Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Middle and Secondary Education Faculty
Publications

Department of Middle and Secondary Education

2005

Digging Trenches: Nationalism and the First National Report on the Elementary History Curriculum

Chara H. Bohan
Georgia State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub

Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), and the [Junior High, Intermediate, Middle School Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bohan, Chara H., "Digging Trenches: Nationalism and the First National Report on the Elementary History Curriculum" (2005). *Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications*. 22.
https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/mse_facpub/22

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Middle and Secondary Education at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Middle and Secondary Education Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

Digging Trenches: Nationalism and the First National Report on the Elementary History Curriculum

Abstract

The objective of this historical analysis is to determine the origins of the American elementary history/social studies curriculum and to determine how nationalism affected the curriculum as it progressed in the early twentieth century. The Committee of Eight (Co8), established by the American Historical Association in 1905, created the first national report on the teaching of elementary history and civics. Factors influencing the resultant curriculum, such as the pressure for diverse membership, the curriculum established in European countries, the growth and development of American identity and pride, the massive expansion of public schooling, and regulations on teacher certification are examined. A combination of demands resulted in an elementary history curriculum that was nationalistic in perspective, as the report recommended American history to be the sole focus of study in grades one through eight. Comparisons and implications for the present day elementary history curriculum are discussed.

Introduction

In Erich Maria Remarque's classic novel on the horrors of war, *All Quiet on the Western Front*, Kantorek is the stern schoolmaster who encouraged the young, impressionable Paul Bäumer and his classmates to enlist in the ranks of the Germany army. He challenged his students, "Won't you join up, Comrades?" (Remarque, 1929, p. 11). According to Bäumer, who narrates the fictional account of soldiers' experiences during World War I, there were thousands of Kantoreks throughout Germany and the rest of Europe, who believed that they were acting with the best motives – on behalf of

Digging Trenches

national pride and interest. Ultimately, Bäumer suggests that these jingoistic teachers led their students blindly to the slaughter of trench warfare.

Although historians debate the leading factors that contributed to the onset of World War I, nationalism is often chief among explanations. Other factors include the alliance system, militarism and armaments, the international economy, imperial rivalries, and, of course, the sudden killing of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary, in July 1914 (M. Gilbert, 1994; Joll, 1984). Nonetheless, the primacy of domestic policy or “the folly of nationalism” remains a dominant explanation for the onset of the Great War (Ousby, 2002; Keegan, 1998; M. Gilbert, 1994; F. Gilbert, 1984). In his 1882 essay, “*Qu’est-ce qu’est une nation?*” which translates to “What is a nation?”, Ernest Renan argued that the nation, a modern, Western, and likely temporary concept, was held together by history and consent.¹ In fact, Renan thought that the nation defined its inheritance by calling attention to the bonds that unite it. Yet, he warned,

... the progress of historical studies often poses a danger.
In fact, historical investigation unearths acts of violence
that occurred at the inception of any political unit, even
those which have had the most beneficial consequences.
Unity is always achieved brutally (Ousby, 2002, p. 206).

Exploration of the early twentieth century history curriculum will enhance understanding of the influence of nationalism on American elementary education.

Fostering national spirit through education was not unique to the twentieth century. Bruce Curtis (2003) explored the concept of nationalism through the efforts to assimilate French Canadians to a British nationality in the 1830s. Even during such an early time period, education in common schools was a robust component of the nationalization process. However, nationalism was not only fostered through the agency

Digging Trenches

of the state. Curtis found that a wide range of practices contributed to national formation. Benedict Anderson argued in his 1993 book, that nationalism can result also from imagination and communication (Anderson, 1993). Yet, Curtis (2003) acknowledged Eugen Weber's import in demonstrating that little progress had been made as late as 1870 in creating national unity. Ardent nationalism and allegiance to the nation-state were in many ways a product of large scale, mandatory public schooling and its corresponding core curriculum. As increased numbers of students attended public schools in the late 1800s and early 1900s (Cremin, 1988, p. 545; Tyack, 1974, p. 66), following the spread of Horace Mann's common school movement, public school history teaching significantly influenced student understanding of the nation in an age that predated radio, television, and internet. What danger did these studies pose? Were many early twentieth century students, the Paul Bäumers, who became soldiers on the battlefields of Europe, taught by Kantoreks - men "convinced they were acting for the best" (Remarque, 1929, p. 12) that "taught that duty to one's country is the greatest thing" (Remarque, 1929, p. 13)? In retrospect, did these teachers misguide their charges? Did such teachers become agents of nationalism through the early twentieth century elementary history curriculum?

The objective of this historical research investigation is to determine the origins of the teaching of elementary history and to examine how nationalism affected the elementary history curriculum at the turn of the twentieth century, prior to World War I. How did learning about national history, civics, geography, culture, community, customs, and biography become part of the elementary curriculum? Who influenced the study of history and social sciences in elementary schools? Was membership on influential education committees or recommended curricula diverse in perspective? Finally, did

Digging Trenches

national curricula contribute to an ideology that led to war? Undoubtedly, study of the past must speak to the present, so this investigation also considers how early twentieth century elementary history curricula compares and contrasts to current elementary history curricula, such as described in the National Standards for History (Nash, 1996) and current elementary social studies methodological practices. Although the primary focus of this study is the elementary history curriculum in the United States as detailed in the first national report, the curriculum of Germany, France, and England is also briefly examined by comparison.

Examination of U.S. elementary history curricula is important because a majority of teenage Americans did not graduate from high school at the turn of twentieth century. Indeed, in 1899-1900 only 6.4% of secondary aged students earned high school diplomas, and in 1909-1910 the percentage had only increased to 8.8% (U.S. Department of Education, Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, Table 103). During this time period, elementary school enrollment vastly outnumbered high school enrollment figures, even when the wider age span and greater number of grades in elementary schools are taken into consideration. For example, in 1909-1910 out of a total of 17.8 million public school students, approximately 16.9 million students were enrolled in grades K-8 whereas only 915 thousand students attended high school (U.S. Department of Education, Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, Table 36; Cremin, 1988, p. 545). Massive immigration swelled the numbers of students in American schools at all levels (Thorton, 1996), but in the early 1900s the vast majority of the American population, which totaled 90.4 million in 1910, only had benefited from elementary education (U.S. Department of Education, Digest of Education Statistics, 2002, Table 36). Many more American

Digging Trenches

students would have learned history in elementary schools rather than secondary schools in the early twentieth century. Throughout the 1900s, the ratio of elementary students to high school students changed significantly as a larger proportion of American students earned high school degrees as the century progressed (Mullen, 1996, p. 19-20). For example, by 1980, out of 40.9 million K-12 public school students, 27.6 million attended elementary school and 13.3 million attended high school (Cremin, 1988, p. 545). Therefore, the impact of the elementary history curricula would be more significant in the early 1900s when most students only attained elementary level education compared to later in the twentieth century when more Americans earned secondary degrees.

Origin of the Committee of Eight (Co8)

In 1905, the American Historical Association (AHA) commissioned the first conference on the teaching of history in American elementary schools. In the late 1800s and early 1900s, the National Education Association (NEA) and the AHA supported efforts to investigate and make recommendations for the teaching of history in secondary schools, however, the teaching of history in U.S. primary grades remained largely unexplored. The report of the Committee of Ten - conference on History, Civil Government and Political Economy at Madison, Wisconsin, and the report of the Committee of Seven, provided careful research about secondary school history teaching in American schools, and these documents served as blueprints for this later investigation of history teaching in elementary schools. The Committee of Seven members employed newly developed social science methods to investigate the status of history instruction. Although methods such as collecting surveys and analyzing statistical data were uncommon forms of historical inquiry at the turn of the twentieth century, they were

Digging Trenches

typical of the work of the new progressive professional social scientists, such as Lester Frank Ward, Florence Kelly, Jane Addams, and Carroll Wright (Ross, 1991). The Co8 employed similar social science methods to research the teaching of history in U.S. elementary schools.

Prior to the late 1800s, several historians assert that history was seldom taught in elementary schools. Indeed, Noah Webster reported at the time of the American Revolution that no history was read in schools; indeed, no abridged history of the United States even existed. Webster developed the first reader to include historical topics (Smith, Palmer and Correia, 1995). Samuel Chester Parker (1912), Dean at the University of Chicago in the early 1910s, reported that by 1880 American history was studied in most grammar schools for patriotic purposes, but that histories of most other countries or regions were omitted. Emma Willard, however, presented a contrasting image of history teaching in the 1800s. Beginning in the 1820s, she advocated the teaching of history and geography at all levels (Nelson, 1987). Hannah Adams (1755-1831) also contradicts the image of non-existent history curricula in the early republic. Adams was a historian who created teaching materials for nation-building and citizenship education for American school children (Schwartz, 2001).

By 1890, a broader conception of history teaching developed (Parker, 1912), particularly due to the influence of the reports of the Committee of Ten and the Committee of Seven, which both adopted more expansive perspectives on history teaching. However, these earlier reports focused primarily on the secondary school teaching of history, and most likely were not as influential on the elementary history curriculum as the Co8 report. Parker credits Herbert Spencer and the Herbartian

Digging Trenches

movement with widening the scope of history education to include sociological study and to help students become interested in larger societal and human concerns when engaged in the study of history.

During the 1890s, a small number of national committees were concerned with elementary education. Indeed, an increase in interest in the teaching of history was evident in the report on elementary education by the Committee of Fifteen, which had been commissioned by the National Education Association (NEA) in 1895. The Committee of Fifteen had recommended lessons in general history and biography throughout the eight years of elementary schooling (Johnson, 1917). The NEA had also commissioned a report on rural schools by the Committee of Twelve which had made suggestions for a program of studies in history that revealed influence from the French educational system. The Committee of Twelve recommended four areas of historical/social science study based upon age. These included: 1) biography, history, and travel (through pictures) for five to seven year old students, 2) current events for seven to nine year old students, 3) readings in U.S. history for nine to eleven year old students, and 4) general history and leading figures for eleven to thirteen year old students (Johnson, 1917). A small, but growing interest in the teaching of elementary history existed in the 1890s.

The benefit of hindsight reveals that the history curriculum recommended by the Co8 was principally nationalistic in focus, despite a broader perspective than the history curricula of earlier eras. In addition, the 1910s elementary history curriculum did not include comprehensive study of other cultures, and with the subsequent onset of war, perhaps elementary students should have been encouraged to study foreign nations. The

Digging Trenches

recommended curriculum remained largely nationalistic in perspective. Patricia Thevenet (1994), who examined the work of the Co8, provided a detailed and broad analysis of the significance of the report, but did not emphasize the limits of a report that recommended studying only American history and neglected the study of world cultures.

Members of the Co8, which included three superintendents, two normal school representatives, one teachers college and two university professors, employed novel techniques of inquiry to study elementary history teaching methods.² These social science methods of investigation were similar to those used by members of the earlier committees. The Co8 sent circulars of inquiry to approximately three hundred superintendents of schools throughout the United States (American Historical Association Records, James to Executive Council of the AHA, n.d., hereafter called AHA records). The committee analyzed the existing condition of elementary history teaching and made recommendations to enhance the teaching of history in primary grades. Suggestions were made for teaching history in first through eighth grades. In addition, committee members spent time observing the work of elementary schools in England, Germany, and France, and made recommendations based upon international comparisons.

The Co8 advanced a plan that increased the number of hours devoted to teaching history that centered on the teaching of American history. These recommendations clearly emphasized U.S. national history. Nonetheless, the committee was convinced that its “grouping of subject matter for the several grades will better serve the purpose of all history teaching in the grades, [and] will awaken a distinct curiosity in the relation of American conditions to the rest of the world” (Co8 report, hereafter called Co8R, 1912, p. xv).

Digging Trenches

The work of the Co8 is historically significant in its impact upon the modern elementary history/social studies curricula. While a growing body of literature has emerged on the history of secondary schools and the teaching of high school history (see e.g., Angus and Mirel, 1999; Dickinson, Gordon and Lee, 2001; Saxe, 1991; Duke, 1995), historical research on the teaching of history in the elementary grades is more limited (see e.g., Lascarides and Hinitz, 2000; Alleman and Rosaen, 1991; Thevenet, 1994; VanSledright, 2002). Knowledge of the historical context in which elementary history education developed will further current understanding of elementary social studies education.

Biographies of the Committee Members

Members of the Co8 were more diverse in professional experience than previous American Historical Association Committees. Archival records reveal that AHA officials, including Andrew McLaughlin, Managing Editor of *The American Historical Review* and Director of the Bureau of Historical Research at the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University Professor and Corresponding Secretary of the AHA, were intentional in selecting a more diverse group (AHA records, McLaughlin to Haskins, January 19, 1905). Members of the earlier Committee of Ten and Committee of Seven largely comprised history professors from established, highly acclaimed, and largely northeastern universities. The Co8 included history professors, as well, but also included individuals with experience in normal schools, teachers colleges, and the professional educational arena.

In 1905, when selection for the Co8 began, AHA officers also intentionally chose individuals from different regions of the United States and sought participation from

Digging Trenches

grade school teachers, as well. While selecting members from various regions of the U.S. at present might not seem progressive, it was in 1905. A northern prejudice against southern education clearly existed at the turn of the last century. The Civil War was only forty years past, and carpetbaggers had reported poor conditions and wanting education in the South. In the antebellum era, southern education was severely under funded and African Americans in the south who sought education faced enormous restrictions. Such educational barriers led academics to perceive southern education to be of lower intellectual quality. Indeed, in recommending Eugene Brooks, from North Carolina, for membership on the committee, J.P. Breedlove wrote to Secretary Haskins,

He is broad-minded, he is able to speak of conditions in Southern Schools, and he will not be a clog on the action of the committee. This is about all you can get out of any Southern man. If I am not much mistaken your committee will not look to the Southern representative for the progressive features of the report..... The best Southern representative would be one who understood the minimum and did not embarrass those who best understood the maximum requirements (AHA Records, February 27, 1905).

In selecting divergent membership, AHA officers had the assistance of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland which earlier had formed a Committee on History Teaching in the Elementary Schools. Of these eleven individuals, two became members of the Co8 (AHA Records, n.d.). When considering other members for the larger national group, Andrew McLaughlin, wrote that he would “almost insist” (AHA Records, McLaughlin to Haskins, January 19, 1905) that Lucy Maynard Salmon serve, but she never participated. Salmon, a history professor at Vassar College from 1887-1927, had written several reports on teaching history in elementary schools, including one for the Committee of Seven (see e.g., Bohan, 2004; Crocco and Davis,

Digging Trenches

1999). McLaughlin and Haskins, however, were successful at gathering quite a broad membership.

The eight members hailed from varied backgrounds. All eight were accomplished in the fields of history and education. For example, the chair of the Co8, James Alton James, a professor of history at Northwestern University, earned a degree in 1884 from the State Normal School in Platteville, Wisconsin, before continuing his studies at the University of Wisconsin and Johns Hopkins University (J. M. Cattell, J. Cattell, & Ross, 1941; Marquis, 1908; Herringshaw, 1910). Henry E. Bourne was Chair of the History Department at Mather College for Women which later became Case Western Reserve. Bourne, who earned degrees from Yale University, had been a teacher and principal in Connecticut schools before entering higher education. At the end of his career he became the managing editor of *The American Historical Review* (J. M. Cattell, J. Cattell, & Ross, 1941). Eugene C. Brooks, the “Southern man”, was a professor of history and the science of education at Trinity College in North Carolina, and later became the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in North Carolina from 1919-1923 before becoming the President of North Carolina State College (Cattell, 1932).

The only female member on the Co8 was Mabel Hill. Hill, who had been educated at Bradford Academy and Radcliffe College, was an instructor of history and civics at the State Normal School in Lowell, Massachusetts (*Who's Who in America*, 1908). Albert Bushnell Hart, a professor of history at Harvard, was Hill's mentor (Thevenet, 1994) and she collaborated with him on one book, *Camps and Firesides* and he edited her first book, *Liberty Documents* (1923). Hill was also the author of books to assist teachers in the classroom, such as *American History in Literature* (with Lane,

Digging Trenches

1905), *Lessons for Junior Citizens* (1906), and *The Teaching of Civics* (1914). Julius Sachs, a graduate of Columbia University for his undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degrees, was the only individual who had been a member of the earlier Committee of Ten (Cattell, 1932). Sachs was a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University but spent much of his career in secondary education as head of “Dr. J. Sachs School for Girls” on West 59th Street in New York City (AHA Records, Sachs to Haskins, February 20, 1905). He also held leadership positions as the President of New York Schoolmaster’s Association, in 1889, and later as President of the Headmaster’s Association in 1899.

Three public school superintendents were represented on the committee (Thevenet, 1994). These three educators were: Wilbur Gordy, the Superintendent of Schools in Springfield, Massachusetts; James Hixon VanSickle, the Superintendent of Schools in Baltimore, Maryland; and the aforementioned southerner, Eugene Brooks. Wilbur Gordy published many books and articles on historical and educational topics throughout his career. The final member of the Co8 was Henry W. Thurston, formerly of Cook County Normal School, who had become the Chief Probation Officer in Chicago (Co8R, 1912). Thurston left teaching at the time the report was written, but shortly thereafter became Superintendent of the Illinois Children’s Home and Aid Society (Thevenet, 1994), and in 1912 he became the head of the Children’s Department of the New York School of Philanthropy (later School of Social Work of Columbia University). Clearly, the membership of the Co8 extended far beyond the “elite” history professor clique, and nearly all members had professional work experience in the American K-12 school system. Members also hailed from different regions of the country: the Northeast,

Digging Trenches

the South, and the Mid-West. All eight members were influential leaders in the sense that by the end of their careers, each published significant books and articles on historical or educational topics (Thevenet, 1994).

The methodology employed by the Co8 members to inquire about the teaching of history in elementary schools was similar to that used by previous committees. In the early 1900s, these social science methods of investigation remained at the forefront of investigatory methods of research. Despite similar methodology to the Committee of Seven, the nature of the Co8 final report was different. First, teachers were consulted on various features of the report through teacher organizations, such as the History Teachers Association of the Middle States and Maryland, the History Teachers Association of the North Central States, the Chicago History Teachers Association, the National Superintendents Association, and the New England History Teachers Association (AHA Records, James to AHA Executive Committee, November 25, 1907). Discussion of findings, recommendations, and curricula were part of the various associations' programs. In addition, a provisional report was distributed to teachers in order to obtain feedback. The Co8 members were aware of the previous criticism of reports and did not want to be accused of hasty preparation, or of "the working out of fine spun theories on the part of college men" (Co8R, 1912, p. ix). In order to eliminate such criticism, the chair of the Committee, James Alton James, noted, "We have striven, in these ways, to get our work before the teachers of history and others interested in the subject" (AHA Records, James to AHA Executive Committee, November 25, 1907). The Committee included members of the education profession who were currently working in schools districts, and sought input from real teachers in real classrooms. Chairman James wrote,

Digging Trenches

“Before final publication, we want to place the work in the hands of actual teachers for trial” (AHA Records, James to Haskins, November 24, 1906). During the course of four years, the committee met on several occasions in locales such as Providence, Rhode Island and New York City with its final meeting in New York City in May 1907 (AHA Records, James to Haskins, May 28, 1907). Subsequently, the report was written and then finally printed in 1909, and published as a book in 1912.

European Comparisons

Similar to the Report of the Committee of Seven, some members of the Co8 also spent time in foreign countries in order to observe the methods of teaching elementary school history outside of the United States. In general, American educators at the turn of the past century perceived that certain European countries had more fully developed educational systems, which could serve as role models for U.S. schools. In 1917 Henry Johnson of Teachers College wrote, “The history programs of continental Europe are, as a rule, more skillfully organized than the history programs of the United States, and leave more connected impressions of history” (p. 156). Yet, in many European countries a stronger centralized authority prevailed in the school systems especially when compared with the decentralized system in the United States. Therefore, American educators faced challenges when employing European models in U.S. schools.

Nonetheless, members of the Co8 researched the elementary history programs of England, Germany, and France. These three western European countries were selected, not only because of close political ties to the American government, but because their status as strong nation-states meant their school systems were highly developed. For example, Bismark, the Iron Chancellor of Germany in the mid-late 1800s, had unified the

Digging Trenches

German federation and centralized the government, including the school system (Ryder, 1973). Although the German nation was “adolescent” when compared to France and England, its school system was decidedly well-regarded, and in higher education served as a model for the first American research universities established in the late 1800s such as Johns Hopkins and Cornell University. Primary schools, known as *grundschule*, and elite secondary schools, known as *gymnasium*, served as models for committee members (Eurydice-Informationsstelle der Länder, 2001/2).

When describing the German system, the committee report noted that historical study typically began in the fourth school year in Germany. The German curriculum was confined to biography and national history, but was also closely correlated with geography. The report noted that, “the predominance of the national in both geography and history is a marked characteristic” (Co8R, 1912, p. 127). Indeed, members added that recent changes in the history curriculum in Germany indicated that, “the purpose of the government [was] to use history and to forward in a direct manner the making of patriotic citizens” (Co8R, 1912, p. 129). Many of the German students observed in the investigation for the Co8 likely became the soldiers who fought in the German Army during World War I (see, MacMillan, 2002).

A pronounced fostering of national spirit was evident in the German history curricula. A typical student in Leipzig studied “The History of Leipzig” in the third year, “The History of Saxony” in the fourth year, “Leading Points in the History of Germany” in the fifth year, “Selections of Greek, Roman and Assyrian History and Old German History to Charlemagne” in the sixth year, “History of the Thirty Years War” in the seventh year, and “History of Brandenburg and Germany History to the Present” in the

Digging Trenches

eighth year (Co8R, 1912, p. 128). German teachers relied primarily on oral teaching methods and pictures to tell the narrative of German history. In the lower grades, textbooks apparently were used rarely. Typically, the teacher would speak for a few minutes, and then would question students about the material presented. Although the Committee members described schools in Leipzig, such narrowly focused historical study was typical of the elementary history curriculum at many schools throughout Germany. For example, at Lessing Hauses, as war broke out in 1914, students studied the history and geography of the war from the German perspective (Chronik 1903-1998 des Lessing Hauses, 2004). One might expect that students learned basic German history after five consecutive years of studying the subject in elementary schools.

The curricula in France followed similar patterns of nation study as in Germany. Indeed, the use of patriotic history was advocated by Fustel de Coulanges and was “disseminated by the Third Republic through its official iconography and its educational system” (Ousby, 2002, p. 206). In France, the focus of study in the second through fifth years was national French history and biography. The sixth, seventh, and eighth years, however, provided a bit broader curricula than the German counterpart, as students examined the Middle Ages, modern times, and contemporary times until 1789 (Co8R, 1912). Nonetheless, a terminus of 1789 reveals that the course focused on the French nation, as well, as 1789 is the well-known start of the French Revolution.

The English elementary history curricula, while also advocating the study of national history, was clearly the most liberal in perspective of these three European nations. In England at the time, a unified national curriculum did not exist, so members only reported on the elementary history curriculum recommended by the London Board

Digging Trenches

of Education in 1908 (Co8R, 1912). The London elementary history curriculum for English students ages six to twelve years old consisted of stories on a range of topics such as: Alexander the Great, Roman history, Charlemagne, St. Francis of Assisi, Columbus, Galileo, Washington, Garibaldi, and, naturally, British Isle history. Yet, the history curriculum for slightly older students ages twelve to sixteen, took on a greater nationalistic perspective, with a three year course of study devoted solely to the whole of English history. An English textbook on the teaching of History in Elementary schools published a few years later, revealed similar nationalistic foci, as time periods studied included: the British and Roman Period, the Middle Ages, the Tudor Period, and the Stuart Period (Archer, Owen, and Chapman, 1916). The authors, Archer, Owen, and Chapman (1916) claimed that the study of history was important for 1) broadening outlook and 2) helping to form pupils' views on present day questions. Yet, a broadened outlook clearly meant a study of the great accomplishments of Western society. Archer, Owen, and Chapman (1916) noted,

We need not discuss the case of states which have contributed little to general progress or of those which have been left in a backwater. Citizens of the great states of the West can feel that their countries have ideals to impart to mankind, and that the welfare of each man's own nation is the means by which he can best further the welfare of the world. Patriotism will be as real with us as with an Athenian or a Roman, though the realization of progress will modify its character (p. 6).

The nationalism, in varying degrees, of the elementary history curricula in Germany, England, and France, must have influenced members of the Co8. Like their foreign counterparts, members of the Co8 recommended an elementary history curriculum that focused largely on the American nation. Even when the history of other

Digging Trenches

nations was explored, it was with an eye towards its relevance to the United States. For example, Greek history was studied because its ancient democratic form of government served as an antecedent of American democracy.

Recommendations of the Co8

The report of the Co8 recommended a program in history for every year of elementary school. Since two-thirds of the typical American schools implemented such a program, the report did not argue the merits of a comprehensive program in elementary history (Co8R, 1912, p. ix). The widespread acceptance of history in the school curriculum differed from earlier reports where committee members had to justify a thorough history program. Despite increased attention to historical study as the century progressed, history programs varied widely in content and sequence throughout the nation. Committee members, with the support of teachers and teacher organizations, believed it important to make recommendations for a comprehensive, standard elementary history curriculum (Thevenet, 1994).

The aim of the Co8 curriculum was to focus on American history, in order for students to understand American civilization, institutions, traditions, and current events. A primary aim of teaching history, according to the report, was for students to understand “the various fields of human activity” (Co8R, 1912, p. x). Such phrasing connotes a broader interpretation of history than one confined to strictly military and political events and figures. Indeed, understanding American history included knowledge of European people before they crossed the Atlantic. Each grade level had specific topics of study in order to avoid repetition and dullness. Yet, other nations’ histories were important only in terms of how they related to American history. As such, the curriculum was

Digging Trenches

noticeably nationalistic, and only included Western heritage at particular points relevant to the unfolding story of the developing American nation.

Early Elementary Grades

Several aspects of the committee's early twentieth century history curriculum (see chart at end of manuscript) share common traits with more current history curricula, such as *The National Standards for History* (1996). Of course, the historical context during which each report was created varied considerably, and there are noteworthy differences in curricula recommendations between past and present. The recent *National Standards for History (NSH)* includes an entire section on peoples and cultures around the world in the standards for K-4 history. Similarities and differences also extend to contemporary elementary classroom practices. For example, the Co8 placed an emphasis on learning about holiday traditions, what social studies educators today refer to as the "holiday curriculum" (Seefeldt, 2005; Chapin & Messick, 1999).

The specific history curriculum recommended by the Co8 for the first grade included the study of Native Americans, in order to foster an understanding of "primitive life" and the study of public holidays (Co8R, 1912, p. 1-5). The attention to Native Americans in the early grades was extensive, but tended to provide a romanticized view of Indians as "noble savages", and native culture received almost no attention in later grades. In comparison, *NSH* expected students to "draw upon data in paintings, artifacts, to hypothesize" about Native American culture, to use "legends and myths" to read "historical narratives imaginatively" (Nash, 1996, p. 29). The Co8 report recommended Thanksgiving as topic of study as this event incorporated both foci of the first grade history curriculum - Native Americans and holidays. Washington's birthday and local

Digging Trenches

history were also recommended areas of study. In the second grade, the center of historical study remained primitive life and public holidays.

Holidays and Native Americans as areas of study are similar to social studies topics common in current early childhood classrooms across the United States. *The National Standards for History* includes holidays, such as, Martin Luther King's birthday, Presidents' Day, Memorial Day, the Fourth of July, Labor Day, Veterans Day, and Thanksgiving in the K-4 curricula. In contrast to the Co8 report, this more recent history curriculum emphasized several days that celebrate "democratic values and principles," in order to help students understand the influence of ideas (Nash, 1996, p. 33).

In practice, the holiday curriculum has several weaknesses. It has been criticized for promoting superficial understanding of cultural heritage, rather than fostering in-depth thinking and problem solving skills. Furthermore, this curriculum is viewed as stereotypic and sterile in content (Seefeldt, 2005; Chapin & Messick, 1999). It is not surprising that Wendy Hood (1994) in her article "'Did They Know He Had Slaves When They Elected Him?' Young Children Can Ask Powerful Questions," found that her students held several misconceptions about Native Americans, such as they lived in the past, not the present, and Native Americans all lived in teepees. Indeed, concepts of time remain challenging for young students to comprehend, even older elementary students struggle with notions of time and space.³ Studying about American Indians at the first Thanksgiving, and participating in staged "Pow-wows" is typical of the Co8 curriculum as well as current social studies curricula practices. Because social studies curricula typically promote commonly celebrated American holidays, they also foster national

Digging Trenches

identity and pride, but frequently do not promote comprehensive understanding of other cultures and holidays that are celebrated in various parts of the world. Current elementary history curricula ought to facilitate student understanding of time and space, comprehension of nation and world, and ought not to reinforce stereotypical or romanticized notions about people, places, and events.

The Co8 report furthered national identity and pride in the recommendation that biographical study of heroes should be introduced in third grade. Individuals studied included men from Ancient Greece, Ancient Rome, and the Middle Ages, such as Ulysses, Alexander, and Canute. The study of heroes had the potential to promote nationalism, as superficial examination of individuals ‘who made the nation great’ without attention to human frailties and flaws can lead to misconceptions about the nation-state. In the section “The History of Peoples on Many Cultures Around the World,” *The National Standards for History* suggested students study a wide range of early explorers, such as Marco Polo, Zheng He, Eric the Red, and Christopher Columbus (Nash, 1996, p. 37). In *NSH* U. S. History K-4 section, studying important historical figures is recommended, although specific individuals such as George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Martin Luther King, Jr. are not listed. These omissions and other aspects of the *NSH* were a source of tremendous controversy (Nash, 2000). *NSH* also proposed that students learn to identify “ordinary people who have believed in fundamental democratic values (Nash, 1996, p. 32). Many national, state, and local elementary social studies curricula suggest the introduction of biography and the study of heroes in third grade, and several social studies educators have suggested methods for the thoughtful study of character traits of prominent and ordinary citizens (see, Parker, 2001;

Digging Trenches

Grant and VanSledright, 2001). Recent attention to women's history has made female leaders such as Clara Barton, Betsy Ross, Sacagawea, Harriet Tubman, Eleanor Roosevelt, Wilma Rudolph, and Sandra Day O'Connor popular choices of study among elementary-aged girls. Of course, it remains common for young boys to select contemporary sports figures.⁴ Biographical studies in elementary classrooms remained popular over the course of the twentieth century and likely their popularity extends much further in the past and will continue in the future. In addition to biographical research and continuing the study of Indians from first and second grade, the Co8 report suggested that third grade students learn about Columbus and events and symbols connected to American Independence.

Promotion of national identity and pride continued in the fourth and fifth grade as the committee recommended studies devoted to learning about "Historical Scenes and Persons in American History" (AHA Records, Provisional Report on A Course of Study in History). The curriculum was entirely focused on the development and growth of the American nation. Suggested studies included American explorers; local pioneers; George Washington; Benjamin Franklin; Revolutionary heroes; the Revolution; the New Republic; Westward expansion of the New Republic; Webster, Clay and Calhoun; the Civil War; and Industries. The entire elementary curriculum recommended by the Co8 advanced understanding of the American nation, perhaps at the expense of learning about other nations, cultures, and people. Exclusive study of the American nation had serious implications. The recommended curriculum for the middle grades did not deviate from undivided attention to the American nation.

Middle School Grades

Digging Trenches

The promotion of nationalism in the Co8 curriculum for the sixth, seventh, and eighth grade was developed in greater detail than the outline for grades one through five. Indeed, the inclusion of curriculum for the earlier grades was added later, as the initial draft of the report only included grades six, seven, and eight. In fact the early draft was titled, “Provisional Report on a Course of Study in History,” rather than the final title, “The Study of History in Elementary Schools.” In addition to writing curricula for the lower grades, the final report had a more nationalistic tone than the provisional report. Perhaps the slight change in tone resulted from the teacher suggestions and criticisms that the Co8 sought. Indeed, the cover of the provisional draft stated that Chairman, Professor J.A. James would be glad to receive suggestions and criticisms, which could be mailed to him at his address. The introductory note of the provisional report stated,

...if American history is to be the principal subject of study in the elementary school, we must take this history in no narrow sense... One of the most important duties of the teacher is to put the national history into its place in the history of the world... (AHA Records, Provisional Report on a Course of Study in History, p. 1).

Yet, the final report emphasized the importance of American national history to a much greater extent, and did not stress America’s place in the history of the world. Indeed, American history included the study of peoples before they crossed the Atlantic, but their relevance was determined by how they affected the course of American history. The final report warned that teachers should not “content themselves with the ordinary commonplace about the brevity of American history, unless they are careless of the very object of giving instruction in the subject” (Co8R, 1912, p. xi).

Despite the more nation centered purpose, much of the outline for sixth, seventh, and eighth grade curricula in the final published version did not differ significantly from

Digging Trenches

the provisional report. In sixth grade, teachers were given introductory exercises to impress upon students the European origins of American citizens. Topics of study included: 1) Where Americans Came From 2) When America Was Unknown 3) What Americans Started With 4) Geographic Conditions in Greece, in Rome, during the Middle Ages, and on the Trade Routes between East and West 5) Columbus 6) Successors of Columbus and 7) Conquest and Colonization (Co8R, 1912; AHA Records, Provisional Report on a Course of Study in History). A Eurocentric focus on America's origins dominated the Co8 curriculum for sixth grade. For example, in topic two, students studied a map of the world from the beginning of the Christian era that showed most people living around the Mediterranean (Co8R, 1912, p. 24). In topic three, students learned about recent inventions such as the telephone, as well as ancient inventions "made before Columbus discovered America" (Co8R, 1912, p. 25) such as movable type, the compass, and gunpowder. The compass and gunpowder are Chinese inventions (Williams, 1996), but China is not mentioned in this section.

The last two years of the Co8 curriculum focused exclusive attention on the American nation. The seventh grade course of study began with concentration on the exploration and settlement of North America, and the growth of the colonies until the French and Indian War. Students learned about the first settlements of English, Dutch, and French, the first exiles for political and religious causes, such as the Pilgrims and the Puritans, colonial rivalries and conflict in Europe and America, growth from colonies to commonwealth, colonial government, colonial grievances, the opening of the Revolutionary War, the alliance with France, difficulties of the struggle, the close of the

Digging Trenches

Revolutionary War, and England after the Revolution (Co8R, 1912; AHA Records, Provisional Report on a Course of Study in History).

Students continued to focus on the American nation in the last year of elementary history. The eighth grade course of study followed an outline typical of current American history curricula. Topics included the New Republic, the Constitution, the New Government, the War of 1812, Jacksonian Democracy, War with Mexico, Expansion and how it made the Slavery Question dominant, Civil War, Problems of the Restoration of Peace, the New Union and the Larger Europe, and Industrial and Social Problems of the Republic (Co8R, 1912; AHA Records, Provisional Report on a Course of Study in History). Chronological sequencing of historical events in the Co8 report provided the overarching guiding principle for the course outline of study in history. Chronological ordering remains the dominant framework in history curricula and courses today. For example, the *NHS* for grades 5-12 divided U.S. history into ten eras. In the *NHS* curriculum, students begin the study of America with an examination of “Three Worlds Meet” that illuminates American beginnings until 1620, followed by topics such as colonization, Revolution, expansion, Civil War, industrialization, modern America, the Great Depression, World War II, and postwar America. *NHS* concluded with a study of “Contemporary United States” that focused on 1968 to the present. Chronological ordering is a convenient way to organize history curricula. Teachers, however, are challenged by the fact that as time proceeds, historical topics are added but the time allotted to historical study in the school year remains the same.

Teacher Preparation and Civics Curriculum

Digging Trenches

The recommendations for teacher preparation and the inclusion of civics in the curriculum advanced nationalist sentiment, as well. The report discussed the preparation of the elementary history teacher and aimed for teachers to be knowledgeable in the field of American history. Noting that young students lacked conceptions of the sequence of time and locality, the committee suggested that teachers emphasize storytelling through picturesque presentations and ignore details of time and locality. Comprehending time, chronological sequence, and spatial awareness, often pose difficulties for young elementary students, however, the National Council for the Social Studies notes that a primary purpose of social studies education is for teachers to help students develop these understandings (NCSS, 1988).

The report (1912) noted that teachers ought to appeal to imagination and that normal schools should train teachers to develop speaking and questioning skills. The report suggested, “the language should be simple, vivid, and colorful, with the distinct aim of making the past live again in the heart and head of the child” (1912, p. 98). The committee also suggested that an oral emphasis in grades one through five is best, which is a contrast from current history curricula foci that stress reading and writing. Reading and writing skills can be measured on standardized tests, but students’ verbal abilities are much less frequently encouraged and evaluated, especially with respect to elementary history and social studies content.

The report (1912) made several other recommendations for the elementary history teacher. The committee unabashedly stated that, “Not every primary teacher ought to be urged, or permitted, to teach history” (Co8R, 1912, p. 94). Teachers who possess no interest in history should not teach the subject. The committee recommended that there

Digging Trenches

be two different examinations for elementary teachers. One test should be given for the four lower grades, and a second examination should be given for the later elementary grades, in particular subjects. This 1909 proposal for a two tier elementary teacher examination system was novel. It predated changes in elementary teacher certification, and the development of middle school as a certification area, that many states adopted much later. The reason for the Co8's proposed change in elementary teacher certification arose from the concern that teachers have greater knowledge of the discipline of history than pupils. Nonetheless, the committee cautioned that successful teaching also "calls for sympathetic insight into the needs, interests, capacities, and knowledge of the learner" (Co8R, 1912, p. 96).

In discussing the preparation of the elementary teacher, the committee noted that students in the last two years of grammar school should have the benefit of a textbook, and that historical study should not be confined to only one textbook. Such progressive recommendations were similar to those made by the earlier Committee of Ten and Committee of Seven. Furthermore, students were to be asked questions that provoked thought rather than simple memorization of indiscriminate details (Co8R, 1912). For example, students were to be given the opportunity to make comparisons. Teachers could ask questions such as, "In what respects were the Pilgrims and Puritans alike and in what respect were they different? What was the difference between the American and English point of view of colonial taxation just before the outbreak of the American Revolution? What good and bad results came from the invention of the cotton gin?" (Co8R, 1912, p. 102). The report also noted that only important dates were to be selected, and quality of materials was preferred over quantity. The recommendation that

Digging Trenches

students did not need to memorize all dates was progressive. The report stated, “it is by no means worth while to know the exact date of any but the most significant events,” (Co8R, 1912, p. 104). Only important dates, such as 1492, 1588, 1689, and 1789 were selected because exact dates did not help students reason about the facts of history.

The report also included a section on the teaching of elementary civics. By including civics in the curriculum, the committee demonstrated the increased importance of the various social science disciplines. The recommendation for elementary civics lessons predated the establishment of the National Council for the Social Studies, and revealed the enhanced relevance of civic education and national identity in a growing country of immigrants. Noting that “civics should permeate the entire school life of the child,” the committee (1912) recommended specific time allotments for the teaching of civics (AHA Records, James to AHA Executive Committee, n.d.). Indeed, civics was deemed so significant that the authors noted, “good citizenship must be the religion of our common schools” (Co8R, 1912, p. 121).

Criticism of the Report

The report of the Co8 received critical attention, particularly in historical associations and teacher organizations throughout the United States. Despite controversy over publication evidenced in earlier archival records (AHA Records, James to Haskins, May 28, 1907), Scribner’s published the final report in 1912 as a book. None of the contemporaneous criticism of the report critiqued the nationalistic curriculum outlined by the committee. Because world attention was soon diverted towards war in Europe, perhaps the report did not seem to have as immediate and powerful an influence as the work of the earlier Committee of Ten and the Committee of Seven. Indeed, the limited

Digging Trenches

reception and discussion of the work of the Co8 as evidenced in the first nine volumes of *The History Teacher's Magazine* which became *The Historical Outlook* in 1918 when it came under editorship of the National Board for Historic Service (NBHS), may also be due to the fact that the report concerned elementary students, rather than secondary school students (McKinley, 1918). Clearly reading, writing, and arithmetic remained the focus of much elementary education, and social studies or history education retained secondary status in the curriculum. Historically, a common characteristic of the grade school curriculum has been an emphasis on the “3 Rs” – the fundamentals. Another diversion from the elementary history curriculum was mounting consideration for a curriculum that emphasized vital present day problems rather than historical studies (Johnson, 1917). History became increasingly viewed as relevant only in its relationship to current issues and problems. A thrust for a curriculum that seriously emphasized social sciences was burgeoning. By 1916, inclusion of the social sciences was evident in the NEA report of the Committee on the Social Studies in Secondary Education which included recommendations for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. In addition, the turn of the century also witnessed the beginning of the junior high school movement, which considered these “middle” grade levels as distinct from elementary and secondary levels.

The report of the Co8 confronted other challenges, as it was viewed by some “competent judges” as disappointing (Gambrill, 1912, p. 30-32). Critics noted that the introduction was rambling and uninspiring, the section on teacher training disorganized, and the treatment of practices in foreign countries was considered brief and in particular aspects of questionable accuracy. Despite these seeming flaws, and criticism that the course of study was “too heavy” especially for rural communities where it might not be

Digging Trenches

possible to find an elementary teacher well versed in historical studies, there were several meritorious features of the Co8 report. Indeed, one reviewer noted,

It presents for the first time in this country, a complete and co-ordinated course of study in history for the elementary schools, and it is the product of four years of intelligent and presumably painstaking study by a Co8 competent scholars and educators (Gambrill, 1912, p. 32).

Henry Johnson (1917), Professor of History at Teachers College, Columbia University, remarked that a beneficial aspect of the report of the Co8 was due to the fact members sought precedents in actual classroom practice, and the suggested changes led to revisions and improvements in textbooks. Criticism of the report did not note the striking nationalism of the course of study. In fact, reviewers noted that the plan of “focusing the course around American history is fundamentally sound” (Gambrill, 1912, p. 31). Another reviewer noted that teacher preparation in normal schools would have to require far more attention to courses in history than was currently practiced (Pray, 1912).

The American Historical Association archival records indicate that a minor controversy followed the publication of the Co8 report that would not have been noted in journals, such as the *The History Teacher's Magazine*. A letter from James A. Woodburn of Indiana University accused the report of disparaging a textbook that he co-wrote with T. F. Moran of Purdue University (AHA Records, Woodburn to Haskins, December 18, 1909). Furthermore, Woodburn charged committee members of furthering their own interests in recommending several other books, including some they had authored themselves, and condemning his textbook on Civil Government and United States History. Woodburn's letter prompted a reply from Albert Bushnell Hart, who was President of the American Historical Association in 1909 (AHA Records, Bowen to

Digging Trenches

Haskins, November 15, 1909). Hart defended the work of the Co8 generally, stating that he “would not believe without the most positive evidence that the chairman of that Committee, or any member of it, has been influenced by a desire to push one set of textbooks above another, or by personal hostility to you – and your letter suggests both motives” (AHA Records, Hart to Woodburn, December 21, 1909). Woodburn’s accusations highlight problems that occur when curriculum committees recommend textbooks – problems that also happen in states with textbook adoption committees. Supporting certain textbooks and omitting others impacts collective memory by affecting whose history is recounted and whose history is neglected. The Woodburn controversy also brings to light the “objectivity question” in historical scholarship (Novick, 1988). Is objective truth about the past possible and can it be taught to students? Or are historical narratives told from the biased perspective of a particular author?

Other criticism of the work of the Co8 was directed at the suggested course of study, but not the nationalistic focus. The diversity of membership on the committee was not lauded, and the committee’s emphasis on a practical course of study, rather than a “visionary” or “ideal” plan, appeared to result in a “mediocre product” (Gambrill, 1912, p. 31-31). Despite these noteworthy criticisms, the Co8 report influenced the elementary history curriculum perhaps more than the report’s contemporary critics could have realized. Many of the students who learned exclusively about the history of their own country, and who exhibited patriotic pride, later may have become the soldiers who fought in World War I – the Paul Bäumers in *All Quiet on the Western Front*.

Other Analyses of Nationalism in Elementary History Curriculum

Digging Trenches

The Report of the Co8 was not the only evidence of increasing nationalism in the elementary history curriculum. Once American entry into the war occurred in 1917, the government increased efforts to mobilize support for the war through education (Todd, 1945). The National Board for Historic Service and the Division of Civic and Educational Publications of the Committee on Public Information (CPI, commonly known as the Creel Committee) both relied on university history professors to support war propaganda (Gruber, 1975). Carol Gruber notes that an important relationship existed between the NBHS and the American Historical Association (AHA), and a critical reason for historians' strong interest in public war service was to provide the subject matter of history a sense of contemporary relevance. In the late 1890s the Committee of Seven, which had met to revise the secondary history curriculum, expressed the utilitarian desire to help students and teachers recognize how historical studies related to present issues (see, Dickinson, Gordon, and Lee, 2001; Bohan, 2003). In order to achieve such a goal, the NBHS sought to revise the secondary and elementary history curriculum to make it more relevant to the war (Gruber, 1975; Todd, 1945). The NBHS affected the history curriculum through several avenues that included revising curricula, arranging for speakers on the war at summer institutes for teachers, sponsoring essay contests on why America was at war, encouraging the preservation of source material related to the war, and providing published material on the war (Gruber, 1975).

The NBHS sought curriculum revision that fostered nationalistic and patriotic sentiment. In late 1917, the NBHS requested that professor J. Montgomery Gambrill, professor of history at Teachers College, Columbia University, develop a history curriculum on the war for use by elementary school teachers. Gambrill created a syllabus

Digging Trenches

that called awareness to world issues, and which noted the problems created by nationalism and imperialism (Todd, 1945). He believed that nationalism and imperialism fostered narrow perspectives and ought to be replaced by larger concepts of world order. Gambrell's syllabus was rejected by the NBHS on the grounds that the "untrained teacher" might be misled and not see the positive aspects of nationalism and imperialism. Indeed, a teacher,

might see only the disastrous effects of unbridled nationalism and imperialism in which all the belligerents had been engaged instead of seeing the war, as it was being portrayed officially, as a conflict between autocracy and liberal democracy (Todd, 1945, p. 57 and Gruber, 1975, p. 131).

In place of Gambrell's syllabus, the NBHS printed a leaflet on the war for the elementary grades which provided for systematic instruction in patriotism, heroism, and sacrifice. The NBHS war curriculum encouraged children to engage in a series of activities to help the war effort, such as "1) Eat less of the things soldiers and people of the allied countries need. 2) Be careful of health. Doctors and nurses are needed just now for more important work than curing children's ailments that are a result of carelessness. 3) Be careful of shoes and clothes. We need all the cloth and leather we can spare for the soldiers. 4) Save labor by not giving people extra work. 5) Try to be better boys and girls, so that older folks will not be troubled or worried about you and so can work harder" (Todd, 1945, p. 58-61, citing Colomb, Gerson, and McKinley, 1918).

Other groups criticized the zealous nationalism of the history curriculum, especially pacifists such as Fannie Fern Andrews (Weber, 1997) and Lucy Salmon (Bohan, 2004), and organizations such as the National Council for the Prevention of War (NCPW). Andrews served as secretary of the American School Peace League (1908-

Digging Trenches

1939) which “pioneered the concept of educating for international citizenship into the elementary grades,” through a variety of methods, such as Peace Day celebrations, peace essay contests, and the publication of two elementary textbooks (Weber, 1997, p. iii). In the 1920s, the NCPW conducted an analysis of the textbooks which demonstrated that the history curriculum in every country had helped to spawn the war. The Co8 and many historians who worked for the NBHS did not recognize the consequences of solely nationalistic historical study. American entry into World War I and fear of being considered un-patriotic led to the demise of pacifist movements such as the American School Peace League (Weber, 1997).

Clearly, nationalism was a potent force in the elementary history curriculum in the early 1900s. A critical manner of encouraging allegiance to the nation-state was through the school curriculum, and especially the history curriculum. Teachers, as agents of the curriculum, fostered nationalism if they implemented the Co8 recommendations, simply because attention to other countries and global concerns were omitted from the curriculum. Indeed, the Co8 report recommended the exclusive study of the development of the America nation. In the early 1900s, the elementary history curriculum was critical in developing popular understanding of the American nation, people, and history. During this time period, most Americans attended elementary school and then left formal schooling to enter the world of work and family. Therefore, the elementary history curriculum was important because of its widespread impact, yet it is largely unexplored. By the time American entry into World War I began, a syllabus that recommended student examination of world history or global issues was viewed as unpatriotic and counter productive to the war effort. Myopia and isolationism have consequences.

Digging Trenches

Vestiges of the elementary history curriculum recommended by the Co8 are evident in current elementary history curricula and educational practices, despite criticism of the report in the 1910s, and the ultimate relative obscurity of the committee's work. More recent history curricula, such as *NSH* broadened the focus of elementary history to include the study of people from around the world, but *NSH* was a highly controversial document (Nash, 2000). Nash observed that the more recent debate over the history standards was "an expression of a country's historical image of itself and the intertwinings of public memory with national purpose" (2000, p. xvi). The same observation is true of the Co8 report.

Despite the evident nationalism in the elementary history curriculum of the early 1900s much of the practical outline of the course of study outlined by the Co8 is evidenced in current elementary social studies curriculum. Lessons about the First Thanksgiving, Native Americans, Christopher Columbus, the Founding Fathers, the Revolutionary War, and other American heroes abound in today's elementary classroom. Sometimes written curricula spark controversy. Whether the curriculum document is one hundred years old, or a more recent creation, such curricula ought to be treated as "artifacts of the particular times in which they were written, as social constructions of the national or human past that must necessarily reflect prevailing political attitudes and cultural values and be susceptible to challenge from competing versions of the collective memory" (Nash, 2000, p. xix-xx). The report of the Co8 which recommended an elementary history curriculum that focused on the study of the American nation in grades one through eight reflected an era when nationalist sentiment was burgeoning.

Co8 Recommended Elementary History Curriculum

Grade Level	Topic of Study
1	Native Americans and public holidays
2	Native Americans and public holidays
3	Biographical study of heroes and American Independence
4	Historical Scenes and persons in American history; Growth and development of the American nation
5	Historical Scenes and persons in American history; Growth and development of the American nation
6	European origins of American citizens
7	American nation; Exploration to the Revolutionary War
8	American nation; New Republic to the Industrial Age

References

- Alleman, J. & Rosaen, C. (1991). The cognitive, social-emotional, and moral development characteristics of students: Basis for elementary and middle school social studies. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp.121-133). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- American Historical Association, (1912). *The study of history in the elementary schools, Report of the Co8*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- American Historical Association, (1900-1920). *Records of the American Historical Association, Co8*. Library of Congress, Container 460.
- Anderson, B. (1993). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of Nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.

Digging Trenches

Angus, D., & Mirel, J. (1999). *The failed promise of the American high school, 1890-1995*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Anon. (2004). Chronik 1903-1998 des Lessing Hauses. Retrieved June 12, 2004 at <http://www.lessgym-kamenz.de/6-fakten/1-chronik/lessin>.

Archer, R.L., Owen, L.V.D., & Chapman, A.E. (1916). *The teaching of history in elementary schools*. London, UK: A. & C. Black, Ltd.

Bohan, C. (2004). *Go to the sources: Lucy Maynard Salmon and the teaching of history*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Bohan, C. (2003). Early vanguards of progressive education: The committee of ten, the committee of seven, and social education. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 19, 73-94.

Bohan, C. (1999). Lucy Maynard Salmon: Progressive historian, teacher, and democrat. In M.S. Crocco & O.L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.), *'Bending the future to their will': Civic women, social education, and democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Cattell, J.M., Cattell, J., & Ross, E.E. eds. (1941). *Leaders in education: A biographical directory*. Lancaster, PA: The Science Press.

Cattell, J.M. (1932). *Leaders in education: A biographical directory*. Lancaster, PA: The Science Press.

Chapin, J., & Messick, R. (1999). *Elementary social studies*. New York, NY: Longman.

Cremin, L. (1988). *American education: The metropolitan experience 1876-1980*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Curtis, B. (2003). State of the nation or community of spirit? Schooling for civic and ethnic-religious nationalism in insurrectionary Canada. *History of Education*

Digging Trenches

- Quarterly* 43, 325-349.
- Dickinson, A., Gordon, P., & Lee, P. eds. (2001). *Raising standards in history education, International review of history education, Vol. 3*. London, UK: Woburn Press.
- Duke, D. (1995). *The school that refused to die*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Eurydice-Informationsstelle der Länder. (2001/2002). The education system in Germany. Retrieved June 12, 2004 at <http://www.eurydice.org/Eurybase/Application/contents.asp?chapter=2>.
- Gambrill, J. M. (1912). History in elementary schools: Shall the course of study recommended by the Co8 be adopted in the elementary schools? *History Teacher's Magazine*, 3, 30-32.
- Gilbert, F. (1984). *The end of the European Era, 1890 to the present*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Gilbert, M. (1994). *The First World War: A complete history*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Grant, S.G. & VanSledright, B. (2001). *Constructing a powerful approach to teaching And learning in elementary social studies*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Gruber, C. (1975). *Mars and Minerva: World War I and the uses of higher learning in America*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Heringshaw, T.W. (1914). *Heringshaw's national library of American biography, 1909-1914*. Chicago, IL: Heringshaw & Co.
- Hill, M. (1923). *Liberty documents*. New York, NY: Longmans, Green & Co.

Digging Trenches

- Hood, W. (1994). 'Did they know he had slaves when they elected him?' Young children can ask powerful questions. In S. Steffey & W. Hood (Eds.) *If this is Social Studies, Why Isn't it Boring?* (pp. 107-120). York, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Johnson, H. (1917). *Teaching of history in elementary and secondary schools*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Co.
- Joll, J. (1984). *The origins of the First World War*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Keegan, J. (1998). *The First World War*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Lascarides, C.V., & Hinitz, B. (2000). *History of early childhood education*. New York, NY: Falmer Press.
- Lane, M., & Hill, M. (1905). *American history in literature*. New York, NY: Ginn & Co.
- MacMillan, M. (2002). *Paris 1919*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Marquis, A. (1908). *Who's Who in America*. Chicago, IL: A. N. Marquis & Co.
- McKinley, A. (1918). A new title. *Historical Outlook*, 9, 378.
- Mullen, A. D. (1996). *Clio's uncertain guardians: History education at Teachers College, Columbia University, 1906-1988* (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University).
- Nash, G. Crabtree, C. and Dunn, R. (2000). *History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past*. New York: Vintage.
- Nash, G. and Crabtree, C. (1996). *National standards for history*. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for History in the Schools.

Digging Trenches

- National Council for the Social Studies. (1988). *Social studies for the early childhood/elementary social studies*. Retrieved June 11, 2004 from <http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/elementary.shtml>.
- Nelson, M. (1987). Emma Willard: Pioneer in social studies education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 15, 245-256.
- Novick, P. (1988). *That noble dream: The "objectivity question" and the American historical profession*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ousby, I. (2002). *The road to Verdun: World War I's most momentous battle and the folly of nationalism*. New York, NY: Anchor Books.
- Parker, S. C. (1912). *A textbook in the history of modern elementary education*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Co.
- Parker, W. (2001). *Social studies in elementary education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, Prentice Hall.
- Pray, C.E. (1912). History in normal schools: How shall professional schools prepare their pupil to teach in accordance with the Report of the Co8? *History Teacher's Magazine*, 3, 54-56.
- Remarque, E. M. (1929). *All quiet on the western front*. New York, NY: Fawcett Books.
- Ross, D. (1991). *The origins of American social science*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryder, A.J. (1973). *Twentieth-century Germany from Bismark to Brandt*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Saxe, D. (1991). *Social studies in schools: A history of the early years*. Albany, NY:

Digging Trenches

- State University of New York Press.
- Schwartz, S. (2001). "The origins of history's mission in America's schools: A case study of Hannah Adams," *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29, 2, 212-237.
- Seefeldt, C. (2005). *Social studies for the preschool/primary child*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Smith, B. Palmer, J. and Correia, S. (1995). "Social Studies and the birth of NCSS," *Social Education*, 59, 7, 393-398.
- State Board for Educator Certification. (2004). General requirements to become certified. Retrieved June 11, 2004 from <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/certinfo/routecertif.asp>.
- Thevenet, P. (1994). The beginnings of a standardized social studies curriculum in the elementary schools. (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University).
- Thorton, S. (1996). "NCSS: The Early Years," In O.L. Davis, Jr. (Ed.) *NCSS in retrospect*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Todd, L.P. (1945). *Wartime relations of the federal government and the public schools, 1917-1918*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University Bureau of Publications.
- Tyack, D. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Digest of Education Statistics, Table 36*. Retrieved February 3, 2004, from <http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/tables/dt036/asp>.

Digging Trenches

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Digest Education Statistics, Table 103*. Retrieved February 3, 2004, from

<http://www.nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/tables/dt103/asp>.

VanSledright, B. (2002). *In search of America's past: Learning to read history in elementary school*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Weber, Julie. (1997). The reign of peace we hoped for: A history of the American School Peace League. (doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University).

Williams, S. (1996). *Made in China: Ideas and inventions from ancient China*. Berkley, CA: Pacific View Press.

¹ In contemporary French, a common manner of writing “What is a nation?” is “Qu’est-ce que c’est une nation?”, but Renan’s 1882 title reads “Qu’est-ce qu’est une nation” in order to emphasize the philosophical nature of his question.

²The introduction of the Committee report states that there were three superintendents, two representatives of normal schools and two from the colleges. However, in submitting the report and stating affiliations at the end, Committee members list three colleges, two superintendencies, one teachers college, and two normal schools.

³ Young students’ difficulties with concepts of time with respect to Native American culture happened in my home. My nine year old son, who is enthralled by life in Medieval times partly because he associates this time period with *The Lord of the Rings* asked me recently, “Mommy, was the Middle Ages a time period before or after the Indians lived?”

⁴ My son is no exception when it comes to selecting a biographical hero. He researched and wrote about Derek Jeter as his famous figure in American history. Thirty years ago, Grover Cleveland was my third grade biographical obsession because he caused havoc in presidential numbering as the 22nd and 24th President of the U.S.