forbes, Bertie C. "Treacherous Teachings." *Forbes*, 15 August 1939, p. 8.
- Foster, Badi G. "Are We the People? Thoughts on Creating Alternatives in Citizen Education." Speech at National Conference on Education and Citizenship: Responsibilities for the Common Good, Kansas City, M.O. 20-23 September 1976. Transcript. Folder "Citizenship Education – National Conference, Kansas City, Sept. 1976, Agenda, Advance Copies of Speeches (1)." Box 55. NCSS.
- Foucault, Michel. "Truth and Power." Michel Foucault. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Trans. and ed. by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon, 1980, pp. 109-133.
- Fouts, Jeffrey T. "Multicultural Education and the Idols of the Mind: Why Multicultural Education is under Attack." *Social Education*, 57(7), December 1993, pp. 356-358.
- Franklin, Ben A. "3 Held in Dispute over Textbooks." *New York Times*, 19 September 1974, p. 14.
- Freeman, Ira Henry. "U.S. Pays Homage to Its War Dead: Wreath-Laying Rites and Parades Honor Veterans Here and in Nation." *New York Times*, 12 November 1959, p. 16.
- Fresno Unified School District Board of Education. "Policy of Studying Controversial Issues." 23 May 1961. Folder "NCSS Cont. Issues Proj. – 5/23/61." Box 538. NCSS
- Frevert, Ute, et. al. *Learning How to Feel: Children's Literature and Emotional Socialization, 1870-1970*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Friedman, William R. to Daniel Roselle. 14 April 1973. Letter. Folder "Letters to the Editor – Roselle." Box 27. NCSS.
- Frost, William B., James A. Brown, Ralph Adams Ellis, and David M. Fink. *A History of the United States: The Evolution of a Free People*. Chicago: Follett, 1969.
- Gabler, Mel and Norma Gabler with James C. Hefley. *What Are They Teaching Our Children? What You Can Do About Humanism and Textbooks in Today's Public Schools*. Wheaton, I.L.: SP Publications, 1985.
- Gallup Jr., George H. *The Gallup Poll: Public Opinion 1972-1988*, vol. 2: 1976-1977. Wilmington, D.E.: Scholarly Resources, 1978, pp. 859-862.

- Garraty, John A. *A Short History of the American Nation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.
- Garraty, John A., Aaron Singer, and Michael J. Gallagher. *American History*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.
- Gillon, Steven M. *The Democrats' Dilemma: Walter F. Mondale and the Liberal Legacy*, [The Contemporary American History Series]. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
- Goldfield, David. *The American Journey: A History of the United States*, combined ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1998.
- Goldstein, Jack S. *A Different Sort of Time: The Life of Jerrold R. Zacharias, Scientist, Engineer, Educator*. Cambridge, M.A.: MIT Press, 1992.
- Goldstein, Paul. *Changing the American Schoolbook*. Lexington, M.A.: Lexington, 1978.
- Governor's Committee on Public Education. *Public Education in Texas: Research Report*, vol. 2. Austin: Texas Education Agency, 1969.
- Grace, Thomas M. *Kent State: Death and Dissent in the Long Sixties*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2016.
- Graff, Henry F. *America: The Glorious Republic*, revised ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990.
- Gramsci, Antonio. "On Education." Antonio Gramsci. *Selection from the Prison Notebooks*. Trans. and ed. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. New York: International Publishers, 1971, pp. 24-43.
- Greenawald, Dale. "Maturation and Change, 1947-1968." *Social Education*, 59(7), 1995, pp. 416-428.
- Greenberg, Steve. "Where is Graceland? 1980s Pop Culture through Music." Gil Troy and Vincent J. Cannato (eds.). *Living in the Eighties*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 152-166.
- Greene, Bob (ed.). *Homecoming – When the Soldiers Returned from Vietnam*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1989.
- Gruver, Rebecca Brooks. *An American History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley, 1976.
- Guenther, John and Wayne Dumas. "Teacher Familiarity with and Use of Project Social Studies Materials in the Midwest." *Educational Leadership*, 30(7), April 1973, pp. 641-643.
- Haas, John D. and Richard van Scotter. "An Inquiry Model for the Social Studies." *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 59(389), March 1975, pp. 74-81.

- Hadden, Jeffrey K. and Charles E. Swann. *Prime Time Preachers: The Rising Power of Televangelism*. Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley, 1981.
- Harman, Gilbert. "Moral Relativism Defended." *The Philosophical Review*, 84(1), January 1975, pp. 3-22.
- Harrison Jr., William K. "May A Christian Serve in the Military?" n. D. William K. Harrison Jr. Papers. Accession #038. Folder 2. Box 2. Dallas Theological Seminary.
- Hartshorn, Merrill F. "Statement on HR 6774." *Social Education*, 25(6), 1961, pp. 296-297.
- Harwit, Martin. *An Exhibit Denied: Lobbying the History of Enola Gay*. New York: Copernicus, 1996.
- Hassna, Steven. "VVAW History: San Francisco Vets Day Parade 1972." *The Veteran*, spring 1997, 27(1), pp. 8, 17.
- Hawkins, David. "In Teaching U.S. History: We Need to Resume Yea-Saying." *Dallas Morning News*, 25 September 1969, p. 2D.
- Hearings before the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations of the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate*. 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> session, 3 June and 11 July 1974. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Hedstrom, Judith E. and Frances Haley (eds.). *Social Studies Materials and Resources Data Book*, vol. 4. Boulder, C.O.: Social Science Education Consortium, 1979.
- Hefley, James C. *Textbooks on Trial: The Informative Report of Mel and Norma Gabler's Ongoing Battle to Oust Objectionable Textbooks from Public Schools – and to Urge Publishers to Produce Better Ones*. Wheaton, I.L.: Victor Books, 1977.
- Hefley, James C. and Harold Smith. "What Should Johnny Read?" *Christianity Today*, 28, 7 September 1984, pp. 24–27.
- Heinl, Robert D. "The Collapse of the Armed Forces." *Armed Forces Journal*, 7 June 1971, pp. 30-38.
- Hentoff, Nat. "The Dumbing of America." *The Progressive*, 48(2), February 1984, pp. 29-31.
- "Her Review Revealed Marilyn Monroe Given More Textbook Space than George Washington." *The Liner*, March 1973. Hall-Hoag Collection of Dissenting and Extremist Printed Propaganda, Part II, Brown University Library.
- Herbers, John. "Mondale Charges Reagan Supports Imposing of Faith." *New York Times*, 7 September 1984, p. A1.
- Hess, Gary R. *Presidential Decision for War: Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, and Iraq*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2009.

- “Hijacking History.” *New York Times*, 30 January 1995, p. A18.
- Hillocks Jr., George. “Books and Bombs, Ideological Conflict and the Schools: A Case Study of the Kanawha County Book Protest.” *The School Review*, 86(4), August 1978, pp. 632-654.
- Hinchman, Kathleen A. “How Teachers Use the Textbook: Lessons from Three Secondary School Classrooms.” Ernest K. Dishner, Thomas W. Bean, John E. Readence, and David W. Moore (eds.). *Reading in the Content Areas: Improving Classroom Instruction*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Dubuque, I.A.: Kendall/Hunt, 1992, pp. 282-293.
- Hoar, William. “Parents Revolt When Textbooks are Propaganda.” *American Opinion*, November 1974, p. 1.
- Hoertel, Bruce. “War Warning, Hope of Peace Themes of Armistice Talks.” *New York Times*, 12 November 1949, p. 1.
- Höijer, Birgitta. “The Discourse of Global Compassion: The Audience and Media Reporting of Human Suffering.” *Media, Culture and Society*, 26(4), 2004, pp. 513-531.
- Honig, Bill. “Educational Excellence Movement: Now Comes the Hard Part.” *Phi Delta Kappan*, 66(10), June 1985, pp. 675-681.
- Hopkins, Ellie. “Textbook and Rebellion.” *Longview News-Journal*, 2 November 1970, p. 4A.
- Hopkins, W. Wat. “The Supreme Court Defines the Marketplace of Ideas.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 73(1), spring 1996, pp. 40-52.
- Huemer, Julia, Sidney Edsall, Niranjana S. Karnik, and Hans Steiner. “Childhood Trauma.” William W. Klykylo and Jerald Kay (eds.). *Clinical Child Psychiatry*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley and Blackwell, 2012, pp. 275-294.
- Huggard, Ethel F. (ed.). *Selecting Instructional Materials for the Public Schools of New York City*. Pamphlet. New York: City of New York Board of Education, 1955.
- Ianni, Francis A. J. and Lois S. Josephs. “The Curriculum Research and Development Program of the U.S. Office of Education: Project English, Project Social Studies and Beyond.” Robert William Heath (ed.). *New Curricula*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964, pp. 161-212.
- Jacobs, William J. *America’s Story*, teacher’s annotated ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1990.
- Johnson, Lyndon B. “The President’s News Conference of July 28, 1965.” *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1965*, book 2: June 1 to December 31. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966, pp. 127-132.

- Johnson, Lyndon B. and Richard Daley. Sound recording, telephone conversation #13409, 7 September 1968. Recordings and Transcripts of Telephone Conversations and Meetings. Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library. <http://www.discoverlbj.org/item/tel-13409>.
- Jones, Arnita A. "The OAH in Troublesome Times, 1980-2000." Richard S. Kirkendall (ed.) *The Writing and Teaching of American History, OAH*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 49-57.
- Jordan, Winthrop D. and Leon F. Litwack. *The United States*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1991.
- Kalb, Marvin. "When Kerry Stormed D.C." *The National Interest*, 124, March/April 2013, pp. 25-36.
- Kammen, Michael. *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture*. New York: Vintage Books, 1991.
- Kandell, Jonathan. "Only 500 Parade on Veterans Day: 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Marchers Hear Pleas for Employment." *New York Times*, 26 October 1971, p. 20.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. 1785. Trans. Allen W. Wood. New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press, 2002.
- Kaufman, Paul J. "Alice's Wonderland; Or, School Books Are for Banning." *Appalachian Journal*, 2(3), spring 1975, pp. 162-168.
- Kazin, Michael and Joseph A. McCartin. "Introduction." Michael Kazin and Joseph A. McCartin (eds.). *Americanism: New Perspectives on the History of an Ideal*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 2012.
- Keller, Charles R. "Needed: Revolution in the Social Studies." *Saturday Review*, 16 September 1961, pp. 60-62.
- "Still Needed: A Revolution in the Social Studies Or Is This Where I Come in?" Speech before Kentucky Council for the Social Studies in Louisville, K.Y. 27 October 1962. Transcript. Folder "Secondary Soc. St. Classes – Teachers' Guide 1968." Box 109. NCSS.
- Kennedy, John F. "Remarks at the Conference on Vietnam Luncheon in the Hotel Willard, Washington, D.C., June 1, 1956." Papers of John F. Kennedy. Pre-Presidential Papers. Senate Files. Series 12. Speeches and the Press. Folder: "America's Stake in Vietnam, American Friends of Vietnam." Box 895. John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum. <https://www.jfklibrary.org/asset-viewer/archives/JFKSEN/0895/JFKSEN-0895-014>.

- “Special Message to the Congress on Education.” 29 January 1963. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: John F. Kennedy, January 20 to November 22, 1963*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964, pp. 105-116.
- Kerry, John F. “Vietnam Veterans against the War, Speech before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.” *Legislative Proposals Relating to the War in Southeast Asia, United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations*. 92<sup>nd</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 22 April 1971. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Kilpatrick, James J. “Finally, We Honor the Vietnam Dead.” *Washington Post*, 11 November 1981, p. A27.
- Kirst, Michael W. and Decker F. Walker. “An Analysis of Curriculum Policy-Making.” *Review of Research in Education*, 41(5), 1971, pp. 479-509.
- Klahn, Richard P. “Curriculum Development in the Social Studies – A Position.” Speech at NASSP Convention in Pittsburgh. 12 February 1963. Folder “Council on Basic Education – Speeches & Articles.” Box 47. NCSS.
- Kleinman, Dena. “Influential Couple Scrutinize Books for ‘Anti-Americanism.’” *New York Times*, 14 July 1981, pp. C1, C4.
- Kolchin, Peter. “Slavery in United States Survey Textbooks.” *Journal of American History*, 84(4), March 1998, pp. 1425-1438.
- Koprowski, Claude. “Simple Rites Honor War Dead.” *Washington Post*, 12 November 1966, p. B1.
- Kraemer, Sven F. *Inside the Cold War from Marx to Reagan: An Unprecedented Guide to the Roots, History, Strategies, and Key Documents of the Cold War*. Washington: American Foreign Policy Council, 2015.
- Krasner, Barbara (ed.). *Historical Revisionism*. New York: Greenhaven, 2020, p. 15.
- Krauthammer, Charles “The Cold War Memorials.” *Washington Post*, 4 August 1995, p. A23.
- Kublin, Hyman. “Teaching about Asia.” Bernard Berelson (ed.). *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences*, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the NCSS. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962, pp. 191-240.
- Lachmann, Richard and Lacy Mitchell. “The Changing Face of War in Textbooks: Depictions of World War II and Vietnam, 1970-2009.” *American Sociological Association*, 87(3), 2014, pp. 188-203.
- Landau, Yehezkel. “The President and the Bible: What Do the Prophets Say to Our Time?” *Christianity and Crisis*, 12 December 1983, pp. 474-475.

Langguth, A. J. *Our Vietnam: The War 1954-1975*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.

Lawrence, W. H. "President Voices Concern on U.S. Missiles Program, But Not on the Satellite: Disclaims a Race – Views Feat of Soviet as Political and Not Military Victory." *New York Times*, 10 October 1957, p. 1.

Lecker, Lorna. "Textbook Controversy Leads to Organization of School Book 'Watchdogs.'" *Burlington Free Press*, 26 November 1973, pp. 1-2.

Lee, John H. "It Was a Day for American Flags and Patriotism." *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1991, p. SDB3.

Leinwand, Gerald. "The Year of Non-Curriculum: A Proposal." *Social Education*, 32(6), October 1968, pp. 542-545.

Lelyveld, Joseph. "Protests on Cambodia and Kent State are Joined by Many Local Schools." *New York Times*, 6 May 1970, p. 20.

Lembcke, Jerry. "The News and Myth of Spat-Upon Vietnam Vets." *Humanity & Society*, 27(4), 1 November 2003, pp. 630-641.

Leo, John. "History Standards are Bunk." *U.S. News and World Report*, 6 February 1995, p. 23.

Leos Robert H. to administrator addressed. "Conforming and Nonconforming Textbooks." 24 November 1999. <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/taa/text991124.html>.

"Letter to the Editor: The History Thieves." *Wall Street Journal*, 8 November 1994, p. A23.

Lewis, Ronald L. and John C. Hennen Jr. (eds.). *West Virginia: Documents in the History of a Rural-Industrial State*. Dubuque, I.A.: Kendall/Hunt, 1975.

Lindsay, D. Michael. *Faith in the Halls of Power: How Evangelicals Joined the American Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Lindsey, Hal. *The 1980s: Countdown to Armageddon*. Toronto: Bantam Books, 1981.

Linthicum, Tom. "Fenton Says Teaching Issue is Board's Main Criticism." *Atlanta Constitution*, 20 December 1971, p. 16A.

– "Protests Delay Okay of Social Studies Texts." *Atlanta Constitution*, 25 November 1971, p. C14.

– "School Board Bars 10 Texts by Fenton." *Atlanta Constitution*, 17 December 1971, p. 19B.

- Lockerbie, D. Bruce. *A Man Under Orders: Lieutenant General William K. Harrison Jr.* San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Loewen, James W. *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong.* New York: Touchstone, 1995.
- Loveland, Anne C. *American Evangelicals and the U.S. Military 1942-1993.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1994.
- Lüders, Adrian, Eva Jonas, Immo Fritsche, and Dimitrij Agroskin. "Between the Lines of Us and Them: Identity Threat, Anxious Uncertainty, and Reactive In-Group Affirmation: How Can Antisocial Outcomes Be Prevented?" Shelley McKeown, Reeshma Haji, and Neil Ferguson (eds.). *Understanding Peace and Conflict through Social Identity Theory.* New York: Springer, 2016, pp. 33-53.
- Manson, Gary, Anna Ochoa, Gerald Marker, and Jan Tucker. "Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines." *Social Education*, December 1971, pp. 853-869.
- Marker, Gerald. "Why Schools Abandon 'New Social Studies' Materials." *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 7(4), 1980, pp. 35-57.
- Martin, William. "The Guardians Who Slumbereth Not." *Texas Monthly*, November 1982, pp. 144-148, 150-151, 260, 262, 264, 266-271.
- May, Ernest R. *A Proud Nation*, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Evanston, I.L.: McDougal Littell, 1984.
- McCarthy, Joseph. "Speech on Communists in the State Department in Wheeling, W.V." 9 February 1950. Digital History Project, University of Houston. [http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp\\_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&psid=3633](http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/disp_textbook.cfm?smtID=3&psid=3633).
- McCloud, Tina. "Dedication Set to Give New Life to Old Glory." *Daily Press*, 11 November 1985, p. B2.
- McCreary, Eugene. "The Crisis Threatening American Education." *Social Education*, 26(4), 1962, pp. 177-184.
- McGraw, Carol. "Southland Salutes Its Veterans With Flags, Prayer, Taps." *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1988, pp. T8-9.
- McMurry, Charles. *Special Method in History: A Complete Outline of a Course Study in History for the Grades below the High School.* New York: Macmillan. 1903.
- Menendez, Albert J. "Who Are the Evangelicals?" *Christianity Today*, 22(8), 27 January 1978, p. 42.
- Michaelson, Wes. "The Piety and Ambition of Jimmy Carter." *Sojourners*, 5, October 1976, pp. 15-18.

- Mitgang, Herbert. "Mississippi Textbook Dispute Revived." *New York Times*, 29 March 1981, p. 36.
- Moreau, Joseph. *Schoolbook Nation: Conflicts over American History Textbooks from the Civil War to the Present*. Ann Arbor, M.I.: Michigan University Press, 2003.
- Morgan, Lynn M. and Elizabeth F. S. Roberts. "Reproductive Governance in Latin America." *Anthropology & Medicine*, 19(2), 2012, pp. 241-254.
- "NAE Convention Resolutions." *United Evangelical Action*, 1 July 1952, p. 8.
- Nash, Gary B. *American Odyssey: The Twentieth Century and Beyond*. New York: McGraw Hill, 2005.
- *American Odyssey: The United States in the Twentieth Century*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1994.
  - "The History Standards Controversy and Social History." *Journal of Social History*, 29(issue supplement), November 1995, pp. 39-49.
  - "Reflections on the National History Standards." *National Forum*, 77, summer 1997, pp. 14-18.
- Nash, Gary B., Charlotte Crabtree, and Ross E. Dunn. *History on Trial: Culture Wars and the Teaching of the Past*. New York: Random House, 1997.
- Nash, Gary B. and Ross E. Dunn. "History Standards and Culture Wars." *Social Education*, 59(1), 1995, pp. 5-7.
- National Center for History in the Schools. *National Standards for United States History: Exploring the American Experience*, original expanded ed. Los Angeles: Author, 1994.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. *Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, report to the U.S. Department of Education. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983.
- National Council for the Social Studies. "Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Teacher, A Policy Statement of the Academic Freedom Committee of the National Council for the Social Studies." 1967. Folder "NCSS – Academic Freedom & the Social Studies Teacher 1967-68." Box 109. NCSS.
- National Council for the Social Studies Task Force on Ethnic Studies. "Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education." *Social Education*, 56(5), September 1992, pp. 274- 294.
- National Education Association. "Danger: They're After Our Schools!" Folder "National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education – Pamphlets & Articles 1950-1953." Box 343. NCSS.

- *Declaration of Independence: Education for a Global Community. A Summary Report of the NEA Bicentennial Program.* Washington: Author, 1976.
  - *The Social Studies in Secondary Education: A Report of the Committee on Social Studies on the Reorganization of Secondary Education.* Bulletin 28. Washington: Bureau of Education, 1916.
- “National Science Foundation Act of 1950.” Public Law 81-507, 81<sup>st</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> session, 10 May 1950. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1950.
- Nixon, Richard. “Address to the Nation on the War in Vietnam.” 3 November 1969. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon, 1969.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971, pp. 901-909.
- “Letter to the Editor.” 27 October 1965. Printed in “Nixon Explains Stand on Ousting Genovese.” *New York Times*, 29 October 1965, p. 42.
  - “The President’s News Conference of May 8, 1970.” *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon, 1970.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971, pp. 419-426.
  - “Vietnam.” Television campaign advertisement. Nixon-Agnew Campaign Committee, 1968. Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum. [www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968/vietnam](http://www.livingroomcandidate.org/commercials/1968/vietnam).
- Oliver, Donald W. *Learning to Think Critically.* Prepared by the Harvard Social Studies Project for the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Salt Lake City: Utah State Board of Education, 1967.
- “The Selection of Content in the Social Sciences.” *Harvard Educational Review*, 28(1), winter 1957, pp. 271-300.
- Olson, David. *Jerome Bruner: The Cognitive Revolution in Educational Theory.* New York: Continuum International, 2007.
- “Opposing Views by Congressman on the Question: Should the U.S. Continue to Assist Colleges Where Campus Disorders Exist?” *American Legion Magazine*, September 1969, p. 24.
- O’Sullivan, Christopher D. *Colin Powell: American Power and Intervention from Vietnam to Iraq.* Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2009.
- Palmer, Robert. “The Pop Life: Riding the Country’s Wave of Patriotism.” *New York Times*, 13 May 1981, p. C34.

- “Peace Prayers Set Armistice Day Key in Troubled World: 5,000 March to Eternal Light for Ceremony in Honor of the City’s Fallen Heroes.” *New York Times*, 12 November 1951, p. 1.
- Peck, Ira, Steven Jantzen, and Daniel Rosen. *American Adventures*. New York: Scholastic, 1979.
- Periods of War. 38 United States Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), §3.
- Petrovich, Michael B. “Teaching about Russia and Eastern Europe.” Bernard Berelson (ed.). *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences*, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the NCSS. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962, pp. 241-281.
- Phillips, Kevin. “Bush Running Against the Grain.” *Los Angeles Times*, 7 August 1988, pp. A1, A6.
- Pierpaoli Jr., Paul G. “CHAOS, Operation (1967-1973).” Jan Goldman (ed.). *The Central Intelligence Agency: An Encyclopedia of Covert Ops, Intelligence Gathering, and Spies*, vol. 2: *Documents*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2015, pp. 62-63.
- Pitkin, Robert B. “What’s the Matter with November 11?” *American Legion Magazine*, November 1972, pp. 18-19.
- Platt, Nathaniel and Muriel Jean Drummond. *Our Nation from Its Creation: A Great Experiment*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966.
- “Policy of Studying Controversial Issues in the Classroom.” 17 October 1957. Folder “NCSS Cont. Issues Proj. – 5/23/61.” Box 538. NCSS.
- Popular Memory Group. “Popular Memory: Theory, Politics, Method.” Robert Perks and Alistair Thomson (eds.). *Oral History Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1998, pp. 75-86.
- “Porkchop Hill on Korea Front Marks Bloody Armistice Day.” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1952, p. 2.
- Porter, Reinette. “The Newspaper in the Classroom – A Detailed Unit on Propaganda.” Course outline, University of California, Los Angeles, 1962. Folder “Newspapers UCLA Workshop, Secondary Soc. St. Classes – Teacher’s Guide 7/29-8/10/62.” Box 109. NCSS.
- Porter, Stephen R. *Benevolent Empire: U.S. Power, Humanitarianism, and the World’s Dispossessed*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Powell Jr., Lewis F. “Confidential Memorandum: Attack on American Free Enterprise System” (“Powell Memo”). Memorandum to Eugene B. Syndor Jr. 23 August 1971. Original typescript.  
<http://law2.wlu.edu/deptimages/Powell%20Archives/PowellMemorandumTypescript.pdf>.

- Priest, Karl C. (ed.). *Protestor Voices: The 1974 Textbook Tea Party: A First Time First-Hand Protestor Account of the Event that Launched the Fight for the Heart and Soul of America*. Poca, W.V.: Praying Publishing, 2010.
- Quindlen, Anna. "A Cold Veterans Day of Marchers and Memories, 'Patriotism is Coming Back.'" *New York Times*, 12 November 1980, p. B1.
- Rachels, James. "Lying and the Ethics of Absolute Rules." James Rachels. *Can Ethics Provide Answers? And Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*. Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997, pp. 125-143.
- Ravitch, Diane and Chester E. Finn Jr. *What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Rawls Jr., Wendell. "In Iran Crisis, 'Patriotism Became Important Again.'" *New York Times*, 11 December 1979, p. 20.
- Reagan, Ronald. "Acceptance of the Republican Nomination for President." 17 July 1980. <https://usa.usembassy.de/etexts/speeches/rhaccept.htm>.
- "President's 28<sup>th</sup> News Conference." 21 February 1985. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Ronald Reagan, 1985*, book 1: *January 1 to June 28*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1988, pp. 197-201.
- "Remarks at the Annual Convention of the National Association of Evangelicals in Orlando, Florida" ("Evil Empire Speech"). 8 March 1983. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Ronald Reagan, 1983*, book 1: *January 1 to July 1*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984, pp. 359-364.
- "Red Moon Over the U.S." *TIME*, 70(16), 14 October 1957, pp. 27-28.
- Reichley, A. James. "Religion and Political Alignment." *The Brookings Review*, 3(1), fall 1984, pp. 29-35.
- "Religion: Counting Souls." *TIME*, 108(14), 4 October 1976, p. 75.
- Rice, John. *War in Vietnam: Should Christians Fight?* Murfreesboro, T.N.: Sword of the Lord Publishers, 1966.
- Rickover, Hyman G. *Education and Freedom*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1959, p. 35.
- "The Education of Our Talented Children." Transcript. Folder "Speech, Hyman G. Rickover, 'The Education of Our Talented Children' 11/20/56." Box 198. NCSS.

- Riley, Karen L. "Foreword." Barbara Slater Stern (ed.). *The New Social Studies: People, Projects and Perspectives*. Charlotte, N.C.: Information Age Publishing, 2010, pp. ix-x.
- Ringle, Ken. "At Ground Zero." *Washington Post*, 26 September 1994, p. A1.
- Risjord, Norman K. *History of the American People*, teacher's annotated ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1986.
- Root, E. Merrill. *Brainwashing in the High Schools: An Examination of Eleven American History Textbooks*. New York: Devin-Adair, 1958.
- Rosellini, Lynn. "Salute Opening for Vietnam Veterans." *New York Times*, 10 November 1982, p. A16.
- Rowe, John Carlos. "Eyewitness: Documentary Styles in the American Representations of Vietnam." John Carlos Rowe and Rick Berg (eds.). *The Vietnam War and American Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991, pp. 148-174.
- Rubinton, Noel. "Battle Brewing in Warsaw over Book Banning, Burning." *Indianapolis Star*, 12 July 1978, pp. 1, 20, 21.
- Ruther, Nancy L. *Barely There, Powerfully Present: Thirty Years of U.S. Policy on International High Education*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Sager, Mike. "Sad and Bitter Memories: Nation Honors Veterans, but Some Feel Forgotten." *Washington Post*, 12 November 1979, p. C1.
- "Satellite Belittled: Admiral Says Almost Anybody Could Launch 'Hunk of Iron.'" *New York Times*, 5 October 1957, p. 2.
- Saxe, David Warren. "The National History Standards: Time for Common Sense." *Social Education*, 60(1), January 1996, pp. 44-48.
- Schiavoni, Yvonne. "School Board Sets Guidelines for Future Textbook Adoption." *Charleston Daily Mail*, 22 November 1974, p. 1.
- Schlosser, Kolson. "Education and Intimate War of Position." *Political Geography*, 60, 2017, pp. 66-75.
- Schneider, Donald O. and Ronald L. Van Sickle. "The Status of the Social Studies: The Publishers' Perspective." *Social Education*, 43, October 1976, pp. 461-465.
- Schultz, Mindella. "Beyond Values Clarification – Intercultural Communication." 20 April 1976. Folder "PB Meeting 11/76." Box 1. NCSS.

- “Can the Social Studies Survive Consciousness – And If So, How? A Plan for Democratizing the Social Studies Profession and its Classrooms.” 25 October 1976. Folder “PB Meeting 11/76.” Box 1. NCSS.
  
- Schulz, Hal. “Remembering a Forgotten Holiday.” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1975, p. E2.
  
- Schwartz, Melvin and John O’ Connor. *The New Exploring American History*. New York: Globe Book, 1981.
  
- Scott, Eugenie C. *Evolution vs. Creationism: An Introduction*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Berkley: University of California Press, 2009.
  
- Scott, Katherine. “Nixon and Dissent.” Melvin Small (ed.). *A Companion to Richard Nixon*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, pp. 311-327.
  
- Scott, Wilbur J. “PTSD in DSM-III: A Case in the Politics of Diagnosis and Disease.” *Social Problems*, 37(3), August 1990, pp. 294-310.
  
- Sellers, Charles G. *As It Happened: A History of the United States*, annotated teacher’s ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
  
- *Memoirs of Charles G. Sellers Jr.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017. <https://nature.berkeley.edu/~c-merchant/Sellers/memoirs.html>.
  
- “The Role of the College Historian.” Erling M. Hunt, Charles G. Sellers, Harold E. Taussig, and Arthur Bestor (eds). *The Role of History in Today’s Schools*. Washington: Council for Basic Education, 1966, pp. 13-19.
  
- Seltzer, Curtis. “A Confusion of Goals: West Virginia Book War.” *The Nation*, 2 November 1974, pp. 430-435.
  
- Serrano, Richard A. “Smithsonian Says It Erred, Scraps Exhibit on A-Bomb: Museum: Critics Charged that it Portrayed the U.S. as Aggressors; Controversy Hurt Institution’s Funding.” *Los Angeles Times*, 31 January 1995, p. A1.
  
- Shafer, Boyd C., Richard A. McLemore, and Everett Augspurger. *United States History for High Schools*. River Forest, I.L.: Laidlaw, 1966.
  
- Shaver, James P., O.L. Davis, and Suzanne W. Helburn. “The Status of Social Studies Education: Impressions from Three NSF Studies.” *Social Education*, February 1979, p. 150-154.
  
- Shen, Fern. “Forgotten ‘Angels’: Black Soldiers Helped Free Nazis’ Victims.” *Washington Post*, 11 November 1992, p. D1.

- Shuster, Kate. "Teaching Hard History: American Slavery." Southern Poverty Law Center, 2018. [www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/tt\\_hard\\_history\\_american\\_slavery.pdf](http://www.splcenter.org/sites/default/files/tt_hard_history_american_slavery.pdf).
- "Sight Red Baby Moon Over U.S." *Daily News*, 5 October 1957, p. 4.
- Skinner, David. "A Battle over Books: West Virginians Battled over Their School Books in 1974." *Humanities*, 31(5), September/October 2010.
- Small, Melvin. "Influencing the Decision Makers: The Vietnam Experience." *Journal of Peace Research*, 24(2), June 1987, pp. 185-198.
- Smith, Gerald R. "Project Social Studies." *Social Education*, 27(7), 1963, pp. 357-410.
- Smith, Roland M., Eugene D. Levy, and Martha H. Brown. *Faces of America: A History of the United States*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Sobel, Robert. *The Challenge of Freedom*. River Forest, I.L.: Laidlaw, 1982.
- Social Science Education Consortium. *Social Studies Curriculum Materials Data Book*. Boulder, C.O.: Author, 1971.
- "Social Studies Materials in the Free Marketplace of Ideas – A Policy Statement of the National Council for the Social Studies on the Handling of Challenges to Instructional Materials." Folder "NCSS – Academic Freedom Committee, Nov. 1 & 24, 1966-1967." Box 109. NCSS.
- "'Star Wars': How the Term Arose." *New York Times*, 25 September 1985, p. A10.
- State Board of Education (Texas). Section 19, Texas Administrative Code. Chapter 113, *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills for Social Studies*. 1998.
- Stewart, Ollie. "How France Remembers." *American Legion Magazine*, August 1961, pp. 14-15, 37.
- Strauss, Valerie. "It's Back in the Age of 'Alternative Facts': 'Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History Textbook Got Wrong.'" *Washington Post*, 26 July 2018. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/answer-sheet/wp/2018/07/26/its-back-in-the-age-of-alternative-facts-lies-my-teacher-told-me-everything-your-american-history-textbook-got-wrong/>.
- Strayer, Joseph R. "History." Bernard Berelson (ed.). *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the NCSS*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962, pp. 20-41.
- Tajfel, Henri and John C. Turner. "An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict." William G. Austin and Stephen Worchel (eds.). *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Monterey, C.A.: Brooks/Cole, 1979.

- “The Teacher and Controversial Issues.” January 1952. Whittier, C.A.: Whittier Union High School District, 1952. Folder “NCSS Cont. Issues Proj. 5/24-5/61.” Box 538. NCSS.
- Thompson, Edward P. “The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth-Century.” *Past and Present*, 50(1), 1971, pp. 76-136.
- Tischler, Nancy M. “Onward, Christian Soldiers?” *Christianity Today*, 2 February 1973, pp. 15-17.
- Todd, Lewis Paul. “Afterword: Revising the Social Studies.” In Bernard Berelson (ed.). *The Social Studies and the Social Sciences*, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the NCSS. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962, pp. 282-303.
- “Editor’s Page.” *Social Education*, 14(5), 1950, p. 195.
- “Editor’s Page.” *Social Education*, 22(2), February 1959, p. 53.
- Treadwell, David. “Reagan Hails Monument as Sign of Healing.” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1984, p. A1.
- “Tribute to Honor Vietnam Entertainers.” *Los Angeles Times*, 9 November 1984, p. 2.
- Trillin, Calvin. “U.S. Journal: Kanawha County, West Virginia: Some Elements in a Dispute That Resulted in the Closing of Schools, the Shutting Down of Industry, the Wounding of Men, and the Cancellation of Football Games.” *New Yorker*, 30 September 1974, pp. 119-127.
- Truman, Harry S. “Executive Order 9825.” 21 March 1947. Harry S. Truman Library and Museum of the National Archives. <https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/executive-orders/9825/executive-order-9825>.
- Tucker, Sherrie. *Dance Floor Democracy: The Social Geography of Memory at the Hollywood Canteen*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2014.
- “Two Minutes of Silence.” *New York Times*, 11 November 1961, p. 22.
- Union of International Associations. *Encyclopedia of World Problems and Human Potential*. <http://encyclopedia.uia.org/en>.
- United States Code of Federal Regulations. 38. §3.2.
- United States Senate. “Gorton Amendment No. 31.” *Congressional Record*. 104<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, 18 January 1995. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995, pp. S1025-1069.
- Urban, Wayne J. *More than Science and Sputnik: The National Defense Act of 1958*. Tuscaloosa, A.L.: University of Alabama Press, 2010.

- “U.S. Urged to Honor Vietnam Veterans.” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1979, p. B4.
- Uva, Kenneth and Shelley Ann Uva (eds.). *United States in the Making*, vol. 3: *Expansion through the 20th Century*. New York: Globe, 1980.
- Ver Steeg, Clarence L. *American Spirit: A History of the United States*. Chicago: Follett, 1985.
- *American Spirit: A History of the United States*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1982.
- “Veterans Day.” *Daily Press*, 11 November 1999, p. 20.
- “Veterans Day Embraces ‘The War that was ‘Lost.’” *Daily Press*, 12 November 1986, p. A6.
- “Veterans Day Events Scheduled.” *Los Angeles Times*, 9 November 1958, p. SC1.
- “Veterans Day Speakers Rap Vietnam Protests.” *Los Angeles Times*, 12 November 1965, p. SF8.
- Viadero, Debra. “Texas Board Fines Publishers over Error-Filled Textbooks.” *Education Week*, 11(18), 22 January 1992, p. 5.
- “Vietnam War Dominates Veterans Day Observance: Thousands Migrate to D.C. Memorial.” *Daily Press*, 12 November 1992, p. A5.
- Vincent, Louis. “Remembering Armistice Day.” *Los Angeles Times*, 10 November 1989, p. B6.
- Vogel, Steve. “For Those Who Served: D.C. Shelter Honors Its Own: Number of Homeless Veterans On the Rise, Survey Shows.” *Washington Post*, 12 November 1999, B1.
- Wade, Richard C., Howard B. Wilder, and Louise C. Wade. *A History of the United States*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
- Walker, Daniel. *Report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968. Reprinted in Robert W. Winslow (ed.). *The Emergence of Deviant Minorities: Social Problems and Social Change*. San Ramon, C.A.: Consensus Publishers, 1972.
- Walker, Reagan. “Bush: Capturing the ‘Education’ Moment?” *Education Week*, 19 October 1988, p. 8.
- Wallace, Mike. “What Johnny Can’t Read.” CBS “60 Minutes,” CBS-TV Network, 15 June 1980. Mike Wallace CBS/60 Minutes Papers, Season I: September 1968-July 1969. Box 8. Bentley Historical Library at University of Michigan.
- Walsh, Jim, Frank Kemerer, and Laurie Maniotis. *The Educator’s Guide to Texas School Law*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005.
- “We Are All Veterans.” *New York Times*. 11 November 1959, p. 34.

- Weinstein, Allen and R. Jackson Wilson (eds.). *Freedom and Crisis: An American History*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., vol. 2. New York: Random House, 1978.
- Weir, Lorna. "The Concept of Truth Regime." *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 33(2), 2008, pp. 367-389.
- "What Ever Happened to Veterans Day?" *New York Times*, 10 November 1975, p. 201.
- "What of UMT?" *United Evangelical Action*, 15 February 1952, p. 7.
- White, Theodore H. *The Making of the President – 1968*. New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1969.
- Williams, Ruth Baja. "Veterans Betrayed." *Washington Post*, 11 November 1998, p. A23.
- Wilson, Woodrow. "Armistice Day Proclamation." 11 November 1919. Library of Congress. [www.loc.gov/item/2004540423/1919-11-01/ed-1](http://www.loc.gov/item/2004540423/1919-11-01/ed-1).
- Wiltz, John Edward. *Modern American History: The Search for Identity*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.
- *The Search for Identity: Modern American History*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1978.
- Withrow, Lynn. "Book Controversy Generates Heat at Board Meeting." *Charleston Daily Mail*, 24 May 1974, p. 1A.
- Wood, Leonard C., Ralph H. Gabriel, and Edward L. Biller. *America: Its People and Values*, heritage ed., teacher's ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1985.
- Wronski, Stanley P. "A Statement on the Social Studies." *Social Education*, 22(2), 1958, p. 66.
- Zimmerman, Johnathan. "Brown-ing the American Textbook: History, Psychology, and the Origins of Modern Multiculturalism." *History of Education Quarterly*, 44(1), Special Issue on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the "Brown v. Board of Education" Decision, spring 2004, pp. 46-69.