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Since American Democracy seemed truly threatened, schools were seen as a fundamental tool to safeguard the democratic order. Clearly, the burden of the responsibility came to rest on the shoulders of the high school social studies classrooms. Because of the apparent urgency of the situation, the social studies began to focus less on the needs of the individual and more on the needs of a democratic society. Education for democracy took on an entirely new meaning. In the education equation, the role of democratic education as the means and the individual as the end were reversed. The implications for the nature of individual learning were tremendous. The independent thought and critical thinking that were striven for in the Thirties were more neglected than forgotten as the students' role as national and world citizens was emphasized. These shifts were very real, and with the aid of hindsight, should not be very surprising; the same types of changes were seen on a larger scale only a decade later. Indeed, the wartime changes in the social studies seemed to be a foreshadowing of the larger conservative shift that took place only a few years later. In the end, the war had solved, for many years
Both on philosophical and practical grounds, as education, when centered in a political democracy, the debate becomes all the more perplexing. Indeed, since the American Republic was formed, education has been an issue that has occupied the most talented of minds. What became almost immediately apparent was the conflict of interests—a conflict between the society and the individual.

Several questions are inherent in the formulation of the paradox. What would be the focus of the school in the new republic, the society or the individual? The emphasis on the needs of society was especially appealing after the Revolutionary War had freed the colonies from British rule; there was a tremendous need for an identity and a common culture. Education was seemingly perfectly suited to form this sense of patriotism. Common "American" values could be instilled in the young students by the nation's schools.

However, even if the needs of society were thought primary, the means of best fulfilling these needs were still in question. Wouldn't society best benefit from citizens, not with a one sided patriotic view of the nation, but with a critical questioning ability that challenged the representatives and the status quo? In essence, if the purpose of education was to, in the words of Thomas
The issue, unfortunately, is not even that simple.

After all, the revolution was fought largely for the rights of the individual. In pursuing the unprecedented freedom and liberty, would it be right to place the needs of society above those of the individual? And again, even if it were resolved that the individual should be the focus of the new nation, a question arises, is the individual better off in a well ordered society with common values and interests, or in a society where diverse thought was most valued.

David Tyack, in writing *The One Best System*, had examined the paradox and summarized.

Having fought a war to free the United States from one centralized authority, [the educational theorists] attempted to create a new unity, a common citizenship and culture, and an appeal to a common future. In this quest for a balance between order and liberty, for the proper transaction between the individual and society, [they] encountered a conflict still inherent in the education of the citizen and still expressed in the injunction to teachers to train students to think critically but to be patriotic above all. Hence proceeded a paradox from their search for ordered
liberty. The free American was to be, in political conviction, the uniform man.¹

Of the theorists mentioned by Tyer, the most prominent was Thomas Jefferson. In Jefferson's views, the paradox can be clearly seen. On the one hand, he was somewhat defensive of the new republic, feeling that the democracy could not be maintained without order, and that the nation was too young to withstand free political inquiry. "On the other hand," wrote one author, "he did not so much propose to make education the instrument of nationalism, as to render it the means by which the people should come to know their rights, to control their government, and so maintain their liberties."² This is illustrated in Jefferson's Notes on Virginia. "Reason and free inquiry," wrote Jefferson, "are the only effectual agents against error." Unfortunately for Jefferson and the history of education however, the balance between order and liberty was not so easily maintained.

These facets of the paradox have yet to be permanently resolved. Throughout the history of American education, the balance between order and liberty has acted more like a pendulum that has swung between those that believed the needs of society are primary and those that feel the individual should be the focus of education. The effects of the industrial revolution and the Russian launch of Sputnik have been well documented in the story of education. Often overlooked however, are the dramatic changes the field of
The war years were a microcosm of the debate that had lasted since the birth of the nation. How was education for democracy to be pursued?
An examination of prevailing attitudes of educational theorists and education commissions provides a natural point of departure in understanding the change war brought to the social studies in the 1940's. In such an examination, however, it is important to remember that these publications reflect only the thought and theory of the time, and not necessarily the actual practices in the classrooms. Yet, as Herbert Kliebard notes in *The Struggle for the American Curriculum*, even such imperfect evidence nevertheless provides a "weather vane by which one could gauge which way the curriculum winds were blowing."\(^3\) When the winds come from many directions, as curriculum influences did in the 1930's, rarely does such a gauge remain steady. Indeed, the differing features of the progressive education movement made the exact relationship between the individual and society less than clear. As a general indicator, however, the weather vane is still of use. In this respect, the opinions of important theorists and commissions, such as the National Education Association (NEA), provide a necessary framework in determining how the individual was educated just before the war. Once this is established, the wartime perceptions and attitudes of the educators will make the subsequent shift in commitment more clear.
If a "weather vane" was used to gauge the curriculum tendencies of the 1930's, it would point in the direction of progressive education. Therefore, to better understand the relationship between the individual and democratic society in the Thirties, a close look at the meaning of progressive education is first necessary, since it was certainly a dominating theme at the time.

Unfortunately, however, the task is not a simple one; progressive education meant many things to many people. "The more I studied [progressive education]," Kliebard commented, "the more it seemed to me that the term encompassed such a broad range, not just of different, but of contradictory, ideas on education as to be meaningless." Although the major emphases of the movement were somewhat contradictory, they all were based on the idea of reform and shared the title of progressive education.

The progressive education movement began near the turn of the century as a reaction to the customary traditional curriculum, which usually implied a teacher-centered, academically-oriented classroom. The National Education Association's Committee of Ten, appointed in 1892, characterized the philosophy behind the traditional curriculum. The committee felt, according to Diane Ravitch's The Troubled Crusade, "that all secondary
students, regardless of whether they intended to go to college, should be liberally educated and should study English, foreign languages, mathematics, history, and science. Such subjects, it was felt, were important to all students. Even those that were not college bound still would benefit from a foreign language course, for instance, because it was education that contributed to a mental discipline—it helped develop powers such as memory and reasoning.

In contrast, progressive educators generally emphasized the needs of the students beyond that of learning traditional knowledge. The basis for this change was the seemingly conclusive scientific evidence that discredited the theory that traditional classes improved general mental functioning. As a result, the new progressivism emphasized courses more applicable to the students' present and future life. That which interested students became important. The curriculum was justified, Ravitch commented, "by its utility to the student or by the way it met identifiable needs and interests of students." To this end, the students became more active in the classroom; small group discussion, for example, replaced the traditional textbook recitations. The movement, in general, was characterized by an overused but nevertheless appropriate phrase, learning by doing.

This new emphasis on the needs and interests of the student represented one aspect of the progressive education...
movement. Such a curriculum in harmony with the child's real interest was supported by a group identified by Kllebard as the developmentalists. Flexibility and diversity is what differentiated this curriculum from the traditional curriculum. One author noted that freedom for the child became the leitmotiv of the new movement.\(^7\)

Despite the appeal of the new emphasis, the progressive education movement did not gain full force until 1918 when the NEA's *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* was published. Whereas the Committee of Ten spelled out the philosophy of the traditionalists, the Cardinal Principles did much the same for the progressives. Said the report, "The objectives of secondary education should be determined by the needs of the society to be served and the character of the individuals to be educated."\(^8\) In this light, the committee presented seven principles by which all secondary level offerings should be judged. These were: 1) health, 2) command of fundamental processes, 3) worthy home membership, 4) vocation, 5) citizenship, 6) worthy use of leisure and 7) ethical character. The difference between these "Cardinal Principles" and the "Committee of Ten" is obvious— traditional subjects were transformed along utilitarian lines. According to Ravitch, "So little did the commission think of traditional, school bound knowledge that the original draft of the report failed to include, 'command of fundamental processes,' its only reference to intellectual development, as a main objective of secondary education."\(^9\)
Nevertheless, the "Cardinal Principles" was undoubtedly responsible for bringing progressive education out of the experimental schools and into the mainstream of the organized education profession.

However, as the progressive movement became more popular, significant changes occurred. As evidenced in the Cardinal Principles, "the needs of society" became an additional emphasis of the movement. Gradually, this replaced the focus on the individual. In contrast to the developmentalists, the social efficiency educators believed that the needs of society should be primary in the teaching of children. According to Diane Ravitch, "The social efficiency element of the Cardinal Principles...became the cornerstone of the new progressivism." Social efficiency implied the need for social utility. The most important question to educators became: Is the student learning that which will be useful in his future role as an adult? The schools strove to make the answer affirmative in every possible case. History, to this end, began to emphasize efficient citizenship, for example.

Social efficiency seemed to replace developmentalism as the primary emphasis in the schools of the progressive movement, but it too had its critics. The most notable was George S. Counts. His criticism of social efficiency was that it would naturally lead to a preservation of the status quo. Because scientific methods were needed to enhance
efficiency, Counts felt that scientists would have too great a role in the schools. Since Counts believed that scientists invariably reflected the dominant interests of the society, he concluded, "the inevitable consequence is that the school will become an instrument for the perpetuation of the existing social order rather than a creative force in society."11

As this sort of criticism gained influence, the differences between those emphasizing the needs of society became abundantly clear. The question separating the two strands was fundamental: was education to preserve the status quo or was it to challenge and reform society? Counts and others felt that schools could and should have an active hand in shaping society. This was the natural converse to the social efficiency approach. As the nation plunged into the depression, however, the view of social change became ever more appealing. By the 1930's, Kliebard noted, social efficiency or, "fitting the individual into the right niche in the existing social order, gave ground to the feeling that schools had to address ongoing social and economic problems by raising up a new generation critically attuned to the defects of the social system and prepared to do something about it."12

Thus, this social reconstructionalism was the prevailing feature of the progressive education movement just before the war. The individual's education in the 1930's was based
on this aspect. Several NEA publications from the time corroborate this, and the relevant textbooks provide further evidence of how the individual was treated in the social studies curriculum before the war.
While the greater emphasis of the social reconstructionists was placed on society's needs rather than those of the individual, the role of the individual in the schools was nevertheless of fundamental importance. In order to strengthen democracy in the future, it was felt that students needed to be equipped with questioning and decision making skills. Although these means were less efficient, the reconstructionists felt examining and learning the problems of democracy would better equip the students to deal with the problems as adults. Democracy would subsequently benefit.

Thus, this idea of social meliorism and individual development are not mutually exclusive. The individual seemingly could receive a critical, balanced education in the face of the progressives' new emphasis on society. John Dewey and other influential actors in the progressive movement were critical of attempts to impose on students a predetermined social ideal, arguing that such an attempt to preserve the status quo ignored the vital importance of "freedom in thinking." According to Klueberd, "For Dewey, the road to social progress was much more closely tied to the ability of the schools to teach independent thinking and to the ability of the students to analyze social problems.
than it was to an organized effort designed to redress specific social evils.13

There is further evidence to indicate that the individual's development was not forgotten in the schools' dedication to society and democracy. Various publications, most by the NEA, emphasize the importance of critical thought and discussion in the democratic education of the 1930's. Perhaps the most important and influential of these appeared in 1937 and was titled, The Unique Function of Education in an American Democracy. This publication commented,

The primary business of education, in effecting the promises of American democracy, is to guard, cherish, advance, and make available in the life of coming generations the funded and growing wisdom, knowledge, and aspirations of the race. This involves the dissemination of knowledge, the liberation of minds, the development of skills, the promotion of free inquiries, the encouragement of the creative or inventive spirit, and the establishment of wholesome attitudes toward order and change—all useful in the good life for each person, in the practical arts, and in the maintenance and improvement of American society.14

Moreover, the report included, somewhat surprisingly, given the nature of progressivism in the 1930's, the
importance of education in the classics such as Plato and Ralph Waldo Emerson. While this aspect of the report may have been somewhat extreme, (Ravitch stated, it was out of step with the new spirit of progressive education) this apparent regression to the traditionalist curriculum and mental discipline still indicates that educational theorists had not completely neglected the full development of the individual in concentrating on the best interests of society.

The Purposes of Education in American Democracy, also published by the Educational Policies Commission in 1938, corroborates this. The author felt that too much emphasis was placed on the study of the classics, but nevertheless felt, "The general end of education in America at the present time is the fullest possible development of the individual within the framework of our present industrialized democratic society." This was justified by the belief that "Social progress and individual freedom interact; each is essential to the other." As essential objectives of the schools, this report included both civic responsibility and self realization.

Indeed, each objective was essential to the other. As mentioned earlier, the study of the problems of democracy in schools was seen as beneficial to the future strength of democracy. At the same time, this sort of study would aid the individual by opening the mind and training the ability
Education does preserve and spread knowledge appropriate to the solution of specific problems, instills the disciplines essential to the acquisition of knowledge, describes the points of view from which problems are discussed, sets forth the assumptions and imperatives on which solutions depend, and in the classroom, illustrates the spirit and procedure in which knowledge and reason are applied in coping with the adjustments of society.¹⁶

Thus, the general notion that the dominance of progressive education in the 1930's implied only an education for the needs of society at the expense of developmental education does not seem to be warranted. Certainly, in the 1930's less emphasis was placed on the study of classics and foreign languages, since they were not seen as socially useful as perhaps some vocational courses. But as the above examples show, the notion of social utility did not necessarily exclude education for the intellectual development of the individual.
THE EFFECT OF CHANGING PERCEPTIONS

The perception that students needed to have reasoning and problem solving capabilities became popular in the 1930's as a result of the depression. As the nation moved closer to war, however, the attitudes of the educators began to affect this perception. In other words, the perceived threat to democracy made educators rethink the schools' role in society. It was felt that the schools, like many other institutions, should adapt to meet the needs of war. This adaptation meant certain changes were necessary. To better understand why the methods were revised, a closer look at the wartime perceptions of the influential educational theorists and commissions may first be useful.

The attitudes of the nation's educators is quite apparent in almost any relevant publication. The schools were thought to be of fundamental importance in the war effort—the consequences of war would be even more severe if the schools did not actively participate. A War Policy for American Schools, published by the Educational Policies Commission exemplifies this. The first paragraph reads, "When the schools closed on Friday, December 5, they had many purposes and they followed many roads to achieve those purposes. When the schools opened on Monday, December 8, they had one dominant purpose—complete, intelligent, and enthusiastic cooperation in the war effort. The very existence of free schools anywhere in the world depends upon
the achievement of that purpose."17 Another document by the Educational Policies Commission, titled, What the Schools Should Teach in Wartime, serves as a further example. "With some exceptions and uncertainties," it stated, "the secondary school must be primarily a school for war."18 Clearly, the schools were not to have a passive role in the war effort.

Because of this attitude, the schools had to do more than adapt; change was necessary. The Educational Policies Commission stated, "To expect that the secondary-school program can be retained substantially as it was, with superficial additions here and there to acknowledge the fact that the United States is engaged in a war of survival, is to avoid reality."19

The necessity of change affected all areas of the curriculum. The National Education Association's Wartime Handbook for Education specified how nine different curriculum emphases could adapt to the war. Included in these were science, mathematics and geography. In addition, however, entirely new courses were recommended to better serve the wartime needs of the country. One especially clear example was the call for preflight aviation training. In response to the needs of the Army and Navy for candidates for cadet training, the handbook recommended, "specialized courses in preflight aviation to boys that are
Clearly, the schools intended to do whatever was possible to help the cause.

That these changes and adaptations were intended to be temporary is somewhat significant. The Educational Policies Commission noted, "Every effort should be made, after immediate and genuine emergency demands are met, to continue the normal educative process at full efficiency." A similar comment in a different publication notes that, "The program for education in wartime, as presented in these pages, is not, in some respects, a program that we would favor in peace." These views, however, disappeared as the war progressed. The importance of this more permanent effect of the change will be discussed in a later chapter.

There can be little question that the schools were willing to change to become a part of the war machine. What is not yet apparent is how this effort affected the progressive notion of social meliorism, and more importantly, how the student's education differed as a result. More than any other curriculum area, the social studies are best suited to demonstrate the change in this regard.

Just before the war, education for democracy meant enhancing the critical thinking skills of students. The social studies were fundamental in this regard. During the war, however, this was de-emphasized. There were two important reasons for this. First, critical thinking
education demanded time—time to examine and contemplate problems and reach solutions. Such an education was not seen as efficient in wartime. The time would be better spent in more useful and practical education, such as a preflight aviation training course. The second reason for a de-emphasis on critical thinking during the war was that it was perceived as threatening to the social order. In wartime, a government needs as much support as possible, an examination of its problems was not seen as supportive and in fact, dangerous.

The neglect of such problem-solving techniques is seen in almost any wartime NEA publication. For example, in outlining some general policies, one subsection of an NEA document titled, "Quick Decisions: Instant Action," states,

We must learn, first of all, to speed up the tempo of our decisions and actions in education. Properly accustomed to reaching decisions only after extended discussion, longtime research, and matured reflection, education cannot now operate at the peace-time pace. The necessity for prompt action requires...at every point the loyal, intelligent, enthusiastic cooperation which marks the good soldier.23

In wartime, the understanding of democracy no longer required a critical understanding of its problems. As the NEA's Wartime Handbook illustrates, one of the wartime goals of the social studies was, "the democratic way of life must
be understood and appreciated by all citizens of a democracy." This was not as surprising as the description that followed.

There should be in elementary and secondary schools study of dramatic, key episodes in the history of American democracy; biographies of men and women whose lives have advanced or personified the democratic tradition; great documents in American history; contrasts between democracy and dictatorship; civil liberties; and the responsibilities and self disciplines as well as the privileges of citizenship.24

Nowhere is it said that a key to understanding democracy is an additional understanding of its problems.

This provides an interesting contrast with a document published just before the war--also by the NEA. Education and the Defense of American Democracy states, "Education can help to clarify the nature and goals of democracy [by focusing] the searchlight of free and constructive inquiry on those social and economic problems, which, if allowed to remain unsolved, threaten to disintegrate democracy from within."25

As these examples illustrate, the effect of the war on perceptions regarding the role of education, specifically the social studies, had changed prevailing attitudes as to the nature of education for democracy. The critical
thinking and examination of problems, once thought to be constructive and conducive to a strong democracy, had in wartime become seen as destructive and threatening to the stability of democracy. This shift could not be more clear. This new commitment to a wartime society had important consequences to the nature of social studies education, specifically, its relationship to the individual.
--CHAPTER III--
CHANGE IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSROOM

Certain articles and NEA publications suggest that a change in thought had occurred as the United States became involved in the second world war. These documents, however, do not indicate the extent to which the change in thought had impacted the classroom. This is a seemingly more important change, since it had a more direct impact on the student. Using textbooks as evidence, certain changes in the social studies classroom are made clear. The wartime role of the textbooks resulted in a new treatment of the reader as well as new content presentations. These wartime changes differed significantly from the nature of education in the Thirties, and therefore started a trend that would last for many years.
World War II apparently generated a feeling among educational theorists that the social studies classroom, as it existed in the 1930's, would no longer be suitable for the new wartime era. This feeling is exemplified by the NEA's shifted emphasis. The study of America and its democracy was thus not the same in the 1940's as in the 1930's.

How can this shift be proven? To study the changed emphasis of the NEA proposals alone is not enough. The reason is simple. The attitudes reflected in the NEA documents show only that there was a shift in thought. Exalted educational theories and NEA policy statements, however, are notoriously poor indexes to what actually takes place in the classroom. In other words, an apparent change in the thinking of educational theorists does not necessarily imply a change in what students were actually learning.

So the problem remains. Evidence is needed to meet two objectives. First, it must substantiate the apparent shift seen in the NEA's publications. Second, it must show that what the NEA proposed actually filtered down to the high school social studies classrooms.

To meet these objectives, secondary level civics and history textbooks can serve as particularly useful tools.
If a shift did indeed take place, then contrasting textbooks from the prewar and wartime eras should make this shift apparent. This, in turn, would show that there was support (from the publishers that produced the texts, the administrators that chose them and the teachers that worked with them) for the new emphases put forward by the NEA. Subsequently, if this contrast is clear and conclusive, it can be safely assumed that a change did actually occur in the classroom, since textbooks were important classroom materials.

Textbooks are not perfect sources of evidence and in this light, two objections may arise. One objection may pertain to the difficulty in using them to form generalizations. It is important to keep in mind that the 1930’s and 1940’s were a turbulent period in the field of education. The future course of education was very much undecided, so just as various education journals reflected differing opinions, the same was true for textbooks. Certain authors, for example, may have been more critical toward democracy than others. Therefore, when certain textbooks are cited as examples, the aim is to demonstrate a general trend. In other words, although there is some diversity, a certain pattern is clearly recognizable.

A second objection to the using of texts as evidence pertains to the extent of their use. It is difficult to question the expanding use of textbooks throughout the
1930's. However, it seems reasonable to think that since events were happening so rapidly during the war years, the use of textbooks would decline. After all, throughout the war, textbooks were virtually outdated by the time they were published. For this reason, voices of protest arose concerning the use of textbooks in the classroom. A 1940 study by the Harvard Graduate School for Education is one example of this. The study concluded, "a teacher cannot and should not depend solely on a textbook if he wants to keep the course abreast of current trends." If teachers and administrators heeded such warnings, the implications for the wartime use of textbooks would be obvious and using texts as evidence would therefore be a futile exercise.

Indeed, the war seemed to jeopardize the extent to which textbooks would be used. However, much evidence exists to show that the use of textbooks did not decline during the war years. For example, an essay written in 1942 concluded, "the situation at the present time still seems to be dominated largely by one basal textbook in each subject in the hands of each pupil." Similar support can be seen in other articles. One writer commented, "Instruction by textbook still remains by far the most common method of instruction in the social studies." Thus, despite the rapid change in current events at the time, the textbook seemed to remain a dominant feature in the social studies classroom.
The conclusions of these authors need not be taken only at face value however. From an economic point of view, it makes perfect sense that the use of textbooks did not decline during the war. The publishers of these texts were at the mercy of the school boards and selection committees. In order to survive and succeed, publishers were forced to meet the wants and needs of the educators. This was true in the war period as it is today. An article titled, "Progress in Social Studies Textbooks," stated simply, "because of the financial hazard involved, publishers cannot afford to lag behind educational needs." The article continued, "The demand...must be there, else the book will not survive." All in all, the question of the extent texts were used during the war does not seem to be a valid objection.

Thus, with these objections noted, textbooks can provide a somewhat reliable source of evidence. Actually, it is difficult to think of a better source. Textbooks reflect not only the changing trends in the field of education but also how these trends were presented in the classroom. To this extent, textbooks, as evidence, go a step further than NEA publications. That textbooks can serve as a window into the classroom was recognized even at the time. One author wrote in 1939, "We should recognize the fact that in American educational practice textbooks virtually represent the curriculum." Another stated similarly, "The textbook is, in the last analysis, the sounding-board of our schools. In it are reflected the
practices of the classroom. Thus, with all of this in mind, textbooks can be used with a clear conscience as a means of substantiating the NEA's attitudes and also demonstrating that these attitudes had indeed taken effect in the classroom.
THE CHANGING ROLE OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS IN THE THIRTIES AND FORTIES

Given that textbooks are legitimate sources of evidence, what can be expected of them to corroborate the claim that there was change in the social studies? If a change did indeed take place in the social studies classrooms, then a change should also be seen in the textbooks that were used at the time. Therefore, to shed light on this change, wartime textbooks need to be contrasted with those of the pre-war years. A substantial difference in textbook presentation would suggest the occurrence of a shift in both attitude and actual classroom presentation.

Before examining the actual presentation of the textbooks, it may be helpful to first study how the roles of the texts changed from the Thirties to the Forties, since this change was responsible for the subsequent changes in presentation. In other words, because of the war, a new role was assumed by the textbooks. This meant that the authors and publishers had to alter the style and presentation from that of the Thirties. It makes sense therefore, to study the cause before the effect.

What was the role of the textbook in the 1930's? Unfortunately, there seems to be no clear answer to this question. It has already been stated that this was a turbulent time in the field of education. This question
seems to exemplify the situation: consensus as to the use of textbooks in the classroom was a rarity. Yet even despite the variance of opinion in this matter in the Thirties, a clear change can be seen as a result of war.

Judging by the apparent attitudes of the NEA before the war, it would seem the role of the textbook in the classroom would be very clear. As argued in the previous chapter, the aims of the social studies, according to the NEA, were to enhance reasoning and problem solving skills in students. Examining and discussing the problems of democracy was one way to serve this end. Since discussion techniques seemed the best way to develop understanding and intelligent public opinion, the NEA emphasized the utilization of this technique. The role of textbooks, in this case, would be merely supportive. Since emphasis was on discussion, texts could best serve as reference books, providing background information.

Indeed, there is much evidence to support that this was the role the authors and publishers assumed. A 1937 study regarding this very topic examined the most widely used American school textbooks in history, civics and economics. The study concluded, "The majority of such books are merely factual—telling how certain events have happened or are happening, or what certain problems, theories and data are." The study asked for a response from authors or publishers. One writer responded, "Textbooks appear to have
as their chief end the acquisition of information rather than the development of significant ideals and understandings which will make boys and girls better citizens.33

The above study and others suggested that a reason for this was the publishers' profit motive. In an effort to please any possible buyer, controversial statements were avoided, leaving the text in what one critic described as a devitalized condition.34 This same critic claimed that this nature of textbooks "kills any inclination on the part of the student to draw his own conclusions." Thus, they could best be used as reference books or "sources of information for students whose interests have already been aroused in the subject by the use of more vivid and timely materials...."35

Other studies, however, claim that the textbook occupied a more prominent position in the social studies classroom. A study in 1940 argued that "The textbook has probably exerted a more direct and extensive influence upon the social studies curriculum in the United States than any other single factor."36 Similarly, a significant inquiry made by the National Society for the Study of Education maintained that, "the work of the typical American classroom, whether on the elementary or secondary level, has been and is still characterized by a lifeless and
perfunctory study and recitation of assigned textbook materials."^37

Thus, of the above studies, there seems to be debate as to the extent the textbook was used in the classroom. Was it a supplementary tool or did it have a more active role? Still another study made before the war, concluded, "The modern textbook author conceives it to be his duty to help the child to learn, not merely to present a body of information." The study went on to comment, "there is general agreement that a social studies text should not present merely information but should aid in inculcating a higher sense of civic and social responsibility."^38 This view would suggest that textbooks might better aid the teacher by presenting important problems and appealing to the reasoning power of the students. This, in turn, would better supplement discussion techniques.

The authors of one popular text of the time, The United States in the Making, showed in the preface that their book was more than a mere presentation of facts. "It is the aim of this volume to give the pupil as complete an understanding as possible of the problems which have confronted and which still confront this country, and thus to contribute to his training as a future citizen." It was later noted in the preface, "We believe that the textbook should offer ways and means of deepening and broadening the pupil's grasp of the subject."^39
Another pre-war text was geared toward the same end. The publisher of *The Record of America* noted, "[the text's arrangement] subordinates memory and develops the reasoning power of students by encouraging them to think of history as a living force affecting our own times." \(^{40}\)

Apparently, the only possible conclusion that can be drawn is that the role of textbooks in the 1930's was confused and inconsistent. As the United States entered the Second World War, however, the confusion seemed to disappear, and a definite pattern began to emerge. Whatever the role of textbooks before the war, the main objective during the war was to have an active hand in educating for democracy. Whereas before the war, this was the function of the teacher and discussions, it became fashionable during the war for textbooks to insure that students were being educated for democracy. This was the new role for textbooks. Significantly, the meaning of "education for democracy" seemed to change as a consequence.

Because of the war, the development of the individual became of secondary importance to the needs of the country. Before the war, reasoning skills were taught through the questioning of democracy and its inherent problems. Students would consider issues and possible solutions. This was considered "education for democracy" since the strength of democracy depended on intelligent, aware, voting citizens.
During the war, however, this "education for democracy" came to be perceived as "education against democracy."

Discussing the problems of democracy seemed dangerous at a time when the threat against it was perceived as very real. Democracy, because of the crisis, needed loyalty and support, not a scrutiny of its problems. Thus, a new "education for democracy" began to emerge. The goals were the same as before, namely, a supportive public, but the means were seen as less dangerous. Students, rather than examining the faults, would be shown the virtues of their democracy. The new method was somewhat of a shortcut, but seemingly more appropriate in wartime.

Nevertheless, despite this consequence, this new role meant that if textbooks were dull presentations of information before, they would become more emotional appeals for support; if they were more oriented to the development of reason through the examination of problems, they became more biased and one sided. Evidence of this new function will emerge when the effects of the changed role are analyzed. Suffice to say now that the new role meant new presentations—presentations that would affect the treatment of both the reader and the content.
NEW TREATMENT OF THE READER

One consequence of the wartime conception of "education for democracy" that can be seen in textbooks is an entirely new treatment of the reader. As argued in previous chapters, the needs of a democratic country, namely supportive and loyal citizens, overtook the importance of well educated students. In the Thirties, the NEA, in outlining the purposes of the social studies, placed as one of the primary objectives the individual student's self realization. This meant that the "full development of the individual was of supreme importance." With the coming of war, however, civic responsibility became increasingly emphasized. This can be clearly seen in the new treatment of the reader by textbook authors.

The most important difference in the treatment of the readers was a new conception of the placement of the student in the social order. In other words, textbooks began to treat students as active citizens, as opposed to future citizens. During the war, the actions and attitudes of the students began to matter. That this was not the case prior to war may seem somewhat surprising, but apparently true.

The journal, Social Education, published an article in 1937, that corroborates the point. "It is unimportant what judgments students make of current events in the years when they wield neither the power of action nor that of public
opinion. It is of major importance how they are trained to arrive at the judgments on which they will be acting twenty years from now.\textsuperscript{41}

Evidence that this was the attitude of textbook authors as well, can be found in prefaces of pre-war textbooks. A previously mentioned textbook, \textit{The United States in the Making}, states in its preface the importance of having the student understand the nation's problems as a means to "contribute to his training as a future citizen."\textsuperscript{42} Similarly, the material presented in \textit{The Story of Our Republic} is said to be important to the "citizen of the future."\textsuperscript{43} These views seemed to express a larger opinion that students needed to develop intellectually before they become considered truly active citizens.

Thus, when considered in terms of the intent of the social studies at the time, the views are not at all surprising. The consideration of students as future citizens merely emphasizes the attitude of the NEA concerning the importance of developing reasoning and critical thinking skills. As might be expected, then, the wartime consideration of the reader as an active citizen reflects the revision in the attitude of the NEA.

This new consideration of the reader is evidenced in several ways in the textbooks. Perhaps the most obvious is in the introduction or preface of a text. \textit{Our Free Minds}, a textbook first published in 1941, serves as an excellent
example. The foreword begins, "There are two jobs which we of the present generation will have to undertake: one is to help defeat the new forces of barbarism that are threatening such civilization as we have achieved; the other is to find our American way of carrying through the economic, political and social revolution that is sweeping the world." Note the reader is treated as a part of the current situation. This is even more clear in the concluding remark of the foreword, "This book has to do with clarifying our minds and disciplining our wills for the work ahead of us." Textbook authors, because of the war, gave students a current, active role, as opposed to a role strictly confined to the future.

This same change can be seen also in more subtle alterations in textbook presentation. In other words, that the student also had an obligation as a citizen was expressed several ways by the textbook authors. As the following examples will illustrate, what the student saw in the textbook was often no different from the role adults were encouraged to play.

Frequently, textbook authors expressed the notion of an obligation to students in terms of an acceptance of the conditions at the time. This might include extensive presidential powers, higher inflation, rationing and so on. In the text, American Government, all of these issues are discussed in the first chapter of the book titled, "Winning
the War. For example, students are taught how to prevent inflation in a series of paragraphs, each with a heading such as "Save, Don't Buy!" and "Buy War Bonds."46

A very similar presentation is made by Ryllis Alexander Goslin in his textbook, *American Democracy Today and Tomorrow*. In this case, an appeal is made to the reader by presenting a series of illustrations with the simple heading "More of These" which is followed by photographs concerning "Government Regulation," "Taxes," and "Armament Materials." On the opposite page is a series titled "Less of These" and followed by corresponding photographs depicting "Free Enterprise," "Profits," and "Consumer Goods." These examples show how the students were considered as active citizens. Before the war, such issues might have been questioned. During the war, students were taught to accept such conditions as part their obligations as citizens.

The students' obligations as citizens extended beyond the acceptance of existing conditions. Textbook authors made sure that the students understood the nature of the threat as well. One book, *Democracy and Its Competitors*, was devoted solely to this purpose.48 Other books used chapters, or sections of chapters, to discuss the threat in hopes of clarifying the possible consequences of defeat and the necessity of strict home front conditions. Examples of specific presentations will be given later.
There are additional examples of how textbook authors responded to the new priority of civic responsibility. As adults learned to recognize enemy propaganda, so too did students. Several pages of Harold Underwood Faulkner's *The American Way of Life* illustrate that the textbook assumed this role as well. Included in Faulkner's analysis are the dangers and effectiveness of enemy propaganda. A text titled *The Government of the United States*, is further evidence. In a chapter titled "The popular Process in Government" devotes seven pages to propaganda. Included in this chapter are subsections titled, "What is Propaganda," "The methods of Propaganda," and "Propaganda and the Citizen."

The attention paid to this subject was quite extensive in comparison to pre-war textbooks. The 1940 edition of *National Governments and International Relations*, for example, has this, and only this, to say about propaganda, "By stories and editorials which appeal to the emotions, a nation can be made to believe that war is a moral duty." In this case, no attempt was made to identify enemy propaganda, or understand the threatening implications associated with it. On the other hand, a wartime edition of the same text, devoted far more attention to methods of identifying and combatting enemy propaganda.

The notion of citizen obligation took a more active form as well; the student was encouraged to actively
participate in the war effort. Accepting the existing conditions, understanding the threat and recognizing enemy propaganda were important obligations. However, equal emphasis was placed on active participation.

National Governments and International Relations serves as an excellent example of this as well. In the introduction of the text, the author states, "To win the war, all must work—men, women, and children; and we must supply the army and navy with more tanks, ships, and planes than the enemy have. Men must, for the duration of the war, work longer hours; women must operate tools with more speed than knitting needles; and children must do their bit when not in school."52

The specifics left out in National Governments were not ignored by the author of, Speak Up for Democracy, an activity book used in schools during wartime. The book explains, in some detail, certain activities that would help the cause of democracy, or in the words of the publisher, "help lead in the fight to maintain democracy." In addition to helping "How to recognize the enemies and saboteurs of democracy," the book also offers, "How to answer accusations against democracy," and "How to act effectively for democracy in your immediate circle."53 The reader is thus given a definition of democracy and taught the dangers posed by the enemies overseas while constantly encouraging not only support and loyalty, but also action.
Before the war, the students were treated as future citizens only. This changed during the war and students were encouraged to participate both by support and action as though they were adults. This however does not mean that the future obligations were neglected. Students learned, as they did before the war, that the future was in their hands. Of specific importance in this pursuit was an understanding of the role of the United States after the war—-as a world leader.

In textbooks published during the war, examples of this abound. Chapters like, "The United States as a World Power," and "The United States Realizes its Duties as a Leader in World Affairs" and "Bases for a Lasting peace." were not at all uncommon. Frances Fitzgerald in her book America Revised concludes that the emergence of such chapters was the beginning of a new emphasis on foreign policy in textbooks that would last until the mid Seventies. Prior to the war, topics concerning foreign relations, even WWI, were mysteriously absent from the textbooks. With the war then, students learned the importance of U.S. participation in world affairs. Since the war, there has been little question that the U.S. plays an important part as a world leader.

The new role assumed by the textbook authors and publishers during the war affected the way the readers were treated in terms of their obligation to the community,
nation, and world. This change in presentation seems to corroborate the shift in emphasis of the social studies. The students’ obligations as citizens were stressed at the expense of objective of self realization or development of critical thought. The new attitude of the authors regarding the reader is evidence that civic responsibility began to emerge as a priority as a result of the war. That it necessarily took the place of critical thought can be seen in the new presentations of content.
NEW CONTENT PRESENTATIONS

The study of how the presentation of content changed in textbooks is important since it, like the new treatment of the reader, has implications on the larger shift in the social studies. As noted earlier in this chapter, the importance of textbook examination is that textbooks reflect what was happening in the classrooms. A significant revision in the content of wartime texts would reflect other changes in the social studies classroom. Apparently the new treatment of the reader in textbooks implied a new emphasis on the notion of civic responsibility. If critical thinking was de-emphasized as a result, then it too should be seen in the textbooks.

The content of wartime textbooks indeed seems to support the contention that critical thinking was a casualty of war. Considerable evidence of this is seen in the various new presentations of information and significant revisions that altered the tone of the textbooks.

The change in presentations took many forms. Perhaps the most glaring feature of social studies textbooks that were published during the war was the depiction of the enemy and the nature of the threat. As has been discussed, the role of Thirties textbooks apparently was to present information as free from bias as was possible. This was important to make the discussions in class productive.
keeping the students opinions and decisions free from outside influence. During the war, however, the depictions of the enemy were anything but unbiased.

In the 1940 edition of *National Governments and International Relations* clearly illustrates how the unbiased presentations were replaced with "patriotic" ones. In the pre-war edition, a chapter titled "Hitler and the Nazis," includes a subsection titled, "The accomplishments of Hitler." This subsection is remarkably unbiased in its presentation. The accomplishments of the Hitler regime are presented in list form. "The Hitler regime," began the section, "Revived hope for Germans and developed enthusiastic patriotism among the youth, reduced unemployment, built extensive paved roads, made the streets clean and free from beggars, built many new homes, and sent Christmas baskets to three million German homes." Indeed, this section portrays Hitler as the hero to his country that he was, regardless of common American opinion.

However, changes came with war. A revised edition of the same text was published in 1943. The chapter, "Hitler and the Nazis," is very much the same except for the subsection mentioned above. "Hitler's Accomplishments" was deleted entirely and replaced with a subsection titled, "Hitler's Ideal: A German Dominated Wor'd." Hitler was portrayed as anything but a hero in this section. In fact, the final sentence of the section reads, "he usually signs
non-aggression pacts before pouncing upon his victims." 56

This sort of revision seems to be more the rule than the exception. With war, depictions of the enemy became increasingly prejudiced.

In a book titled *Our Free Minds*, published in 1941, H.A. Overstreet describes Nazism in the following manner.

> Nazism is a peculiarly perverted, short-ranged view of human nature. It is as perverted and short ranged as the view of ancient pedagogues who, for their own convenience, instilled knowledge with a rod. Nazism is fatally presumptuous because it assumes a knowledge of human impulses and aspirations no mortal can have, and a control no mortal should possess. And so, in the long run, it would seem, Nazism must go the way of death, since it denies in man that which is the way of life. 57

Overstreet's description of Nazism seems particularly fatalistic especially given the success of the Nazis by 1941, when his book was published. A more common presentation, but one no less patriotic portrays the enemy in a more threatening light. Dwight Lowell Dumond exemplifies this in his book *A History of the United States*, published in 1942. Note the rhetoric used in the following passage. "The dictators who were grinding their own people and those of neighboring states under the heel of tyranny, did not hesitate to destroy, by every means in their
power, the greatest democracy of all time. Similar rhetoric was again used in National Governments and International Relations. The second chapter of this book begins with the simple statement, "Whether we approve of war or not, in order to survive we must crush the brutal forces that seek to enslave the world."

The techniques of these authors seem clear. By using extremes and strong adjectives, the war and its implications are made especially clear. But the approach should not be particularly surprising. Outside the schools at the time, Americans were being bombarded with propaganda in the forms of posters, pamphlets, and radio. The techniques were similar and at times indistinguishable. Indeed, at times the textbooks seemed to cross the line from education to indoctrination.

Examples of this can be seen in the illustrations used in the wartime textbooks. When one pictures an American propaganda poster from WWII many images may come to mind. With the aid of hindsight it is easy to draw parallels between a typical wartime poster and the photographs used by textbook publishers. It is no accident that the textbooks used illustrations similar to the propaganda issued by the government throughout the war. For the textbooks it was the most effective and most efficient means of giving to students an "education for democracy."

Propaganda-like pictures seemed to be used frequently in textbooks. In a book by Harold Faulkner titled U.S.A., a later chapter in the book contains only three photographs. One is a picture of a Nazi armored vehicle with the caption, "Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia, contrary to his promises, and put an end to the independence of this freedom loving nation." The second photograph shows women working in an aircraft factory. This caption reads, "Here are a group working on a dismantled airplane quite unconscious of the grease on their faces and fingers." The third photo in this chapter is a triumphant scene of the Americans landing at Normandy. The similarities to national propaganda are not difficult to draw.

Harold Faulkner was not the only textbook author to use this technique however. Frank Abbott Maugruder, in an aforementioned text, *American Government* also used photos closely resembling propaganda as well as illustrations of actual government propaganda. It is interesting to note that in the 1939 edition of his book the picture opposite the title page is of the National Monument to the Forefathers in the town of Plymouth, Massachusetts. This photo is not unexpected for the title page of a government class textbook. In the 1943 edition of the same text, however, the picture opposite the title page is replaced with one that shows three U.S. bombers and is titled "Wings of Victory." The photo was provided courtesy of the Boeing Aircraft Company and it not surprisingly seems more like an
advertisement than an illustration for a book to be used in a civics class.

It is interesting to speculate on the meaning of this revision. The meaning somehow seems to extend beyond just the adaptation of the text to a war oriented theme. The "Wings of Victory" photo certainly represented a new role for the United States. No longer was the United States to be an inward looking nation, as was represented by the picture of the earlier edition. Rather, the role as technology leader and world power was assumed. The publisher's selection of "Wings of Victory" subtly expresses this to the reader.

In the first chapter of the same textbook, more examples of the same technique can be found. The reader is exposed to several pictures—some showing the destruction at Pearl Harbor, others showing American Military weapons and factories, and still others show content citizens buying war bonds or receiving rationing books. The use of photographs in these textbooks provide a striking portrayal of the war and its implications on the home front. There can be little doubt as to why these photos were chosen. This technique seemed to help meet the goal of encouraging patriotism and loyalty.

When exaggerated depictions of the enemy and propaganda like illustrations were not used, other means were employed. A technique just as common was the use of contrast to make a
point. To best present the situation to the reader, the authors explained democracy using much comparison and contrast with other forms of government. This we versus they approach was very common in wartime textbooks and accompanied the use of the other techniques to present the reader with a very clear idea of democracy and the nature of the war.

The combination of the rhetoric and illustrations in war texts must have had a powerful effect. This we versus they approach often used both slanted rhetoric and striking illustrations. As with the other methods of presentation, the line between education and indoctrination is fine indeed, if existent at all.

The most vivid examples of this use of contrast can be seen in Earl S. Kalp's book, *Democracy and Its Competitors*. This style of contrast is used throughout the book, but when illustrations are used, the method becomes especially effective. The book consists of several plates, each of which has two pictures—one showing an aspect of Nazism or Fascism and the other showing the opposite feature of democracy. For example, one plate shows American children running down a sidewalk. The caption reads, "Youth plays in a Democracy." Below this photograph shows columns of children carrying guns, presumably in Germany or Italy. Its caption reads, "Youth drills in a totalitarian state. The exaggeration makes the contrast abundantly clear.
Similarly, in a plate corresponding to a chapter titled "The Press and Radio," the top illustration shows a newsstand in an American city with the caption, "The press has the loudest voice in America," while directly below is a scene of a convention apparently in an arms factory in Germany that states, "The voices of the big guns speak the German language." This sharp contrast is a means for schoolbook authors to provide an understanding of democracy and the enemies to democracy appropriately suited to the needs of war.

Magruder used this technique as well in the 1943 edition of his textbook, *American Government*. A section titled "War Aims" is curiously placed in the foreword of the book. The section contrasts "their" aims to "ours" and clearly demonstrates the use of both exaggeration and contrast. Consider the following examples from the section. "Admiral Yamamoto said, 'I am looking forward to dictating peace to the United States at Washington.'" Below this quotation is one from Churchill and Roosevelt from the Atlantic Charter. "Great Britain and the United States 'seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.'" Several similar quotation contrasts are listed. Mussolini is quoted, "We wish to hear no more about brotherhood, sisterhood, cousins, and other such bastard relationships, because relationships between states are relationships of force." The rebuttal states, "We have a Good Neighbor Policy towards other
It is interesting to speculate the placement of this section in the foreword of the book. It could have just as easily been placed in a chapter titled, “Winning the War.” In the foreword, however, the tone for the book seems to be set and the sense of urgency is more effectively conveyed to the reader. In fact, establishing a different tone to wartime textbooks was actively pursued by the authors and publishers.

Frances Fitzgerald’s America Revised, made a study of this effort by tracing the “ideological drift as it crossed over the subsequent junior-high school texts of the mid-century.” Fitzgerald uses the best-selling text of Mabel Casner and Ralph Henry Gabriel as a case study. After considering the 1931 and 1938 editions, Fitzgerald examines the 1942 edition of The Story of American Democracy. “In the central part of the book, the titles have changed, and these give a rather different tone to the book. Where once there were ‘problems’ to ‘challenge democracy,’ there is now only progress: ‘American Life Becomes Better for the Common Man,’ and so on.” Fitzgerald continues, “In contrast to the final worryings of the 1938 edition, this book ends on a note of optimism concerning air travel.”
The same sorts of revisions are clearly evident in other textbooks as well. As Fitzgerald noted, curiously absent from wartime editions are chapters once so common concerning the problems of democracy. *The Story of America*, published in 1937 includes a chapter simply titled, "Problems of Government." Texts published throughout the war such as Faulkner's *U.S.A.*, titles took a much more triumphant tone: "American Government Marches on to Aid the Common Man." There was seemingly nothing America could not overcome.

To make this apparent to the reader, the war editions stressed consensus, rather than conflict. Particularly exemplary in this regard is the topic of the New Deal. Pre-war texts grant the existence of the significant opposition to its programs and policies. *The United States in the Making*, published in 1937, includes a subsection titled, "Opposition to the New Deal." Corresponding questions and activities at the end of the chapter dealt with both the positive and negative aspects of the program. "Look over newspapers and periodicals and make a collection of cartoon for and against the New Deal," and, "Attack or support the developments under the New Deal," are examples. Similarly, the 1938 edition of *A New Nation* notes the significant opposition. A question posed at the end of a relevant chapter asked, "What were the causes of rising opposition to the New Deal Program?"
As expected, the wartime editions make little mention of the conflicting views. To answer questions at the end of the chapter, students needed to consider only the positive aspects of the New Deal. In *U.S.A.*, for example, students are asked, "Is there any evidence that Roosevelt's New Deal was popular?"70 The sense of consensus was in such ways instilled in the students.

The tone of textbooks changed in another significant way. Not surprisingly, war was glamorized in wartime editions. This was something specifically avoided in pre-war textbooks. A 1935 study concerning textbook selection, included in its criteria for selecting a text, that it should, "show how civilization has progressed by turning from military to civil methods," and advised that, in the textbook under consideration, "military events should be held to a minimum."71

These were hardly attributes of popular books in wartime. In a section of *American Government* describing the branches of the United States Army, each division is portrayed in a heroic manner, "There's thrilling action for gunners, drivers, radio men and mechanics in the Army's tough armored divisions." Similarly, in describing the infantry, the author notes, "Eleven different weapons give deadly firepower."72 It seems almost needless to say that this section did not even exist in the 1939 edition.
The change in specific presentations and general tones of wartime textbooks collectively suggest that critical thinking was not a top priority in the teaching of high school students. Between these revisions in content and the new attitude toward the reader, wartime textbooks suggest that the war brought change to the social studies. The effect and meaning behind these changes cannot be understated.
Thus far, it seems apparent that the war had affected the social studies in two ways. The first shift occurred at the level of educational theory, as seen in various articles and NEA policies. A second, more tangible change took place in the classrooms, as evidenced by alterations in textbook presentation. These two factors resulted in a reduction, if not elimination, of the discussion and analytical methods that were used in the social studies classrooms before the war.

One important question however, remains to be answered: Was this shift natural for the time and circumstances? After all, the war had brought changes to several institutions. Government became larger and ever more powerful, industry adapted by producing ammunition rather than automobiles, and so on. In this light, the relative changes in education would be less questionable, and the consequences less dramatic. However, the lasting nature of the changes imply that the new commitment and its consequences affected more than just the schools and students of the war years. Therefore, the logical conclusion is that the social studies curriculum had not just adapted for war, it had changed for a whole new era in history. For this reason, the implications and consequences of the shift in social studies education become even more significant in the history of education.
Indeed, social studies education in the post-war era was remarkably similar to that during the war. This may seem surprising considering that nazlism and fascism were no longer threats to democracy, and wartime conditions, such as rationing and price controls no longer required justification. But, in fact, several factors explain the longevity of the shift. Of these, the nation's pride and egolism in the aftermath of war was prominent, as was the popularity of the new life adjustment movement and the emergence of a communist threat. Taken together, these factors explain the longevity of the changes in social studies and the extension into the post-war years.
THE EXTENSION OF PATRIOTISM

One of the goals of the social studies in wartime was to foster patriotism and instill loyalty in the students. The NEA stated this explicitly. "Such loyalty as is desired in a democracy in wartime can be developed by the schools." The document explained that one way to pursue this was through "a judicious, sincere, and dignified use of symbolism, pageantry, and music to express those ideals which students have been taught to understand and practice." Apparently, the end of the war did not bring an end to this objective. The patriotic appeals extended throughout the postwar years.

An article that appeared in 1948 titled, "Maintaining a Balance of Important Values," seems to exemplify the feeling of many educators after the war. As quoted in the article, it was felt, "In this period of conflicting ideologies, our first task is developing in our pupils a passionate and intelligent devotion to our American way of life." This quote seemingly could be found just as easily in a wartime education journal article; the priorities were essentially the same. To be fair, the article also acknowledged the need to avoid teaching "our pupils to accept uncritically the social and economic imperfections of their society. For our vitality as a nation lies in our freedom to think and to work as free Americans...." Equally important of note, however, is the tendency to treat critical thinking and the
study of the problems of democracy as of secondary importance--an afterthought. Note the final message of the article. "We must not, in the face of our glorious past and our stirring hopes for the future, allow our pupils to develop cynical and defeatist attitudes." 77

The above article seems to be an especially reliable source of evidence concerning post-war attitudes since the textbooks of the era corroborate the trends. The article's conclusion, "We must not... allow our pupils to develop cynical and defeatist attitudes," was certainly one heeded by the textbook publishers. "The Textbook in Post-War Education" was an article written by the Executive secretary of the American Textbook Publishers Institute in 1946. According to the author, "the importance of the contents of the books is shown by the care that is exercised to see that undesirable material is eliminated and that desirable material is included." 78 Apparently, the textbooks responded in no small degree.

The response of textbook authors and publishers usually took several different forms. Certainly, undesirable material was eliminated. Frances Fitzgerald noted in America Revised that the 1950 edition of Casner and Gabriel's popular textbook gave the impression that, "there are no more bad people or bad social conditions." 79

Similarly, the government in Hagrunder's 1948 edition of American Government has seemingly solved every domestic
social problem. Veterans benefits, social insurance, employment services and child welfare are all topics that dominate the first chapter titled, "Winning the Peace." One subsection of the chapter titled, "The Union has Given Us a Land of Abundance," is especially exemplary. The corresponding illustration is Norman Rockwell's painting, "Freedom From Want," that depicts a large family sitting down to a full dinner. The problems of the depression had all but disappeared.

The other side of the same coin is also evident in the post-war textbooks while the nation's problems were often overlooked, its achievements were significantly highlighted. Turning again to Magruder's 1948 textbook, the technological advancements were clearly stressed. Especially evident is the development of the atomic bomb. Two illustrations are used to portray the power of the weapon and thus the power of the nation. One chart almost proudly shows the estimated mortality at different distances from the center of an atomic explosion. The other compares the might of a 1/2 ton atomic bomb with a relatively feeble 10 ton bomb.

An equally popular theme concerning technological advancements that can be seen in postwar textbooks was the improvement transportation and communication. The Rise of Our Free Nation, for example, uses nine photographs and charts concerning the commercial and military uses of aviation. American Government includes a subsection titled,
"A Closer Union Through Transportation and Communication."
Both this text and another post war text, *The United States: American Democracy in World Perspective* illustrate how the world is contracting due to improved transportation technology. The improvements in communications and transportation provided an effective means to instill pride and patriotism.

The above examples are significant in that they demonstrate how the United States was presented to the student. As was the case during the war, the faults and problems were avoided and triumphs were highlighted in an effort to form a patriotic consensus and positive attitude. This sort of education for democracy presented through triumphant presentations and patriotic appeals had not disappeared with the war. Therefore, what seemed to be a temporary change to accommodate wartime needs became something of a more lasting nature.
The longevity of the changes in social studies education can be seen in a carryover of wartime values. The longevity of the change can also be seen, somewhat ironically, in the new movements that occurred in education after the war. It is widely agreed upon that the course education had taken after the war was toward "life adjustment education." Life adjustment education dominated the post war education scene. But, although it was a new movement, in the last analysis, it seems to differ little with the social efficiency strand of the larger progressive movement, and for that matter, the new "education for democracy" that emerged as a result of wartime perceptions. It would seem that the new life adjustment education movement and the democratic education of the war years were brothers born of the same father— the social efficiency movement.

Herbert M. Klledard stated in The Struggle for the American Curriculum, "In a period when curriculum concoctions were being brewed on every side, it was life adjustment education that emerged as the sauce that captured the attention of the professional education community." This movement seemed to emerge from the feeling that the nation's high schools could better serve the majority of pupils. Indeed, there was a reformist tone to the movement. The focus of schooling after the war was on the "real
problems" that faced students. But these problems were
quite different than the ones that were attended to before
the war. One prominent educator specified some of these
problems: "getting along well with other boys and girls,
understanding parents, driving a motor car, and engaging in
recreational activities."62

In virtually any definition of life adjustment
education, two aspects are central: vocational education and
citizenship education. While the overall curriculum
expanded to better accommodate the vocational needs, the
social studies virtually remained unchanged in producing
citizens that would fit well into the social order.

The changes brought by life adjustment education were
not really changes at all, at least as far as the social
studies were concerned. Many of the features of the "new"
movement can easily compared with what was seen in the war
years. According to Diane Ravitch, the purpose was to
change "students' attitudes and behavior to conform to
social norms. The ideal was the well-adjusted student, who
was prepared to live effectively as a worker, a home member,
and a citizen."63 The similarities with wartime aims are
obvious.

If the aim of life adjustment education was a more
efficient education, or one with a more functional return to
both the student and society, then the social studies
curriculum that emerged with the war was well suited to meet
the post war aims as well. After all, the wartime aims of the social studies were all geared toward social efficiency. Everything taught in the secondary schools in wartime had to be as directly beneficial to the war effort as was possible. The Educational Policies Commission wrote in 1942, "Without abandoning essential services of the schools, appropriate war duties of the schools should be given absolute and immediate priority in time, attention, personnel, and funds over any and all other activities." That which directly contributed to the war machine became most important. Thus, the social studies required little adaptation to meet the aims of life adjustment education after the war: citizenship education was already firmly in place. Life adjustment education simply built on the foundation that was set for the war effort.

The popularity of the movement helps explain why the changes in the social studies endured even after the war. Time magazine reported that schools in thirty-five of forty-eight states were trying to implement at least some aspects of life adjustment education. Nevertheless, criticism began to rise.

"The Conflict of Education in a Democratic Society" was one response to the type of modern education that emerged after the war. Of the criticisms raised, two seem especially applicable. First was the tendency to teach information rather than knowledge. The difference was that
the former led to conformity while the latter led to independent thought. According to the author, "Our mission here on earth is to change our environment, not adjust ourselves to it." The second criticism, similar to the first, blamed schools for failing to equip the students with "that intellectual power which will enable them to meet new situations and solve new problems as they arise." Indeed, the debate that emerged was similar to that which occupied the social efficiency educators before the war.

Such attacks took their toll. As the Progressive Education Association (PEA) dissolved in 1955, so too did the corresponding life adjustment movement. The launching of Sputnik by the Russians in 1957 drove the last nail in the movement's coffin. Nevertheless, life adjustment was a very popular notion from the mid-Forties through the early Fifties. Because of this popularity, and emphasis on socially useful education, the type of social studies education that emerged because of the war persisted throughout the war years.
THE NEW THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

Clearly, the end of World War II did not bring an end to the wartime goals and presentations of the social studies. The war had built the framework for which social studies education and textbook presentations would rest for the next decade. Actually, the similarities between wartime education and postwar education came to be even more striking. While a sort of egoism was presented during and after the war, a wartime element that took time to emerge in the postwar era was the notion of a threatening enemy. As the fears of communism grew, the wartime and postwar notions of "education for democracy" became nearly impossible to distinguish.

Certainly, communism had emerged as a new enemy for the schools to conquer. To educators, this threat was as dangerous to the stability of democracy as was nazilism or fascism. For this reason alone, the style of social studies education could not afford to return to the pre-war methods. The means of educating for democracy that were employed in wartime were thus essentially the same even after the war had ended.

Frances Fitzgerald, in examining Casner and Gabriel's popular text, noted how the threat was portrayed to the reader. In the authors' effort to contrast the evils of communism with the benefits of democracy, Fitzgerald concluded,
In this section, one is told that "Russia" is a police state, where "the leader of the Communist party has absolute power over... every person." Russia, one learns, is a "fake democracy" and a "fake republic"; worse yet, its industry is geared not to the production of television sets but to war production. In addition, one learns that Russia is tremendously powerful—perhaps even more powerful than the United States....

The perception of the Communist threat is thus presented in much the same way as was the Nazi threat several years earlier.

The new emphasis on communism was so great in textbooks, that Frances Fitzgerald wrote, "The texts of the early Forties had not portrayed the Nazis as half so aggressive, or the Second World War as half such a threat to the country." According to Fitzgerald, the reason for this was that communism was seen as both widespread and invisible. Certainly another possible explanation is that, with atomic weapons, the stakes had increased since the war. Whatever the reason, the Soviet Union had replaced Nazi Germany in the textbooks. This was largely responsible for the extension of wartime education to the postwar era.

That this substitution of communism for fascism or nazilism had influenced the course of education should not be at all surprising. Indeed, it was a phenomenon that overtook the whole nation. Les Adler, in his article
titled, "Red Fascism: The Merger of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia in the American Image of Totalitarianism, 1930's-1950's," addresses this very issue. As Adler noted, "Americans transferred their hatred for Hitler's Germany to Stalin's Russia with considerable ease and persuasion." As an illustration, Adler quoted President Truman, "There isn't any difference in totalitarian states. I don't care what you call them, Nazi, Communist, or Fascist...." Victory in war therefore, did not ease the perceived threat to democracy and education, specifically the social studies, reacted predictably.

Communism was, in fact, seen in some ways as an even greater menace that had to be dealt with. Educators, in response, perceived their role and that of the schools as one of ultimate importance, as had been the case upon the declaration of war. This perceived threat is visible in many articles and publications which reflect the educational thought of the time.

In 1947, an article appeared in The School Executive titled, "Good Schools: Front line against Communism." The primary importance of the role to be assumed by the schools, as demonstrated by the article, is very much similar to the NEA attitudes of the late Thirties. "Let it be understood at the outset," the article stated, "that freedom and the hope it holds for the future is well worth defending and that a spiritual and intellectual bulwark must be erected
against Communism. Let it also be understood that good schools are the first line of defense against Communism.92 As was the case at the outbreak of war, the role of the schools, as seen by leading educators, was of fundamental importance to the security of American democracy. The role was the same as were the presentations in social studies classrooms, only the enemy was different.

Since this sort of education for democracy was not exclusive to the war years, the corresponding consequences cannot be seen as simply affecting only students of the war years. The type of education that began at the outset of war had endured through at least the mid fifties, and arguably much later. Thus, the consequences of the new commitment to a democratic education cannot easily be understated. The longevity of the change demonstrates that the new wartime emphases were more than just circumstantial. The changes seem to suggest that an ideological shift was taking place, not just in education, but in the nation as a whole.
--CHAPTER V--
The Shift as an Indicator of a Larger Trend

The change that took place in the social studies as a result of the war, and the lasting nature of these changes, had affected the relationship between education and the individual. But this change was important for another reason as well. On a larger scale, the changes in social studies foreshadowed the shifting attitudes of society. Tracing the roots of the attitudes of the consensus and conservatism of the Fifties is as necessary as a study of the attitudes themselves. Certainly, the new education for democracy had some effect on the larger political shift, but the extent to which the schools contributed to the change is difficult, if not impossible to assess. In other words, the presentations in the schools cannot be considered a direct cause of the conservative shift. However, elements of this conservative shift can be seen clearly in the schools of the early war years. If nothing else, the new role of schools and the social studies that came with war foreshadowed the larger conservative shift.

According to Godfrey Hodgson, two conflicting elements were key to the creation of the attitudes of the Fifties. The first was a fear of communism and the second was a sort of national egoism. Hodgson wrote, "Confident to the verge of complacency about the perfectability of American society, anxious to the point of paranoia about the threat of communism--those were the two faces of the consensus mood."
Each grew from one aspect of the experience of the 1940's: confidence from economic success, anxiety from the fear of Stalin and the frustrations of power. 93

These elements are often associated only with the post war years. This, after all, is a logical association since it was the fusion of the two seemingly incompatible elements that led to McCarthyism. Hodgson wrote, "McCarthyism transformed the issue of Communist subversion into a shibboleth of domestic political alignment." 94 The effect of the conflicting elements was thus a quieting of the left and a new consensus regarding conservatism that ultimately characterized the Fifties.

Based on the presentations of the social studies, the conservative shift had its roots not in the years immediately following the war, but in the early stages of the war itself. Finding examples of confidence and anxiety in the wartime textbooks is no difficult task. Confidence was reflected in several ways. Perhaps most importantly however, confidence was seen in the neglect of America's problems. The problems of democracy simply were no longer considered in schools. Rather, emphasis was on the might of democracy, the superiority of which soon became clear. The result was a confident, almost egotistical attitude. The industrial might and the dependence of the allies on the "arsenal of democracy" were themes constantly stressed in
textbooks. The reader learned that the problems associated with democracy were nothing compared to its qualities.

At the same time this confidence was expressed to the reader, the worries caused by the threat of the enemy were also apparent. Nazism and Fascism were constantly on the minds of educators and textbook authors. Examples of this are also abundant. A subsection of Magruder's text, titled, "Germany's Dream of a Nazi-Dominated World" is typical. In this way of presenting the threat, a certain anxiety is apparent. A chapter of Casner and Gabriel's text is titled, "The United States Fights for Its Life and for a Free Democratic World." Thus while America's domestic problems were disappearing in textbooks, the void was filled with a new set of international problems. The paradox was clear. Somehow, because of the war, the fear of an aggressive enemy and the confidence in democracy became compatible in the American mind-set.

This anxiety and confidence paradox that emerged in the late Forties therefore should not be surprising. The fears of communism and the sort of hyper-patriotism that was personified by McCarthy had its start not after the war, but at the beginning of war. The communist enemy was different, but that was all. The anxieties associated with a bi-polar and zero-sum conflict clearly began in the early war years. Similarly, the confidence associated with the power of the nation began not with victory, but with the dependence of
the allies on America's resources at the beginning of the war. These assumptions can be made based on the new presentations of the social studies. Indeed, the change in the social studies foreshadowed a larger trend: the conservative shift of the Fifties.
CONCLUSION

The change that occurred in the social studies as a result of the war had clearly placed a higher emphasis on civic responsibility education. The development of critical thinking and reasoning skills was a natural casualty of war. In examining the period, two authors effectively summed the situation.

By the second world war, the Jeffersonian vision of democracy seemed to many to be hopelessly idealistic: the more pressing need was for order, control and unquestioning patriotism. Citizenship education could no longer be entrusted to individual rationality, but must be shaped through institutions—and here schools were to play a prominent role.

The education for democracy that had emerged was fundamentally different from the democratic education that was striven for before the war. A reversal of the means and ends of social studies education had occurred. Before the war, democracy was used as the means to the end of strengthening the education of the individual. This was done by examining the problems and proposing solutions. By getting students to think about the problems, both the individual and society would benefit.

On the other hand, education during and after the war had reversed the ends and means. Before the war, democratic
education was used to benefit the individual directly. The benefits to society were an indirect, though natural consequence. After the war, on the other hand, the benefits of society became a primary emphasis of social studies education. As a result, the indoctrination of important values replaced critical discussion. In the latter case, society was a natural benefactor, but intellectually weaker individuals were the price.

"It has been said that the question is not what education can do for democracy but what democracy can do for education." Indeed, the war seemed to confuse this statement by Mark Van Doren, an important educator of the time.\(^9\) The views of Van Doren are worthy of note because they were seemingly so rare. His was a voice of concern regarding the course of wartime education. "Democracy cannot survive a loss of faith that the best man will make the best citizen. It certainly cannot afford to educate men for citizenship, for efficiency, or for use. Its only authority is reason, just as its only strength is criticism." Because of this belief, Van Doren concluded, "[The individual] is always to be understood as an end, not a means."

These views, however significant, were not widely accepted. Education had to adapt to the times. "Never was there a time when the profession of education carried such a heavy responsibility, never a better opportunity to serve
the nation. Such perceptions of the educational theorists, in this case, the National Education Association, were so strong that fundamental curriculum changes were seemingly justified.

Perhaps in war, these changes were justified. However, the new commitment of education lasted long after the war. Critical thinking and reasoning skills did not return as aspects of the social studies at the end of war. The longevity of the change suggests that the changes in the social studies were more the part of a larger ideological shift. Therefore, the changes in social studies classrooms became all the more significant in terms of the individual’s education.

The new ideology that affected the education of the individual was prevalent on a larger scale as well. The changes in the social studies reflected the coming trends in society. The similarities of the conservative shift with wartime education are noteworthy. The combination of the feelings of anxiety and confidence that occurred in the schools during the war were later seen in the conservatism of the Fifties. Thus, the combination of these attitudes in the social studies foreshadowed the changes that were to come less than a decade later.

The relationship between education and democracy has long been questioned. Thomas Jefferson addressed the issue shortly after the revolution. How was education for
democracy to be pursued? The history of American education shows that the question had long gone unanswered. However, the war had justified a commitment to society. This commitment significantly altered the social studies curriculum and consequently the role of the students. The question regarding the priorities of education in a democracy had, for the time, been solved by the new ideology and the new commitment.
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