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INTRODUCTION

The Commission on the Social Studies (1929-1934) was a committee composed of prominent educators and subject matter specialists, formed by the Council of the American Historical Association in December, 1926, and charged with the task of improving Social Studies instruction at the secondary level. The field of Social Studies education was in a deplorable state according to various studies which had been completed during the preceding decade.

Secondary educators viewed the deliberations of the Commission with guarded optimism. Some educators believed that the work of the Commission would strengthen Social Studies education and restore it to its once prominent position in the secondary school curriculum. As the work of the Commission proceeded, areas of contention began to develop. Positions on the Commission polarized around two points of view: those who favored a progressive, humanistic approach as opposed to those who favored an essentialist, scientific approach. The controversy which centered around these positions led to several interesting questions which form the theoretical basis for this study.

This study will employ the historical method, using the principal primary sources relating to the work of the Commission. Minutes of meetings, position papers, committee
reports, the Annual Report of the American Historical Association, the volumes prepared and published by the Commission, letters and papers of the participants and critical articles relating to the Commission's work form the body of these documents.

This study, based on a careful reading of these documents, will focus on six aspects of the Commission's work; (1) the methodological and philosophical views of the major participants; (2) a consideration and analysis of the social theories advanced by members of the Commission; (3) views of the Commission concerning Social Studies education; (4) an analysis of the views of the dissidents on the Commission who refused to sign the final Report; (5) the role of the American Historical Association as it interacted with the Commission; and (6) the reception of the final Report by secondary educators and an analysis of this criticism.

Social Studies education finds itself in a comparable situation today. There is much criticism directed at the public school and especially at Social Studies education. Confusion exists as to what should be taught and to what grade level. This study will be useful for the following reasons: (1) it will give Social Studies educators some ideas concerning the major-formative influences on their discipline; (2) it will show educators how curricular change has been dealt with in the past; and (3) it was an important event in the
history of American education - as such it has some intrinsic value in being explored and examined.
CHAPTER I
THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, LEADING PERSONALITIES
AND THE PROCEDURES OF THE COMMISSION ON THE
SOCIAL STUDIES

The Commission on the Social Studies began its work in January, 1929, in the midst of what seemed to be a period of endless prosperity. When its work was concluded, in 1934, the country was in the grip of a devastating depression that had been heralded by the Great Crash of October, 1929. In fifteen years the mood of the country had fallen from the giddy heights of military victory and economic prosperity to the gloom of what seemed to be a bottomless pit of economic depression. The intervening years were to be some of the most momentous in the history of the Republic. Social changes, which determine educational policies and curricular change, were to transform American life during this brief period in her history. The first section of this chapter will examine the factors which altered American society and shaped the social environment in which the sessions of the Commission were held.

Factors which contributed to the alteration of American society during this period were: (1) the effects of World
War I, (2) the development of mass culture and consumerism brought on by the effects of industrialization, (3) the shift in population from a rural to an urban society, (4) the effects of immigration from outside the country as well as internal population shifts, and (5) the catastrophic effect of the Great Depression on the economic, social and political life of the country. These factors were often intertwined making it difficult to show a direct causal relationship to social change.

World War I had an unsettling effect on many Americans, varying from the numbing sorrow over the loss of a loved one to the pangs of disillusionment brought on by the failure of the peace settlements. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., in The Crisis of the Old Order, quotes Hiram Johnson, Senator from California, on the impact of World War I.

The war has set back the people for a generation. They have bowed to a hundred repressed acts. They have become slaves to the government. They are frightened at the excesses in Russia. They are docile; and they will not recover from being so for many years. The interests which control the Republican party will make the most of their docility.¹

Johnson’s words proved to be prophetic as the records of the Republican administration show. In another aspect, he was

mistaken about the docility of the people as they tried frantically to return to an era that had vanished, never to appear again. The quest for normalcy became the vision of the grail for the twenties, and was referred to by the adjective, "roaring."

Many people were seeking answers as to the direction American society should take. Charles Beard invited a group of scholars to participate in a symposium based around the eternal question "whither mankind". The contributions were published in book form. In the introduction Beard alluded to the false sense of security that existed in the midst of prosperity and the feeling of political uncertainty. "The age of Victorian complacency has closed everywhere; those who are whistling to keep up their courage and deceive their neighbors merely succeed in hoodwinking themselves."2

Bertrand Russell remarked in the same volume about the damaging effect that the machine had on the individual's self-esteem.

In the modern machine-world, owing to democracy and to the achievements of science, other compensations are possible, more especially nationalism, which identifies the individual emotionally with the power of his group. But in order that such compensations may satisfy, it is necessary to belittle the individual wherever he is not contributing to a totality.3

2Charles A. Beard, Whither Mankind: A Panorama of Modern Civilization (New York: Longmans, Green, 1928) p. 3.

3Ibid., p. 78.
John Dewey, a giant in the academic arena and a respected social critic, described the changes facing American society. He felt that the major social problem of the 1920's related to the preservation of the individualistic values of the older community and their transmission to the newer social or collective democracy that he referred to as "corporateness." 4

The movement towards a mass consumer society was accelerated by population shifts, the growth of the film and radio industries and the attitudes of business leaders. Population shifts made it possible to break down the barriers between urban and rural society. The differences in viewpoint that once existed were being removed. Cities were seen as places of opportunity and promise rather than dens of sin and vice leading to the degradation of the soul. Rural areas were seen as centers of stagnation and backwardness.

The film and radio contributed immensely to the development of a mass consumer society. Attendance at movie theatres skyrocketed during the period. In 1922 forty million cinema tickets were being sold weekly. In

1929 this figure had tripled. Few Americans were untouched by these mechanical means of entertainment. Sales of radios continued until a set could be found in many homes. The new means of entertainment helped immensely to shape the mass consumer mind now so dear to the advertising men of Madison Avenue.

The attitude of business leaders was the third leg in this triangular development. Unlike their European counterparts, American businessmen were willing to move heavily into the areas of consumer credit and installment buying. They were also willing to take the risks of expansion of facilities and production. The old business system was replaced by one based on mass production and consumption. The census of 1920 revealed that for the first time in our history the urban population exceeded that of the rural population. We had become an urbanized, mass consumer society.

At this time the effects of the "new immigration" were felt and an angry chorus of anti-foreign sentiment was raised in response to it. The majority of the newcomers were from South (Italy) and Southeastern Europe

---

(the Balkans). Unlike the Northern and Western Europeans, they embraced the Catholic faith and usually had less education. This group, while anxious to be part of their adopted nation, was not always interested in total assimilation. Ethnic enclaves appeared in the cities of New York, Chicago, Boston, etc. It was felt by many native Americans that these people brought radical doctrines such as Anarchism, Socialism and Bolshevism with them.

Waves of new immigrants, labor unrest and the residue of wartime intolerance led to the Red Scare of the early 1920's. A national crusade led by A. Mitchell Palmer, Wilson's Attorney-General, was directed against labor unrest and the radicals, real or imaginary. Numerous labor leaders were arrested and eventually several hundred undesirable aliens were deported. These activities reached a tragic climax in the execution of Nicolo Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti in 1927. Worldwide protest and sympathetic American public opinion as to their innocence helped to temper the spirit of intolerance but did not remove it from the American scene.

Protests against the country's liberal immigration policies came from all segments of society but especially from the upper classes. Organizations, such as the Immigrant Restriction League, were set up to stop the flood of newcomers from reaching our shores. During World War II,
immigration almost ceased but began again after the peace. Congress, responding to pressure, adopted a drastic new immigration policy. This measure restricted immigration from each European nation to three per cent of the number of its nationals resident in the United States in the base year, 1910. Further restrictions were enacted in 1924 and 1927. Immigration restriction did not eliminate the problem, as animosity toward ethnic groups remained.

Internal migration also presented a problem as Negroes moved from the poor, agrarian South in hopes of finding employment in the large Northern industrial cities. Racial violence became a social problem to be added to the growing list of problems. Negroes occupied the poorer sections of the cities and vied with the new arrivals for the less skilled jobs. Immigrants were often preferred because of their skin color. This period marked the genesis of the racial problems in education which are plaguing the nation today.

The effects of the economic depression spread through the fabric of the American system. Coinciding with this economic and social disintegration were the evils accompanying the passage of the Volstead Act. Prohibition led many citizens to openly defy the law and accounted for the rise of organized crime to a hitherto unknown scale. The social evils generated by the depression
and organized crime exerted enormous pressure on American society and led many critics of the American system to lament the passing of the American dream. It was in this social environment that the Commission began, continued and ended its work.

The depression and its accompanying evils affected all segments of American society, including American education. Many teachers were among the ranks of the unemployed. School districts, unable to generate financial income had to shorten the school year or resort to paying teachers in scrip or merchandise. Thousands of students were unable to finish four years of high school and roamed the countryside in search of work. At the turn of the century the role of the high school seemed full of hope and promise in the American educational system. By the 1930's its future was clouded with doubt and uncertainty.

One of the major developments of American education during the latter half of the nineteenth century was the emergence of the high school as the principal form of secondary education. By the 1890's, the high school had become a permanent fixture in the design of American education replacing the Academy which remained, but was to play a diminished role among twentieth century educational institutions. With the survival of the high school assured, educators turned their attention to the problem of
developing a suitable curriculum. The history of the secondary school in the twentieth century is punctuated by the controversies generated by attempts to deal with curricular problems. Confronted with rapid change on every side, educators hoped to develop a high school program that would meet the needs of a modern, industrial society committed to the goal of free secondary education for each of its citizens.

In the absence of a national educational ministry which was found in most countries, Americans turned instead to professional educational organizations or special interest groups composed of capable laymen to bring about curricular change. Beginning with the work of the Committee of Ten, in 1894, these groups sought to change and modernize the American secondary school curriculum. The aims of these groups reflected two opposing schools of opinion. One group, composed of professional educators and interested laymen, felt that schoolmen should originate, propose, and implement curricular change. They advocated broad, general changes that would encompass the entire system. The other group, composed largely of subject matter specialists, advocated a narrower, traditional view within the confines of their respective disciplines. They felt that they were best fitted by training and knowledge to determine the objectives and course content in their
areas of expertise. With the rapid expansion of the high school population during the first two decades of the twentieth century, the divergence of opinion between the groups increased. The controversy was particularly heated in the area of the social sciences, with numerous disciplines competing for their place in the "curricular sun."

These developments were a prelude to the "era of committees," 1894-1919. This period formed the immediate background out of which the crisis of the social studies curriculum developed; a crisis which would lead to the creation of the Commission on the Social Studies in the mid 1920's. Three committees appeared to have the greatest influence on social science curriculum development. They were: (1) The Committee of Seven (1899); (2) The Committee of Five (1911), sponsored by The American Historical Association and (3) The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (1912), sponsored by the National Education Association. The latter commission was comprised of seventeen different committees; one of which was the Committee on the Social Studies.

The committees were interested in the following areas of curriculum development: (1) aims and objectives; (2) courses and course content; and (3) methodology. It was felt that students could be taught the necessary
values and goals of American citizenship by taking a sequence of courses. Social and class distinctions could also be removed if the necessary courses were included. The impact of World War I was responsible for the revisionist attitude which many educators and subject matter specialists developed. American ideals and goals had to be reevaluated, educators felt, in the light of the war and the changes expected in the years to come.

The Committee of Seven placed great emphasis on the value of aims and purposes in history instruction. Teachers were admonished to be sure of the direction they were taking in their teaching practices. Every teacher, the Committee felt, should be aware of the goals and objectives that were sought in the courses to be taught. History was seen by the Committee as the core subject in the secondary school curriculum. Other courses could be organized around it and linked to it by the commonality of the social process.

Seeming to anticipate the Progressive Movement, the Committee of Seven strongly rejected some of the teaching practices then in wide use. Memorization of facts was seen as a waste of time and not an end in itself. History, the Committee felt, should be studied for its own sake and not merely for formal discipline. Other recommendations which eventually became commonplace in the
teaching of the social studies were: (1) the use of textbooks to provide continuity; (2) written assignments and examinations; (3) the use of outside reading materials and; (4) stress on the influence of geographical causes on historical events.

The curriculum recommended by the Committee was to become the most influential in the history of Social Studies curricula. It included four years of history for the secondary school student. The recommended curriculum was as follows:

1. Ancient History, with special reference to Greek and Roman history.

2. Medieval and Modern European history from the close of the ancient period to the modern time.

3. English History.

4. American History and Civil Government. 6

Despite the lasting influence of the Committee on the social studies curriculum, its recommendations were not well-received in all quarters. The Committees' handling of Ancient History and Civil Government were particular sources of dissatisfaction. Many historians and teachers felt that the average high school student could not deal

adequately with Ancient History. Some critics felt that Ancient History was poorly taught in some schools because classics rather than the history teachers offered the course. This practice, they assumed, led to an overemphasis on Greek and Roman history. Another problem relating to Ancient History was the area to be covered in the course.

Citing the rise in juvenile delinquency, crime and alleged ignorance in the study of Civics and Government, a group of critics called for revision of the Committee's conclusions regarding civil government. Rather than an integrated course in Civics and American History, it was suggested that American History and Civics be taught as separate courses. Professor Leo Bidwood, a highly vocal critic of the Committee, argued: "We cannot give a respectable American History course and a course in Civics in three periods a week." It would not be advisable, Bidwood continued, to: "...take away time from American history to give to Civics and make ourselves think that we are giving an adequate course."$

---


8 Ibid., p. 67.
Organized groups, such as the American Political Science Association, joined in the criticism. In response to these complaints, the Council of the American Historical Association appointed a new committee to study these problems; the Committee of Five. The Committee of Five submitted its report to the American Historical Association in 1910. This report enlarged upon and for the most part supported the earlier report of the Committee of Seven. The Committee of Five reiterated the earlier view that the inclusion of history in the curriculum should be for its intrinsic merit rather than for any supposed disciplinary value. Thus, the Committee of Five concluded:

If history teaching results only in the memorization of a modicum of bare facts there is not much to be said in favor of the retention of the subject as an important part of the curriculum.9

The Committee of Five also upheld the teaching of Ancient History but felt that the methods used should make the course simpler and less abstract to students. Other curricular suggestions were justified, including the controversial American History - Civics course.

The chief contribution of the Committee of Five was the popularization of Modern European History. It includ-

---

ed the earlier recommendations of the Committee of Seven regarding Medieval History and early modern European History. American involvement in World War I and the Committee of Five report have been cited as the principal reasons for the popularity of this course in the 1920's.

The report of the Committee on the Social Studies, sponsored by the National Education Association, indicated the direction curricular disputes would take in the 1920's. The Committee felt that the problems of the community should be included in the Social Studies curriculum. Three major recommendations of this group included: (1) instruction in Civics, not as a theoretical course but as a practical course; (2) changing American History to a full year course; and (3) the addition of a course in problems of democracy, which the Committee felt, should be taught to twelfth grade students.

The recommendations suggested by the committee brought about a reaction from the American Historical Association through the work of the Conference of Teachers of History. This group was a standing committee of the Association charged with the responsibility of continuing regular investigations into the methods and course content of the social studies on the secondary level. Meetings were held in 1916 and 1917. The 1916 meeting ended with a high degree of disagreement concerning the
place of History in the school curriculum.

The conference held in 1917 was well-attended. Professor Henry Johnson of Teachers College, Columbia, gave the major address at this conference. Johnson's views dealt with three problems: (1) course content; (2) lay pressure and (3) methodology. He criticized the views of the Committee of Seven that History courses could be divided into distinct blocks of learning. Johnson indicated that historians have "been talking and thinking of subjects in history, and not courses in history."\(^\text{10}\) Secondly, Johnson felt that historians should not buckle under to lay pressures with regards to the teaching of citizenship and patriotism. Thinking in terms of broader interpretations of history, Johnson felt that:

> We are ready to grant to an extent not hitherto granted, that the better we can understand other peoples, and the more peoples we can understand, the better we shall be able to understand and appreciate that part of ourselves which is distinctly American... We want a patriotism founded upon the kind of understanding of ourselves which comes from an understanding of other peoples, and which brings with it a sense of duty to our neighbors as well as to ourselves.\(^\text{11}\)


\(^{11}\) Ibid., p. 225.
Johnson concluded his address by asking for a methodology and a curriculum in history that was based upon the problems and needs of the present. The history program, according to Johnson, must be "determined by the special interests and problems of the community." The study of history should be broadened in scope to meet the needs of the present and the immediate future.

Rolla Tryon of the university of Chicago was another important speaker at this conference. The major thrust of his address to the conference was an attack on the feeling of status quo within the American Historical Association. Changes in the organization of the American school system, the development of the junior high school, were negating the recommendations of the Committees of Seven and Five. "This fact," Tryon asserted, "makes it very urgent that this Association again attack the history program and bring some order out of the chaotic conditions in which we now find ourselves." He urged the Association to once again assume leadership in adjusting the history curriculum to these new changes.

12 Ibid., p. 220.

Tryon concluded his address by referring to the growing rift between educators and historians which had resulted from the aforementioned problem. Tryon remarked that "Historians believe in history for its own sake, while the educational psychologists, sociologists and administrators believe in history for the sake of the child."\textsuperscript{14} In order to solve this dilemma, historians and concerned educators would have to agree on points of emphasis and content in the social studies.

Despite the warnings of Johnson and Tryon the conference adjourned without taking any direct action. Following the 1917 meeting, the conference lapsed into relative inactivity. In 1919, the Association discharged this group and moved in other directions in attempting to solve the nagging problem of curriculum revision. The next section of the chapter will deal with the steps taken by the Association to bring about the needed changes.

At this point, the American Historical Association turned to the National Board for Historical Services. This group had been created during the war as an organization

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 230.
through which historical scholars could contribute to the defense effort. It was not actually a part of the American Historical Association but the membership of the National Board was comprised largely of Association members. Throughout the war the National Board for Historical Services was involved in a wide range of educational activities. It published a series of suggestions related to the teaching of history in the secondary schools, along with a series of booklets which concerned World War I and its origins. The final activity of its existence was a joint undertaking with the American Historical Association. This was to be a "fresh study of the whole program of historical instruction in the schools."\footnote{Walter Leland, "National Board for Historical Services," \textit{American Historical Association, Annual Report-1919} (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1919), p. 161.}

The study was to be undertaken by the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the schools. This committee was appointed by the National Board for Historical Services and the American Historical Association, in cooperation with the Commission on a National Program for Education of the National Education Association.
The Committee on History and Education for Citizenship set out on its ambitious program in March of 1919. Its tasks were fivefold: (1) to plan courses of history for eight years of common school and four years of high school; (2) to develop course content for the high school history program; (3) to revise the Committee of Eight report as it applied to the elementary school curriculum; (4) to seek to eliminate duplication in course offerings and to set up reliable evaluation procedures for measuring results in history instruction and (5) to consider methods of teaching history on the secondary level. 16

The final report of this committee was quite different from the recommendations of the Committee of Seven. Ancient History was placed in the seventh grade and replaced by a course which offered recent history, economics, geography and civics for the ninth grade student.

The tenth grade offering consisted of modern world history with emphasis on European history. In the eleventh grade, students were expected to take a course in American history. This course was to be organized topically. The twelfth grade course was to be a problems course centered

16 Ibid., p. 178.
around economics, political and social issues.

There were also differences with regard to methodology and the organization of course content. The Committee on History and Education for citizenship advocated the topical arrangement of studies and the problem solving approach in classroom methodology. The Committee of Seven had relied on the traditional approaches of chronology and a more conservative classroom methodology.

The group was officially discharged in 1920 and its report was not accepted by the American Historical Association. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to measure the influence of this group. Since it was largely a middle-of-the-road approach to social studies education, the Report of the Committee on History and Education did not arouse passionate feelings either from the right or left wing groups in education. The Committee did show a willingness to cooperate with and accept points of view of spokesmen for the other social science disciplines as well as professional educators. Lastly, the Committee used the word "world" in describing outcomes of history instruction which was a significant departure from the goals of previous study groups.

The conclusion of the work of the Committee on History and Education brings us to the work of the
preliminary committee which laid the groundwork for the
organization of the Commission on the Social Studies.
This group, known as the History Inquiry, began its work
in 1922. It was charged with the special task of develop-
ing a policy "as to the teaching of history in schools."\(^{17}\)

Using the questionnaire method, the Committee
polled superintendents, principals, and heads of depart-
ments of history and they were asked to respond to a
series of questions which appeared in the November, 1923,
issue of "Historical Outlook." Essentially, the question-
aire sought data as to sequence, courses, methods and
textbooks used by various social studies departments
throughout the nation. The answers and reactions to these
questions were collected for publication and were "made
available to all who were interested in the development
of history teaching and training for citizenship."\(^{18}\)

School programs, reports of curricular committees
and textbooks were also examined by The History Inquiry.

\(^{17}\) Edgar Dawson, "The History Inquiry," Historical
Outlook, 14, (November, 1923): 318.

\(^{18}\) Ibid.
These materials were evaluated in the perspective of the purpose of the Committee.

Outside pressures also played a role in determining the direction taken by the Inquiry. Two major forces were dominant in the United States at this time. One such force was the growing strength of the other social science disciplines. The second factor was the widespread movement for liberalization of the public school curriculum. Political scientists, sociologists and economists voiced disapproval with the existing social studies curriculum. They felt that history dominated the offerings at the expense of the other fields.

There was a growing discontent of scholars and lay people alike with the domination of the secondary school curriculum by more traditional philosophies of education. The Ancient History course, they felt, was a case in point. It had originally been placed in the curriculum to placate college officials who demanded such training. Groups, such as the National Education Association, urged the liberalization of college entrance registration and the social studies curriculum. As a result of these factors, the History Inquiry broadened its scope as it dealt with the problems of the social studies curriculum.
The first phase of the investigation which employed the questionnaire method, ascertained the frequency and the sequence with which certain courses were taught. Educators were asked to respond to the following questions:

What kind of facts are we teaching to history classes? With what success are we teaching these facts, from the standpoint of general information or from that of other measurable purposes? Is the teaching of history in different parts of the country to any degree homogenous? 19

The second aspect of the Inquiry was designed to deal with the success of teaching methods and various curriculum offerings available to students. This phase of the investigation was conducted through the administration of standardized tests to students throughout the country.

One test was given in the course in American history and civics, which is found in all parts of the country in grade 11 or 12, to two or three sections of pupils who completed the course in January, 1924, and to one section of pupils in the same schools, differing, as far as possible, only in the fact that they had not entered the course being tested. The former group were called the "regulars" and the latter the "control." 20

---


20 Ibid., p. 258
At the end of its work the History Inquiry forwarded its impressions and conclusions to the American Historical Association. The major items in the final report were as follows:

1. Ancient History as a separate course seems to be receding in popularity.

2. The tendency to stress recent history seems to be weakening such popularity as Medieval History formerly had.

3. English History as a separate subject seems to be losing ground.

4. The one-year course in World History, while popular in some quarters, does not seem as yet to have made much headway.

5. American History tends to move from the last year of high school to the next earlier year—the Eleventh Grade.

6. There is a tendency to include a course in current problems at the Twelfth Grade level.

7. There seems to be a tendency to put into the Ninth Grade one or more of the new civics courses.

8. There is considerable interest among school administrators in a Junior High Course made up of a combination of materials and industrial and social conditions.

9. The tendency to give a large amount of time to the socialized discussion of current events seems to be growing.

10. The teaching of government seems to be standing still, if not actually receding under the pressure for a rather indefinite discussion of economic and social problems.
11. The training of teachers for the social studies, separately or as a group, is clearly in sad need of attention.\textsuperscript{21}

The final report of the History Inquiry seemed to show that specialized courses in history were not popular. There was a return to the course in general history. There appeared to be a lack of continuity in the course offerings. The study also pointed out the lack of research efforts in the social studies and drew attention to the perennial problem of inadequately prepared teachers in the social studies. Lastly, the Inquiry indicted various scholarly groups, including the American Historical Association for the part they played in bringing about the situation.

In light of the foregoing, it is not difficult to see why the leaders of the Association were generally dissatisfied with the outcome of the History Inquiry. They felt that the Inquiry was not complete; being only a random sampling of social studies offerings and methods. Since the findings of the Inquiry were incomplete, the Association felt that it could not recommend new programs. The results of the Inquiry illustrated the unstable conditions which existed in the social studies. Aware of the possible consequences should these conditions be allowed to persist, the American Historical Association proposed

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 268.
a comprehensive study of the entire social studies program.

At the forty-first annual meeting of the American Historical Association in Rochester, New York, the groundwork was laid for this comprehensive study of the social studies in the public schools. At this meeting the Committee on History and Other Social Studies in the Schools submitted to the American Historical Association a report calling for such an inquiry.

The Committee on History and Other Social Studies in the Schools felt that there were three major factors which necessitated change from the static curriculum recommended by the Committee of Seven. These factors were:

1. the increased social maturity of school-age children;
2. a rapid increase in school attendance and
3. the development of the junior high school. These factors, the Committee felt, pointed to the need for a major study of social studies curriculum and methods. To the Committee, it was clear that: "the curriculum and methods of instruction planned for the self-selected few seeking culture or preparation for learned careers are not suited to the needs of mass education on the present scale." 22

After identifying the problems which existed in social studies education, the Committee then directed its attention to those resources which were available to meet these problems. The Committee felt that there were several like-minded organizations which were seeking answers to these same problems — The National Education Association and The American Political Science Association, to name but two of the interested groups. The study must be conducted by educators and subject-matter specialists who would make use of the resources of these groups.

Another factor was the vast number of research facilities available to assist in the proposed study. Educational research facilities had grown at a record pace during the past two decades. The study was to have a solid footing based on these new methods and facilities for educational research.

The Committee also felt that the "seven cardinal principles" of education should be utilized in the preparation of the report. These seven principles were, according to the Commission on Reorganization, the main objectives of American education. The Committee also embraced this view, despite the protests of more conservative groups and individuals within the American Historical Association. 23

23 Ibid., p. 112.
The American Historical Association, acting within the guidelines set forth by the Committee on History and Other Social Studies in the Schools began its massive study of social studies education. The project was underwritten by the Carnegie Foundation at a cost of $350,000. It would take five years to complete this comprehensive project.

The Commission, organized in 1926, consisted of nine members—later the size was expanded to eighteen. Membership consisted of noted educators such as George S. Counts, Columbia University; Ernest Horn, State University of Iowa; and Jesse Newlon, Columbia University. Subject matter specialists represented were Charles A. Beard, History and Political Science, formerly of Columbia University; Isaiah Bowman, Geography Director, American Geographic Society of New York; Charles Merriam, Political Science, University of Chicago; and August C. Krey, University of Minnesota. A complete list of the membership of the Commission can be found in Appendix I.

Since the leading members of the Commission will be mentioned throughout the work, it might be useful at this

---

point to include brief biographical sketches of the major participants in the work of the Commission.

August C. Krey was the director of the Commission throughout its period of activity. He was the only major figure on the Commission to be born outside the country; being born in Germany on June 29, 1887. Emigrating with his parents to the United States, the family settled in Wisconsin where Krey spent the remainder of his youth and early manhood. After graduating from high school, he attended the University of Wisconsin where he obtained the A.B. in 1907, the A.M. in 1908 and the Ph. D. in 1914. While at Wisconsin, he studied under several great teachers; including Frederick Jackson Turner, Dana Carleton Munro and George Clarke Sellery. Munro led him to the field that was to be his career specialty, the Crusades. Krey's most notable work was a critical examination of William of Tyre, an important figure of the crusading era.

While pursuing his advanced degrees, Krey began his teaching career at the high school level in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. After brief teaching stints at the University of Texas (1910-12) and the University of Illinois (1912-13), he was appointed Professor of History in the University of Minnesota in 1913; a post he was to hold until his retirement. He was department chairman from 1944 until 1955.
In 1913 Krey married Miss Laura Lettie Smith, a well-known American authoress. They had two children.

Like other members of the Commission, Krey was at the prime of his career during the years the Commission deliberated. Unlike some of his university colleagues, he never lost sight of secondary teaching and its problems. Throughout his career he maintained membership in several professional organizations devoted to secondary education. Krey was a member of the National Council for the Social Studies and was active in state and local historical societies which were interested in the teaching of history and research in the social studies.

A gentle, kindly individual, Krey was well-liked by students, fellow scholars and interested laymen. His scholarly abilities and congenial nature made him a natural choice for the difficult assignment of Chairman of the Commission. Philosophically a moderate, Krey was able to bridge the gap between the subject matter specialists and the educators. The relatively smooth working of the Commission was due in no small part to Krey's national stature and his awareness of the many problems facing the Commission.

Charles A. Beard's lifespan covered an important period in American development, the period from 1874 to 1948. His intellectual career covered the half century from 1898-1948; and he was to be a major figure in many
of the intellectual controversies which occurred during this period. While most individuals are content to rise to the top of their chosen field, Beard had the distinction of achieving prominence and wide influence in two fields, Political Science and History. He obtained the presidency of the national association in each discipline. A prolific writer, his works achieved popularity with academics and laymen alike. It is estimated that his histories sold around twelve million copies. The success and controversy engendered by his writings continued until the day of his death. While many academics seek the shelter of the ivory tower, Beard enjoyed playing the role of gadfly and social activist.

His historical works, such as *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States*, were the center of controversy as Beard and other American historians revolted against the scientific view of history prevailing in American historical scholarship. He joined with J. Allen Smith, Carl Becker and other scholars to champion James Harvey Robinson's New History. His intellectual views were to change throughout his life as he adhered to his relativist convictions.

---

Charles Beard was born on an Indiana farm on November 27, 1874, near the town of Spiceland. His family could be considered to be well-off for the period, with substantial land holdings and a high standard of culture for the area. The family was old stock, having immigrated to America 200 years earlier. Religiously the family was Quaker while of the Federalist-Whig Republican tradition politically.

His early education was not unusual. He attended the Quaker academy located in Spiceland. In the fall of 1895 he enrolled at DePauw University in Greencastle, Indiana. College experiences, as they have done to countless others, awakened Beard to the broader world beyond his rural beginnings.

Following the completion of his undergraduate work at DePauw, Beard spent a year at Oxford pursuing graduate studies. He did not complete a degree but did further his social education. Beard became involved with the Fabian Society and other socialist groups. With the aid of a fellow American, Walter Vrooman from Kansas, he helped found a workingman's college at Oxford, named after John Ruskin.

Maintaining a frenetic pace, Beard returned to the United States and attended Cornell University for one year and married his DePauw sweetheart, Mary Ritter. She was
to remain by his side as helpmate and collaborator in some of his best known works. After two years of travel in England where Beard gathered data for his first work, The Industrial Revolution, the couple returned to the United States. Beard entered Columbia University in 1902 and proceeded to finish his formal education, receiving the M.A. in 1903, with the Ph. D. following a year later. Stimulated by such professors as Goodnow, Osgood, Robinson, Burgess, Clark and Seligman, Beard's keen mind reacted vigorously not only to the world of scholarship but also to the bustling life outside his books.

Beard taught at Columbia from 1904 until 1917. He taught European History and English History at first, later switching to American History and Government. It was in the latter area that Beard made his greatest impression. He was chosen to deliver the lecture on "politics" in the university's public lecture series in February, 1909. Beard developed the introductory undergraduate course and his textbook American Government and Politics became a model for others in the field. By 1915, Beard had advanced to the rank of Professor of Politics.

He was a popular teacher, as the testament of many former students record. He had a warm personality and excited the imagination of many students during his career. Further incidence of his popularity can be shown
in the student protests which occurred in the wake of his abrupt resignation from Columbia in 1917. His actions came as a protest against the policy of the administration which resulted in the firing of an instructor with pacifist leanings. He did not, with the exception of visiting professorships, engage in classroom teaching for the remainder of his life, refusing numerous appointments. This is not to indicate that he remained far from the academic scene as Beard was in the midst of intellectual endeavor. A prodigious number of books, essays, reviews and historical criticism flowed from his pen. From his farm in New Milford, Connecticut, he supervised a herd of dairy cattle but often entered the lists of academic controversy either through his sharp, clear prose or in person to deliver an important address.

Beard worked with the Commission over a four year period, from 1930 to 1934. His contribution consisted of the authorship of two works: A Charter for the Social Sciences and The Nature of the Social Sciences. He helped with the final work Conclusions and Recommendations. He also chaired the important advisory committee and was probably the most prominent as well as the most controversial member of the Commission.

George S. Counts held the important position of Director of Research for the Commission. Counts, like
Beard, came from a rural background. He was born on December 9, 1889, on a farm near the small town of Baldwin City, Kansas. His early years were to have a lifelong influence on his thought, even though he would become a sophisticated traveler and spend most of his career at Columbia University, far from his rural origins.

Counts received the A.B. degree from Baker University, a small Methodist college located in Baldwin City. Following his graduation, Counts taught high school for two years before beginning his graduate education. Counts enrolled at the University of Chicago where he majored in Education. At the University of Chicago he came under the influence of Albion Small, Charles H. Judd and Charles Merriam. Other formative influences on his career were John Dewey, Thorsten Veblen and Charles A. Beard, although he did not study under any of the last mentioned.

Counts received his master's and doctorate at the University of Chicago. After teaching at several universities, he accepted a position in the Teachers College of Columbia University. It was at Columbia that Counts made some of his notable contributions to educational theory, research and teaching.

At the time the Commission embarked on its activities, Counts reputation was firmly established. He had published several important works on education during
the 1920's. These works reflected his interest in Sociology and his emerging role as a social reconstructionist. By this time he had authored: *The Higher Learning in America* (1917), *The Selective Character of American Education* (1922), *The Social Composition of Boards of Education* (1927), and *Secondary Education and Industrialism* (1928). His most famous publication would appear during the work of the Commission. This was a series of speeches published under the title *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* (1932).

Counts was another controversial member of the Commission. His activities in the teacher union movement and New York state politics had earned him an undeserved reputation as a "radical." Like Beard, he was qualified for his task as research director. He had a wide range of experience to draw on and was aware of the realities of the problems facing the Commission. As research director, he influenced the deliberations of the Commission and thus played an important role in the final report of the Commission. He also contributed a major volume to the Commission's publications: *The Social Foundations of Education*.

A preliminary plan for the work of the Commission was drawn up by the American Historical Association and
was published in December, 1926, under the title, *History and Other Social Studies in the Schools*. This plan, with revisions and elaborations, served as a guide for the Commission until the completion of its work. In order to facilitate the work of the Commission the committee was subdivided into five major committees and numerous special investigations.

The rationale suggested by the above plan was used by the Commission. Important statements are quoted in their entirety while other less important statements are paraphrased.

1. The social sciences more than any other subject matter area, bear most directly on the life of this nation.

2. The Commission will not limit itself to surveys of textbooks, curricula, or methods. It has to adopt a broad view of the total situation.

3. The nation is undergoing a period of profound change. Educators, particularly in the social sciences, need to be ready to assist in this change.

4. The scientific method will be used as the Commission compiles, analyzes, and organizes materials of the study.

5. The Commission will use current methods being employed in the social sciences, as well as significant work in other disciplines, particularly the report of President Hoover's research committee on Recent Social Trends in the United States.

6. The scientific method, while used extensively, cannot dictate the purpose, policy or program for either statecraft or education.
7. The Commission will go beyond the scientific method and will make judgments based on ethical and aesthetic considerations where they will lead to a better understanding of a social problem and its proposed solution.

8. The conclusions and recommendations of the Commission, consequently, are not, and in the nature of things cannot be, mere matters of quantitative determination. They are drawn up with respect to some general point of view or frame of reference. For some frame of reference, large or small, clear or confused, conditions every general work in the social sciences, every program of instruction in these subjects, every conception of methods and examinations, and every plan of school and administration.26

Following appointments and brief organizational meetings, the work of the Commission got under way. Meetings were held as was thought necessary, in the form of two or three day conferences. Three meetings were held in 1929, two in 1930, one in 1931, one in 1932, and two in 1933. The Executive Committee, consisting originally of A. C. Krey, Charles E. Merriam, and Jesse H. Newlon, and enlarged in 1931 by the addition of Edmund E. Day and Guy Stanton Ford, met at intervals between the meetings of the Commission. The investigation was carried out through the direction of A. C. Krey, head of the inquiry from its inception, and George S. Counts, who served as Director of Research from August 1, 1931.

A central staff, with quarters at the University of Minnesota, the University of Chicago and Columbia University, was maintained throughout the period of the investigation. At the head of the staff was W. G. Kimmel, formerly Supervisor of Social Studies for the New York State Department of Education, who occupied the post of Executive Secretary during the entire career of the Commission. The principal function of this staff was the preparation of reports of progress in the several divisions of the inquiry for the consideration of the Commission. The staff was aided in the investigation of special problems by many scholars and teachers who either worked directly with the staff at intervals or who checked work of the staff at their convenience.

Following the making of a number of analytical and explanatory researches, involving bibliographies, textbooks, course of study, methods of instruction, classroom materials and devices, grade placement and administrative and public relations, the Commission proceeded to organize its work into six major divisions: (1) Philosophy, purpose, and objectives; (2) Materials of instruction; (3) Methods of teaching; (4) Tests and measurements; (5) the teacher and (6) Public relations. As the investigation proceeded, sections two and three were combined into
One committee. Each member of the Commission was assigned to a committee and given a definite task to perform; thus setting up an interlocking arrangement which would integrate the several branches of the inquiry. A complete list of the Committee assignments can be found in Appendix II.

The work of the Commission consisted of special reports, such as a bibliographical study, and specialized studies conducted by each of the five committees; results of which were published in book form. The bibliography, while useful, contained much extraneous material and was not published. To facilitate the work of the Commission, a special advisory committee on objectives was appointed. To this committee were assigned: Charles A. Beard, George S. Counts, Guy Stanton Ford, A. C. Krey and Charles E. Merriam for the Commission, and Franklin Bobbitt, Professor of Education, University of Chicago; Boyd H. Bode, Professor of Education, Ohio State University; and Harold O. Rugg, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. Charles A. Beard served as Chairman. The Committee held four meetings - two jointly with the Commission, one in connection with the advisory Committee on Tests and one independently.

Members of the Committee prepared position papers to develop a pattern of thought which could be used in
the preparation of their report. Charles A. Beard presented a paper on "Preliminary Thoughts on Civic Instruction in the Schools"; Franklin O. Bobbitt on the "Objectives of the Social Phases of Education"; Boyd H. Bode on "Objectives in the Social Sciences"; L. C. Marshall on "What is Involved in Social Livings"; and Harold O. Rugg on the "Typical Objects of Allegiance of the Cultured Man." These papers, as well as the contributions of other members of the Commission, were drawn upon in drafting: A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools. With the completion of the manuscript of this volume, the work of the special committee came to an end. Every study undertaken by the Commission was directed to pay special attention to the philosophy, purposes and objectives of the Social Studies as enunciated in the charter. Fifteen volumes were published dealing with the work of the various committees. A complete list can be found in Appendix III.

With the completion of the work of each committee a final Report was issued under the title: Conclusions and Recommendations. The Commission felt that its principle aim was to present a "frame of reference" which could be used by educators throughout the country; the social sciences being too diverse and changing to
develop a bill of minute specifications for guidance. It was hoped that the report would awaken educational leaders to the enormity of the problem. This would, in turn, lead to the development of new programs in the social sciences, textbook revision, improvement in teacher training and the development of an enlightened view of the problem by educational journalists and publicists.

The report was submitted to the Executive Committee of the American Historical Association in 1933. It was not approved at this time and was sent back to the Commission for revision. Several members of the Commission, Frank A. Ballou, Edmund E. Day, Ernest Horn and Charles E. Merriam declined to sign the report and Isaiah Bowman signed with reservations. The revised report was resubmitted, approved and published in 1934.

27 Ibid., p. 148.
CHAPTER II

THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

The task of the Commission on the Social Studies was herculean when compared with preceding curriculum committees. Previous committees had been staffed by small numbers; i.e., the Committees of Ten, Seven and Eight, and had dealt with specific aspects of the curriculum, not with the curriculum as a whole. Results of the proceedings of these Commissions were contained in slender volumes. The report of the Commission was to run to sixteen volumes, some of which were quite lengthy. While previous commissions had centered their attention around certain particulars of the curriculum, the Commission on the Social Studies went far beyond the basic social science curriculum and made the following broad studies: an analysis of contemporary culture, a survey of social institutions and groups, a study of the functions of the schools and a statement concerning the fundamental objectives which could be promoted by an adequate program in the

---

1 Most volumes ran between 150 and 200 pages while the volume by Counts ran close to 600 pages. Curti, Tryon and Newlon also produced volumes which ran over 300 pages.
social studies. Unlike previous committees, the Commission called upon the teacher to become involved in planning and executing the changes recommended by the Commission. Teachers were admonished to implement the recommendations not only through their teaching experiences, but also by thorough study and contemplation. Lastly, the Report differed from its predecessors in that it failed to recommend a specific program or to endorse any particular subjects or types of organization.

The Commission was composed of outstanding specialists in subject matter areas, as well as leading educators in the field of secondary education. One commentator remarked that the makeup of the Commission constituted an "honor role" of American higher education.² Members of the Commission felt the urgency of the situation and the need for curricular reform in the social studies. As the work of the Commission proceeded, the deepening effects of the economic depression added to the seriousness of their labors. Charles A. and Mary Beard vividly described the plight of teachers and American education as the Com-

mission began its deliberations.

The dream of an educational science was interrupted by the crash of the economic depression, by the sharp curtailment of the employment for which the schools had been preparing their charges, by conflicts over New Deal legislation, by the breaking up of orthodoxy in many places, and by fascist upheavals and wars in Europe and Asia. Such events wrenched the business of education out of the groove and made the "science" of education appear far less scientifically sound. Teachers streamed out into the ranks of the unemployed. Schools by the thousands were closed. Bills were unpaid, even in the rich city of Chicago. Millions of graduates, correctly instructed and precisely tested according to the rigid canons of indubitable masters, could find no places in the scheme of things pecuniary. "Here we come, WPA" was the cry of one graduating class...3

Despite the gloomy social and economic conditions surrounding the Commission, the membership remained intact throughout its period of existence, with three exceptions. Carlton J. H. Hayes and Avery Craven replaced Evarts B. Greene and William E. Lingelbach, who were forced to retire because of heavy work loads. The other exception was Edmund E. Day, who did not become a working member of the Commission until 1930. Leadership of the Commission was in the hands of A. C. Krey, George S. Counts and Frank Ballou. Krey served as Chairman, Ballou as Secretary and Counts served as Director of Research.

3Charles A. Beard and Mary Beard, American in Mid-Passage, Vol. II (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1939) p. 902.
The membership of the Commission was drawn primarily from large midwestern and eastern institutions. Three schools: Columbia University, the University of Chicago and the University of Minnesota provided a large proportion of the membership. Facilities at these institutions were used to help the various staffs prepare the reports and papers of the Commission. This also led to ease of administration as members were often in close proximity of each other.

Ada Comstock, then President of Radcliffe College, was the only female member of the Commission. Other minorities were not represented, nor were any topics discussed that seriously related to their needs. No small colleges were represented, as the membership came from large institutions or private foundations. Edmund E. Day was Director of Social Science for the Rockefeller Foundation and Isaiah Bowman was Director of the American Geographical Society with headquarters in New York City. Frank Ballou, Superintendent of Schools in Washington, D.C., was the only member directly involved in secondary education. Charles Beard remarked on one occasion that "Ballou is the only schoolman among us."

The various subject matter areas of the social studies were represented with historians leading the way with six members. Geography, Political Science, Economics
and Sociology each had one representative. Psychology and Anthropology had not yet become major secondary school subjects, hence they were not represented. Truman Kelley, who helped A. C. Krey prepare the volume on "Tests and Measurements", was a psychologist, but he did not deal directly with the teaching of Psychology or suggest the inclusion of Psychology in the Social Studies curriculum.

It would be difficult to classify the members of the Commission into rigid categories, but there are some distinctions which can be made. They had many concerns in common but there were striking dissimilarities which often characterize individuals of outstanding ability. An almost obvious difference can be seen in the subject matter specialists and those who represented the schools of education. These were not rigid distinctions, as there was often some degree of overlap. For example, George S. Counts was from Teachers College, Columbia University, but he often sided with the specialists during the deliberations of the Commission. A. C. Krey was a subject matter specialist but he helped co-author a volume on tests and measurements and was to find himself in the center of the controversy over this work. There were those who held somewhat dogmatic views, such as Charles Beard and Frank Ballou. Beard had little patience with those who advocated rigid testing procedures. Ballou,
on the other hand, was to lament the lack of rigidity and objectivity in the final report of the Commission. The beginnings of the controversy that was to flare up in the 1950s, between liberal arts specialists and the schools of education, can be seen in its nascent form in some of the infighting of the Commission.

Another dimension of these positions can be discerned between those who held a relativistic view of the educational process and those who held the view that education should be scientific. The views of Gestalt psychology were beginning to make an impact on educational psychologists at this time. Beard, Counts and other members of the Commission tended to follow the relativistic views stressed by this approach, Beard being most explicit in his famous presidential address to The American Historical Association, in December, 1934. Ballou, Day, Horn and their sympathizers stressed the views of Edward Thorndike. Thorndike wrote a letter to the Commission urging the consideration and application of the scientific approach to the work of the Commission. Those in favor of the scientific approach felt it was the responsibility of the Commission to

---

further this aspect of educational methodology. These differences were to remain unresolved throughout the period of the Commission's work.

Commission members such as Jesse Newlon were strongly in favor of the child-centered curriculum, one of the articles of faith in the catechism of progressive education. The specialists inclined to be more interested in a modified, traditional curriculum. Beard, Counts, Krey, Ford and others felt that the needs of the student were important but not the paramount issue in curriculum construction. The child should be considered, but the child-centered curriculum was not adequate to meet the demands of the times. Child-centered curricula neglected a rigorous scholarship and gave the student a very shallow idea of the social sciences.5

What we would today term "social awareness," would be another point of difference between the members of the Commission. Counts was especially aware of the relationship between society and the educational process. Some members still clung to the late 19th century liberal or early progressive views of individualism. Day, Bowman and

---

Merriam appeared to have this point of view. They felt that the scholar should try to improve society but not to the point of trying to reconstruct society. Educators could do only so much and they had to realize their limitations. Counts and his sympathizers saw the coming collectivization of American society and the pluralism of the 1950's and 1960's. Probably, by virtue of their relative youth and training in the new discipline of sociology, they could see the direction American society and education were taking with greater insight.

The members of the Commission were predominantly middle class in their backgrounds and outlook on life. Three members, including the Chairman, were born outside the country: A. C. Krey in Germany, Isaiah Bowman in Canada and Henry Johnson in Sweden. This did not have a significant effect on their development, as they arrived in this country at early ages. Several members came from rural backgrounds, but they did not reflect the stereotyped notion of rural educators. Their families were successful landowners, not sharecroppers or tenants. Some members, such as Charles Merriam, Ada Comstock and Frank Ballou, came from small towns where their parents were moderately successful. No member came from the larger cities, even though at that time approximately
one-fourth of all Americans lived in large cities and the problems they were to deal with were related to large, urban schools.

In order to understand the various roles and positions taken by the members of the Commission, it will be necessary to include additional biographical sketches of the more prominent members of the Commission. Robert L. McCaul, in an important paper "Autobiography in American Educational History", discusses the value of educational biography. Some of the points he stressed, which may be of use for this discussion are as follows: (1) Biographical sketches give us an intimate revelation of the thoughts, hopes, successes, and failures of educators and the philosophies that sustained them throughout the vicissitudes of their lives and careers; (2) An analysis of the experiences of persons of great ability and knowledge who faced certain perennial and important educational problems and devised solutions that may be adapted to the needs of other educators facing similar problems; (3) Evidence on how and why the teaching profession and education have developed some characteristics and not others; (4) Evidence on how and why certain academic disciplines and fields of study in education have developed some characteristics and other others; (5) Testimonial materials that may aid the historian in reconstructing
and interpreting the American past; (6) A body of data for studying the psychology of human behavior and the means by which eminence is won and leadership is attained and exercised in American society. While these views may not apply to every person on the Commission, they will help us to understand the patterns of their behavior as they wrestled with the problems deliberated on by the Commission.

Isaiah Bowman, at the time President of the International Geographical Union, was one of the most prestigious members of the Commission. He would later be appointed to the presidency of John Hopkins University and would play an important role in the formulation of geographical studies in the post World War II era. Bowman was to geographical studies what Beard was to historical and political science studies. Shortly after his birth in Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, on December 26, 1878, the family moved to the state of Michigan. Educated in the public schools of that state, Bowman received his A.A. degree from the State Normal School at Ypsilanti. Continuing his studies at Harvard, he received the B.S. degree in 1905. Returning

---

to his home state, he taught at the State Normal College at Ypsilanti as an instructor in geography. Advancing to graduate study, he completed the Ph.D. at Yale in 1909. Remaining at Yale from 1909 to 1915, he taught Geography as an assistant professor. While at Yale he became interested in South America and led the first Yale geographical expedition to that area. He was subsequently geographer and geologist of the Yale Peruvian expedition in 1911 and in 1913 he was the leader of an expedition to the Central Andes under the auspices of the American Geographical Society of New York.

In 1915 he resigned his position at Yale to become the director of the American Geographical Society, a post he held for twenty years. His contributions to the Geographical Society were many. Among his achievements during his years as President of the Society were the increase in the size of the library and the map collection. Under his direction the journal of the Society, The Geographical Review, became a leading scientific publication. The chief project of the society during Bowman's administration was the preparation of a map of Hispanic America on a scale of 1:1,000,000 in conformity with the standards of the Millionth Map of the World, sponsored by successive International Geographical Congresses. The preparation of this map cost over four hundred thousand dollars and
required twenty years to complete. Two other notable enterprises which he developed were a systematic study of scientific objectives in polar exploration, and a worldwide study of the possibilities of land settlement.

Bowman was also active in foreign affairs, serving as geographer for the peace conference in Paris following the First World War. In 1919 he was the chief territorial specialist to the American Commission to Negotiate Peace; he also served on the Polish Commission, various territorial commissions and the Polish-Ukrainian Armistice Commission. In 1920 he was physiographer for the United States Department of Justice in the dispute over the Red River boundary between Texas and Oklahoma. An amusing story is told of this period of Bowman's work: Bowman seemed so sure of his facts to please the opposing lawyer who remarked sarcastically (to Bowman) "May I inquire whether you consider yourself a major or a minor prophet?" Bowman replied: "I am called a major prophet; my name is Isaiah,"\(^7\) *Newsweek*, citing this story in 1944, called Bowman a "prophet without peer in the fields of geography and ethnology."

\(^7\) *Newsweek* 23: 98–9, April 3, 1944.
Bo~man's conception of Geography embraced Natural History, Sociology, Political Science and National and International Relations. This view can be seen in his remarks concerning the dispute over the Polish frontier at the end of World War I:

If every nation struggles for the best strategic frontier, there can never be peace...It is not the position of the line alone that is important: it is a whole group of economic, racial, ethnic and religious factors that relate themselves to boundary location. Religion does not stop at a mountain crest, nor do marriages take account of ethnic majorities. A well-defined topographic feature may be too important to be neglected in favor of the ethnic considerations. The same may be said of any other line of defense, such as a river or a belt of marshes, as in eastern Poland.8

Bowman was elected President of Johns Hopkins University in 1935, succeeding Joseph Sweetman Ames. Of his administration at Hopkins, it was said:

He proved himself an able administrator being responsible for many financial and academic improvements, a new department of chemical engineering was added to the School of Engineering: the work of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations was directed to special studies for Far Eastern problems and the university's unique tradition - emphasis upon advanced scholarly training and research - was fostered in every way possible.9

8 Ibid., p. 99.

He was to remain as president of Johns Hopkins until his retirement in 1948.

Following World War II he was to work for World peace and security, but he could not be classified as a pacifist. Bowman was against compulsory military training largely because he felt it was a process of indoctrination. To offset military training, he advocated that colleges set up citizenship courses.\(^\text{10}\)

Bowman was not a social reconstructionist. He remarked in a speech at Johns Hopkins:

>This is far from saying that the schools should lead the way in a changing social order. Neither divine grace nor worldly experience has given teachers a special power, all embracing and conclusive, to 'settle' the affairs of men. Human affairs flow in an endlessly changing pattern. Our schools represent but one way of approach and a few of many stages in a student's development.\(^\text{11}\)

These views would place him to the right of some members of the Commission.

He was to author a volume for the Commission entitled *Geography in Relation to the Social Sciences* and was a member of the advisory committee on tests. Despite

\(^{10}\) Ibid., p. 67.

his heavy work load, Bowman worked faithfully with the Com-
mission; refusing the royalties which were offered by
Charles Scribner's for his volume in the Commission re-
port. Maintaining his idealistic position, Bowman at
first refused to sign the final report of the Commission.
He relented and signed the report when he was given the
opportunity to add his reservations and objections. These
views were added to the final report of the Commission.

Edmund Day was born on December 7, 1883, and died
on March 23, 1951. At the time that the Commission was
active he was Director for the Social Sciences for the
Rockefeller Foundation. He was also a Director for both
the Social Sciences and general education in the General
Board of Education, State of New York. Following his
duties in these positions, he became the fifth President
of Cornell university in 1937.

Day was the son of Ezra Alonzo and Louise Moulton
(Nelson) Day. He was born in Manchester, New Hampshire,
but attended public school in Worcester, Massachusetts.
At Dartmouth he received the B.S. Degree in 1905 and the
M.A. in 1906. Day won a Rufus Choate Scholarship during

12 A.C. Krey to Isaiah Bowman, New York, 5 March,
1934, Krey Papers, Archives, University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis, Minn.
his freshman year, with the exceptionally high scholastic average of 92 per cent. For this achievement he was nick-named "Rufus", a nickname that was to remain with him always. Following graduation from Dartmouth, he remained as an instructor in Economics from 1907 to 1910. During this time he received his Ph.D in 1909 from Harvard university. In 1910, Day left Dartmouth to teach Economics at Harvard. He remained there for thirteen years, rising from instructor to full professor and Chairman of the department.

In 1923, he left Harvard to become Chairman of the Department of Economics at Michigan University. While there he organized the School of Business Administration. From 1927-29 he was associated with the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in New York; he remained with this foundation through the years of 1928-29, while on leave from Michigan.

He left his position at Michigan in the fall of 1929, to become Director for the Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation; and in 1933 he took on the additional post of Director of General Education and of Social Science of the General Education Board, another Rockefeller endorsed foundation. One of his duties with Rockefeller foundations was the dispensing of funds, thus being responsible for disbursing 27.5 million to universities and research agencies. An expert on money and banking, Day served as a representative on the preparatory commissions of experts for the World Monetary and Economic Conference in London in 1933.\textsuperscript{13}

The major achievement of his outstanding career was the presidency of Cornell University. He succeeded Livingston Ferrand to that prestigious post in 1937 and held it until his resignation, due to ill health, in 1949. Cornell experienced growth and development under Day's presidency, especially in the years following World War II.

Morris Bishop, in his book *A History of Cornell,* makes the following judgments of Day's abilities and characteristics:

He was a man of power and dominance, keen in his judgment of men and things, serious of purpose, zealous for social betterment, utterly dedicated to his task...

He was also impatient, sometimes tasteless in dealing with opposition, inclined to reply on statistical evidence than on intuition. He lacked the grace of his predecessor Livingston Ferrand in attaining his ends. Some professors of the humanities complained that he never really understood the aims of humane education, recalcitrant to statistical analysis. This was a misconception to which President Day deliberately lent himself...

His proficiency in statistics and economics had a great deal to do with his success and enhanced his reputation as a capable administrator. Day was also described as a pragmatic, practical, "can do man." As the President of Cornell he demonstrated the ability to deal with educational and policy questions on a broad basis. These points can be illustrated by the innovative programs Day developed during

---

15 Ibid., p. 524.
World War II to deal with the need for trained technicians for the military services.

Day served on the Executive Committee of the Commission, as well as on the Advisory Committee on materials and Methods of Instruction. The latter committee, chaired by Rolla Tryon, held two important meetings and recommended a series of projects. Day did not author one of the volumes in the Report of the Commission, but he was the author of four volumes dealing primarily with statistics and economics. He was also active in other professional associations, such as the American Economic Association, the American Statistical Association, the Royal Economic Society (British) and the scholarly fraternity, Phi Beta Kappa.

One of the dissident members, Day, refused to sign the final report of the Commission. He did not issue a formal statement for his refusal to do so, but he did make his position known in a letter to A. C. Krey which will be discussed later in this study.

Frank Washington Ballou was Superintendent of Schools in Washington, D.C., during the years the Commission met. Ballou was born in Ft. Jackson, New York, on February 22, 1879. He died on February 2, 1955.
Ballou was the son of Hiram and Jennie E. (Foster) Ballou. Educated in the public schools of New York, he received his early educational training at the State Normal Training School at Potsdam, New York. He received the B.S. in Education from Teachers College, Columbia. His graduate degrees were obtained from the University of Cincinnati, (M.A., 1911) and Harvard, (Ph.D., 1914). He married Catherine Knapp in 1912 and was the father of two children, Elizabeth and Robert.

Ballou began his administrative career while attending the University of Cincinnati. He was the principal of the technical school operated by the university. From 1907 to 1910 he was an Assistant Professor of Education in the same institution. From 1910 to 1914 he pursued the Ph.D. at Harvard. Following graduation, he was named Director of the Department of Educational Investigation and Measurement in the Boston school system. He held this post from 1914 until 1917 when he became Superintendent of Schools in Boston, a post he held until 1920. From 1920 and throughout the work of the Commission, he held the post of Superintendent of Schools in Washington, D.C.

He served the Commission in four ways: (1) as Secretary of the Commission; (2) on the Advisory Committee on Tests; (3) on an advisory committee dealing with the
teacher; and (4) on the committee to study the relation of teachers and administrators.

Ballou followed the ideas of those educators who stressed the scientific approach to education. As Director of the Department of Educational Investigation and Measurement in the Boston public schools, he conducted several research projects which emphasized the use of these practices. He authored an article for the 15th Yearbook of the N.S.S.E., outlining the various testing procedures used in the Boston school system. His best known work was a detailed survey and analysis of The Appointment of Teachers in Cities. It is difficult to ascertain his views on specific educational issues, as these works were written in the style and format which characterized the scientific movement in education. Devoid of ideological and polemical content these works illustrate the objective, no-nonsense approach to educational practices. The data are arranged in clear, concise tables, leaving no doubt as to the methods, scope and results of the research undertaken. Ballou would not change his opinions with the passage of time. His approach to the Commission and its work stressed these views. One of the major controversies of the Commission was the clash between those who favored a scientific approach to the educational
problems of the day and those who favored a more liberal, open-ended, less objective approach. Ballou favored the precise spelling out of objectives, while Beard, Counts, Krey and others favored looser guidelines because of the uncertainties which they felt lay ahead. Ballou favored the conservative, essentialist approach to dealing with the educational problems of the day.

In his duties as Secretary of the Commission, Ballou sometimes chaired meetings in the absence of Chairman Krey. He did not use these opportunities to espouse his own views but stuck to the agenda of the proposed meetings. Ballou was one of the dissenting members of the Commission. His objections were made public and will be dealt with later in this work.

Charles Edward Merriam was, at the time of the Commission, one of the best-informed contemporary students of Political Science. He was born on November 15, 1874, in the small town of Hopkinton, Iowa, where his father was the postmaster. The elder Merriam wanted his son to follow a legal career but Charles chose teaching in its place. Merriam received a B. A. from the State University of Iowa in 1895. Prior to this he had taught school (1893–94) in an Iowa country school, at $22.50 a month. He continued his teaching career at Lenox College, which was located
in his home town of Hopkinton. At Lenox he taught the Classics and Mathematics. From 1896 to 1900 he was at Columbia University, earning his M. A. (1897) and Ph.D. (1900) and lecturing on political theory for a year as a substitute for a professor who was on sabbatical leave. He spent a year divided between the universities of Paris and Berlin, at this time furthering his knowledge of political science. His dissertation, published in 1900, was on the History of the Theory of Sovereignty Since Rousseau.

Following this varied introduction to teaching and the academic world, Merriam began his distinguished career at the University of Chicago. He started out as a docent in the Political Science department in 1900; rising in the department from associate in 1902-03 to instructor (1903-05) to assistant professor (1907-11), then to professor, becoming the Chairman of the department in 1923. During this time he contributed two major works to the corpus of American political science literature: A History of American Political Theories (1903) and Primary Elections (1909). Charles Beard was to refer to the latter work as being "of the highest practical importance" for both citizen and student.16

Merriam entered the political arena in Chicago in 1905. He became a member of the Charter Convention which was created that year to draft a new charter for the city. He investigated Chicago's revenues for the City Club (Report of an Investigation of the Municipal Revenues), and later he served as a secretary of the Harbor Commission. He completed his stint as a city official in the capacity of alderman, representing the Seventh Ward (the ward where the University of Chicago was located). He was instrumental in creating a commission which, under his chairmanship, investigated municipal finances and exposed large-scale graft within the city government. An advocate of the direct primary, as well as other reforms, Merriam was persuaded to become a candidate in the 1911 Chicago mayoralty race. He won the Republican nomination in the primaries with a high plurality but lost the election by a narrow margin to Carter Harrison. From 1913 to 1917 he served again on the Chicago City Council as alderman from the Seventh Ward and was responsible for the establishment of the Bureau of Public Efficiency.

During these years Merriam was offered positions with important law firms, as well as high posts in Washington in the Taft and Wilson administrations. He declined these offers; preferring to remain in Chicago where he
felt he could get a better prospective on the political process. He felt that he was gaining valuable insight through the role of "participant-observer." Merriam authored a series of works detailing his experiences in city government. Concerned with the problem of finding more adequate research facilities and sounder methods of analysis in political science, Merriam acted as the chairman of a special committee on research for the American Political Science Association. From 1923 to 1927, he was President of the Social Science Research Council which was established for the aid of social science workers. In addition to these activities, Professor Merriam, in collaboration with colleagues and students, and aided by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation, launched studies on such significant aspects of his field as non-voting, propaganda, leadership, and political psychology. Just prior to the Commission's deliberations, he served on President Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends. Like other members of the Commission, he brought a reservoir of talent to the work of the Commission.

On the Commission, Merriam served on the special advisory committee on objectives. The committee dealt with specific aspects of the philosophy and objectives of the study of the social sciences. Out of his work on this committee he authored the volume: *Civic Education*
In the United States. In the work Merriam felt that Social Science was the key to civic education, as he points out:

Social Science is the master key to civic education, unlocking the door to political and social advance. The greatest need of civic education in our day is adequate training for the future in terms of modern social trends and scientific progress. This is the central point which towers over all minor changes and adjustments of programs and courses.\(^\text{17}\)

In this respect he was in sympathy with other members of the Commission who saw the way out of the thicket through proper application of the study of the Social Sciences. The work will be analysed as to its social theory in the following chapter of this work.

Merriam clashed with several members of the Commission during the course of its deliberations. Part of the problem was temperament and part was related to differing educational philosophies. Like the other dissidents, Merriam did not sign the final report. His position and views for this action will be discussed later in this study.

Ernest Horn, like other members of the Commission, had rural origins, being born in Mercer County, Missouri, on July 17, 1882. After being educated in the rural schools of his home county, Horn attended the University of Missouri, Columbia, where he received his B.A. (1907) and M.A. (1909). Continuing his education at Columbia University, he received his Ph.D. in 1914. Prior to obtaining his baccalaurate, he taught elementary school in Mercer County, Missouri, from 1900 to 1905. During his student days at the university of Missouri, Columbia, he was the principal of the elementary laboratory school from 1905 to 1908. He joined the faculty of the University with the rank of Assistant Professor. While serving in this position, he taught various education courses during the period from 1908–09.

Leaving his native state, Horn went to Colorado as a professor of seminary work and as the director of the playground at the Colorado State Teachers College (1909 to 1912). While pursuing studies for the Ph.D. at Columbia Teacher's College (1912–15), Horn was appointed a scholar in education. Horn also taught at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences during his stay in the East. Following graduation, he taught at the State University of Iowa until his retirement nearly fifty years later. He was to become a prominent educator in the
Midwest. Many teachers in the elementary and secondary schools of this region were trained by Horn during his many years at Iowa.

While he espoused progressive ideas on education, Horn is usually placed with the Essentialists. The recognized leader of this movement was William C. Bagley, who co-authored one of the volumes in the Commission's report: The Selection and Training of the Teacher. Other educators associated with this movement were Isaac L. Kandel, Guy Montrose Whipple, Herman H. Horne, W. W. Charters and Horn. Some historians of education also place the well-known educator from the University of Chicago, Charles H. Judd, with this group.18

In his textbook, Foundations for American Education, Harold Rugg describes this group and their approach to educational philosophy:

The Essentialists are a variegated group of Professors of Education and public and private school administrators - who after forty years of advancing prestige, are scorned by most of their liberal arts university colleagues. The Essentialists took their name from their passion for finding, preserving, and passing onto the younger generation 'the essentials' in the

experience of the race, past and present — and especially those essentials which are of practical use to the people today. On the positive side the Professors of Education among them have, for two decades, doggedly put to work the principle of social use. They have insisted that the techniques of life that shall take the time of the school shall be determined by the factual analysis of what use people generally will make of them.\(^\text{19}\)

While a minority in the educational profession, the Essentialists made their views known through spokesmen such as Bagley.

A glimpse at the various publications contributed by Horn reveals his devotion to the Essentialist platform. His works reveal some of the basic tenets of the Essentialist position. They include the following titles: A Basic Writing Vocabulary, 1927; with others Learn to Study Readers; Lippincott's Horner Ashbaugh Speller; and Horn's Shields Silent Reading Flash Cards. He also contributed numerous articles to educational journals and yearbooks.

Horn was not a newcomer to the type of work carried out by the Commission; having served on a similar committee sponsored by the Commonwealth Fund from 1924 to 1926. The committee's purpose was to formulate a statement on the "Basic Processes in Society." Horn, along with Leon C. Marshall and A. A. Goldenweiser, drafted a statement designed to stimulate social studies instruction in American schools. Several prominent figures in social studies education gave critical advice to Horn and his fellow com-

\(^{19}\)Ibid., p. 607.
mittee members. Among those aiding the Committee were Beard, Dewey, Becker, Bode, Turner, Robinson and Roscoe Round. The draft report of the Committee was received with diverse reactions from educators around the country. Beard criticized the draft because he felt it did not place enough emphasis on the "economic environment."

The showdown between the Committee and its detractors did not occur as the project was discontinued when the director of the fund, Max Ferrand of Yale, took a position with the Huntington Library in 1927. The problems faced by this Committee would haunt Horn in the future.

Horn served the Commission on the Social Studies by working on the following committees: (1) Materials and Methods of Instruction; and (2) The Advisory Committee on Testing. When the latter committee ran into a snag in presenting its final Report, he chaired a special subcommittee to draft an alternate statement. The subcommittee issued a compromise statement, but it was not accepted for the final Report of the Commission. This refusal played a part in Horn's actions as the Commission ended its work and will be dealt with in a later chapter of this study.

Horn authored an important volume in the Commission's Report. It was to be the principal statement on the
Commission's views on methodology and was entitled: *Methods of Instruction in the Social Sciences*. In this volume he noted the efforts of the Commission in the volume by Beard: *Charter for the Social Sciences* and the final statement: *Conclusions and Recommendations* to give in perspective the most important goals of instruction and to indicate their implications for education.²⁰ His essentialist views were evident, as he indicated what was needed to straighten out the dilemma between objectives and teaching:

Statements of general implications for content and methods, no matter how skillfully formulated, are not sufficient, however, what is needed is a clear and unequivocal exposition of the way in which these guiding principles may be embodied in the selection, emphasis, and organization of each unit in the course of study and in the methods suggested for its teaching. Until this is done, the gap between objectives and teaching is likely to remain.²¹

Despite his apparent agreement with many aspects of the Commission's Report, he did not sign the final draft.


²¹Ibid., p. 6.
Jesse Homer Newlon was another prominent educator to serve on the Commission. Like Beard, a native of Indiana, Newlon was born in the small town of Salem on July 16, 1882. Educated in the public schools of Indiana, he received the A.B. degree from the University of Indiana in 1907. Newlon continued his education at Columbia University where he received the A.M. degree in 1914. He did not obtain a Ph.D. but accepted an L.L.D. from the University of Denver in 1922. Newlon's early career was not unlike that of other educators during this period.

His educational career began in 1905 when he accepted the position of principal of the high school in Charleston, Indiana. From 1907-09 he taught history and mathematics in the high school in New Albany, Indiana. Moving to Illinois, Newlon taught history and civics in the high school in Decatur from 1908-1912. From 1912 to 1916 he served as principal of the high school in Lincoln, Nebraska. His career moved upward as he was appointed superintendent of schools in Lincoln. He served at this post from 1917-1920. The pace of his career quickened as he became Superintendent of Schools in Denver from 1920-27. By now he had gained national prominence. The capstone of his career came with the appointment of Professor of Education at Teacher's College, Columbia, in 1927. At the
time the Commission sat he was the Director of the Lincoln Experimental School of Teachers College. He was to serve at various capacities at Columbia where he remained until his premature death in 1941.

While at Denver Newlon gained national prominence through his innovative programs in progressive education. Cremin remarks:

Two principles were at the heart of the Denver program: an abiding commitment to individual education and a profound faith in the average classroom teacher. Jesse Newlon shared unreservedly the standard progressive belief that it was the responsibility of the public schools to serve all comers, and that to do so required drastic curricular adjustments in terms of changing social circumstances. Here there was little new in his thinking. Rather, his originality lay in his notion of how these adjustments might be accomplished. "No program of studies will operate that has not evolved to some extent out of the thinking of teachers who are to apply it."22

Newlon's views represented the direction Progressivism was to take in the 1930's.

Newlon wrote several works which stressed his commitment to Progressivism in education. One of his best-known works was entitled: Education for Democracy in Our Time, which discusses his views concerning the nature of

Education is a form of social action. The purpose of education is to modify behavior, to make the individual a different person from what he would otherwise be. It is for this reason that educational policy is always social policy and that, in the modern world, the school is employed, deliberately, for the achievement of definite social purposes, becomes in fact, a crucial element in national policy.23

As the above quote indicates, he was aware of the social forces acting upon an educational system at a particular time in its development.

Later in the chapter, Newlon takes educators, such as Robert Hutchins, to task for failing to realize the effect of social problems on the educational process. The chapter deals with the weaknesses of the Essentialist position. As Newlon forcefully states:

Yet it is difficult to understand how such a theory as that set forth by President Hutchins can be advanced in the face of modern scholarship and the conditions existing in the contemporary world. Such a dictum ignores much that anthropology, history, and philosophy have taught us. Neither education nor "truth" are in all respects the same in contemporary America as in ancient Greece or ancient China or in a primitive culture— or in Nazi Germany. Fascism requires one kind of education, democracy, another; for education always affects social habits and social attitudes.24

24 Ibid., p. 204.
These views indicate that Newlon sympathized with the ideas of the sociologically-oriented members of the Commission, such as Krey, Counts and Beard.

On the Commission, Newlon served on the Advisory Committee on Materials and Methods of Instruction. He headed the special committee involved in the relations of teachers and administrators. Newlon authored a volume in the report entitled: *Educational Administration and Social Policy*. The work was well-received and represented the Commission's views on the relationship between educational administration and social policy. Chairman Krey made the following remarks concerning the volume in a letter to Newlon after its publication:

> I have read it again now that it is dressed up in book form and it impresses me even more than when I first read it. It seems to me that you have laid down the platform on which the school administrators of the next generation must be trained if they are going to do the work that society has a right to expect of them. I do not know how any school administrator who has thought about his work and his position can fail to agree with the principles you have laid down....The younger men now starting the ladder of advancement toward school administration cannot fail to be inspired to a finer and higher conception of their task after reading this book.25

---

25 A. C. Krey to Jesse Newman, New York, 10 September, 1934, Krey Papers, Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Newlon was in agreement with the position taken by the Commission and was one of the signers of the final Report.

Ada Louise Comstock was born in Moorhead, Minnesota, on December 11, 1876. She was the daughter of Lawrence and Sarah H. (Ball) Comstock. She studied at the University of Minnesota from 1892-94, leaving without a degree. She received the B.L. degree from Smith College in 1899 and a diploma from the State Normal School in Moorhead, Minnesota. Her graduate work was done at Columbia where she received the M.A. degree in 1899. She received many honorary degrees but did not work formally for the doctorate. She married the noted historian Wallace Notestein on June 14, 1943.

Her professional career began in 1899 when she was appointed assistant instructor in rhetoric at the University of Minnesota. Rising through the academic ranks, she became dean of women and left the university of Minnesota in 1912. She took a similar position at Smith College where she remained from 1912 to 1923. At Smith she made the acquaintanceship of Merle Curti, who was to author one of the volumes of the Commission's Report. In 1923 she was appointed President of Radcliffe College. At Radcliffe she became an important spokeswoman for higher education.
for women and other liberal causes. She remained at this position until her retirement in 1943. At the time of the Commission, she was at the height of her administrative career. She was the only educator on the Commission who was not a social scientist or educational specialist. Her teaching fields were English and the Humanities. She did not publish as extensively as the other members of the Commission, but she was an important and respected figure in higher education. On the Commission, she served on the Committee related to relations of teachers and administrators. She did not author a volume in the Commission's report.

Miss Comstock was active in many areas related to education and civic interests. She was not a newcomer to the workings of a large Commission; having served on the Commission on Law Enforcement and Observance, popularly known as the Wickersham Commission. She was also the only woman to serve on this commission. It was set up by President Hoover, shortly after his inauguration, to deal with the attitude of the American people toward law enforcement; particularly with the enforcement of the Volstead Act. The Wickersham Commission became embroiled in the prohibition controversy when its director issued a statement urging the states to assume a heavier burden in en-
forcing the Volstead Act. After this auspicious beginning, the Commission settled down to a more peaceful method of operation. Subcommittees were created and various experts were consulted as the Wickersham Commission settled down to a quiet and systematic study of the American machinery of justice. Miss Comstock took a liberal position regarding the repeal of the Volstead Act. In the report of the Commission she made the following statement:

The material which has been brought before the Commission has convinced me that adequate enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment and the National Prohibition Act is impossible without the support of a much larger proportion of our population than it now commands. Moreover, the conditions which exist today in respect to enforcement and which, in my opinion, can be modified only slightly by improvements in administration tend to undermine not only respect for law but more fundamental conceptions of personal integrity and decency. For these reasons, I am one of the members of the Commission who favor an immediate attempt at change. As I still hope that federal regulation of the liquor traffic may prove more effective than that of the states, I favor revision of the Amendment rather than its repeal.26

Miss Comstock was also active in the creation of Bennington College, a school for women, devoted to the

---

ideas of progressive education. She was one of the principal speakers in a fund raising rally that was to provide funding for the college's operation. The school became a showcase for progressive ideas of higher education. She was one of the most staunch supporters of Krey and his position when the going got rough for the Commission's final Report. Miss Comstock acted as a liaison between Krey and members of the Commission who resided in the East. Correspondence between Krey and Miss Comstock reveals that she served as a moderating influence with some of the more outspoken critics of the Commission's final Report. 27

Henry Johnson was another member of the Commission born outside North America. He was born in Sweden on February 10, 1867, the son of John and Christine (Engquist) Johnson. The family immigrated to the United States in 1869 and settled in Minnesota, a center for Scandinavian migration to this country. He received the B.L. degree from the University of Minnesota in 1889 and the M.A. from Columbia in 1902. Johnson did not receive the doctorate, but he did pursue graduate work in Paris and Berlin during the period from 1904 to 1905. Apparently Johnson

felt that not having a doctorate would in no way impede his chances for a college teaching post.

His professional career began in Moorhead, Minnesota, where he served as a teacher from 1889 to 1891 and from 1893 to 1894. Johnson served two terms as Superintendent of Schools in Moorhead from 1891 to 1893 and again during the 1894-95 academic year. From 1895 to 1899 he held the position of head of the History Department in the State Normal School in Moorhead. During this time, Ada Comstock was a student at the institution and probably made the acquaintanceship of Johnson. He left Moorhead to accept a similar position at the State Normal School (now Eastern Illinois University) in Charleston, Illinois. Johnson remained at this position from 1895 to 1906. During the summer of 1904 he was an instructor at the university of Illinois. He was appointed Professor of History, Teachers College, Columbia, in 1906 - a post he held until his retirement.

Johnson, unlike some history professors, became well-known for his involvement in secondary school teacher-organizations. He was a member of the Secondary Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland from 1906 to 1912; serving as President of the group in 1914-15. Johnson chaired the Committee on History in the Schools of the American Historical Association in 1916.
He was appointed to serve on the New York State Board of Regents Committee on History in the high schools.

Along with these activities, he was involved in writing and in editorial projects. Johnson was on the editorial committee of History Teacher's Magazine, an influential professional periodical of the time. His publications included two important works on the teaching of history. They were: The Problem of Adapting History to Children, 1908, and The Teaching of History, 1915. The latter work gives us an idea of his views on history and methodology. Johnson defined history in general terms:

History, in its broadest sense, is everything that ever happened. It is the past itself, whatever that may be. But the past cannot be observed directly. What is known about it must be learned from such traces of former conditions and events as time and chance and the foresight of man may have preserved. Our practical concern in forming a conception of history is, therefore, with these traces, the method employed in studying them, and the results of the study. Traces of past facts of any kind may be regarded as possible material. We speak of history of plants, of animals, and even of inanimate nature. But history in the usual acceptance of the term means the history of man. The materials to be studied are the traces left by his existence in the world, his thoughts, feelings and actions.28

Despite his acceptance of a broad definition of history, Johnson argues for exacting standards of historical

research in the work. He comes down on the side of the relativists in their quarrel with those who advocated the scientific approach to history favored by Ranke and his followers. Johnson states his position as follows:

The realities of history are unique realities. What happened once can never happen again. For any given reality the facts of importance are, then not those common to a number of realities, but rather those that give to one reality its uniqueness. The facts of importance in representing and explaining Luther are not those common to all leaders of religious revolt, but rather those that make Luther unique, that distinguish him from all other leaders.²⁹

He realized that history had become a science in the last seventy-five years due to the work of Ranke and the German school. Despite this, he felt that there was still a need for the descriptive, relativist position. Johnson remarked:

It is conceivable that human action may come in time to be explained in terms of general laws, but even then the reality and succession of realities to be explained must continue to be described, if history is to retain any part of its present meaning.³⁰

The foregoing views would tend to place Johnson in agreement with other relativists on the Commission.

²⁹Ibid., p. 25.
With the Commission, Johnson served on the Committee on Materials and Methods of Instruction. He also served with the Advisory Committee on Tests. This committee was embroiled in one of the major disputes of the Commission and will be treated in great detail in a later chapter. As a result of his involvement on this committee, Johnson wavered in his acceptance of the final report. During the final meeting of the Commission in Chicago in 1934 he was persuaded to accept the final draft of the report. 31

Johnson authored a volume of the report entitled: An Introduction to the History of the Social Sciences in the Schools. This work traced the inclusion of history in the curricula of the schools of Western Europe and its inception in American schools. Like other volumes of the report, it was hailed as an important contribution to the literature on this topic.

Guy Stanton Ford was born in Liberty Corners, Wisconsin, on May 9, 1873, and died in Washington, D. C. on December 29, 1962. He was the son of Thomas D. and

31 A. C. Krey to Ada Comstock, Cambridge, Mass., 27 March, 1934, Krey Papers, Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Helen (Shumway) Ford. Following an education in the public schools of Wisconsin, he attended Upper Iowa University. He received the B. Litt. degree from the University of Wisconsin, where he studied under Ely and Turner. Following graduation he continued his education in Germany, primarily at the University of Berlin (1899-1900). Returning to the United States he attended Columbia University where he received the Ph.D. in 1903. His dissertation: Hanover and Prussia, 1795-1807: A Study in Neutrality, was published shortly after his graduation.

His teaching career began in the public schools at Bremen Co., Iowa, 1891 to 1892. He was Superintendent of Schools in Wisconsin Rapids, Wisconsin, from 1895-98. Leaving the Midwest, he went to Yale as an instructor in History from 1901 to 1906. The University of Illinois lured him away from Yale to set up a new Modern European History Department. He remained at Illinois from 1906 to 1913. Ford left the University of Illinois for Minnesota where he chaired the Department of History and was also the Dean of the Graduate School. He was credited with transforming the University of Minnesota from "an overgrown New England College of the West" to a modern state university.32 While

---

at Minnesota he built up a strong history department which included such outstanding scholars as A. B. White, Wallace Notestein, A. C. Krey and C. W. Alvord.

He managed to teach a full load, as well as perform his administrative duties. He did not limit his attention to the History Department, but he also built up other parts of the graduate school. Ford seemed to have the uncanny ability to spot promising young teachers and researchers.

Ford served on a number of committees and professional organizations. He was on the Executive Council of the American Historical Association in 1915; the "Special Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools" in December, 1918. Ford served as the head of the Division of Civic and Educational Publications on George Creel's Committee on Public Information; on the Board of Editors in 1920, and as Chairman of that board, 1921-27.

On the Commission he served on the Advisory Committee on the Teacher. He did not author a volume of the Commission's Report. He also served on the important Committee on Objectives. Ford's usefulness on the Commission was largely his ability to work with people and bring disparate groups together. He disliked the grandiose or the spectacular and had the ability to persuade people to work together for common ends, and also had what has been called "wise shrewdness and good temper." At the time of the
Commission he was appointed acting President of the University of Minnesota. Later he would receive the post permanently.

Hiram Hayden described this ability in a memorial tribute to Ford:

The very first time I met him was at a meeting involving what seemed to me an important moral problem. As the meeting continued, I was increasingly unhappy to realize that none of the twenty-odd distinguished American educators present as going to face the issue and act decisively within its contest. I had reluctantly just come to this realization when I discovered that I was wrong. For Dr. Ford stood up and, speaking very quietly, brought everyone present, however unwilling to face with one of those rare moments of truth. Ford was in favor of the conclusions reached by the Commission; and he was one of the supporters of the final Report.

Carlton Joseph Huntley Hayes was born in Alton, New York, on May 16, 1882, the son of Dr. Pheletus A. and Permilia (Huntley) Hayes. He was educated at Columbia University, from which institution he received a B.A. degree in 1904, an M.A. in 1905 and a Ph.D. degree in 1909. His teaching career began in 1907 when he was appointed lecturer in History at Columbia. Hayes remained at Columbia throughout his teaching career, rising from lecturer to full professor.

During the summer sessions, Hayes taught at various institutions and colleges throughout the country. He was from time to time a visiting professor for the regular sessions at other universities. He was at the University of California in 1917 and in 1923; at the Johns Hopkins University in 1930 and at Stanford University in 1941.

Professor Hayes achieved international fame during his more than two decades of historical teaching and writing. His books probably reached more students than did his lectures, since they were used as textbooks throughout the United States and in other countries. Students came from long distances to attend his courses. One of his former students related that during the First World War Hayes's course "Europe since 1815" was the most popular at Columbia. Hayes brought European History "from the abstraction of a textbook to an experience lived and a problem to be faced." The former student continues:

...and he always surprised some of us that in the midst of the lectures - first rate theatrical performances, words shot for emphasis, silences sustained for a moment, gestures and movement deployed like those of a good actor - when he looked down at our notes, they were as ordered and clear as if we had listened to a scholastic metronome...Some of the barbs delivered in a dry voice by this baldish, sharp-featured man in his thirties were
directed at us, at our very smugness, at our laziness or at our fathers. 34

Many Columbia graduates considered him to be "one of the most potent forces on the campus," and his courses were considered to be "highlights" of the academic year. 35

Hayes believed that the teaching of history was the active inculcation of the movement of the past rather than a passive narration of past events. On several occasions, Hayes chided modern teachers for their passivity and criticized the textbooks used, particularly those dealing with French history. In 1930, one of Hayes's textbooks, Modern History, 1923, co-authored with Parker T. Moon, was removed from the approved list of textbooks of New York City schools, where it had been used for seven years, "after protests had been made that it was un-American and pro-catholic." 36 Both Hayes and Moon denied the charges.

Hayes authored many historical works. His two volume textbook: Political and Cultural History of Modern

---

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid., p. 348.
Europe was the best known. Other works were: *An Introduction to the Sources Relating to the Germanic Invasion*, (1909); *British Social Politics*, (1913); *A Brief History of the Great War* (1920); *Essays on Nationalism*, (1926); *France, A Nation of Patriots* (1930); *Historical Evolution and Modern Nationalism* (1931); and *A Generation of Materialism* (1935). Lewis Gannet said of the last cited work:

> Mr. Hayes writes as a son of the established Church and a believer in traditional religion, (he writes also with easy learning and with a grace granted to few historians).  

Hayes, who was received into the Catholic Church in 1924, remarked that among the many reasons for his conversion - one of the most important was his historical studies.  

As Hayes served on a number of committees related to historical studies, his work on the Commission was not a novel experience. He received further notoriety by being appointed ambassador to Spain in 1942. His supporters credited him with helping to keep Spain neutral during World War II.

On the Commission, Hayes served with the Committee that dealt with the relations of teachers and administrators and the Advisory Committee on Materials and Methods of Instruction. Hayes did not author a volume in the re-

---

37 Ibid., p. 347.  
38 Ibid., p. 348.
port. As a supporter of the final report, he lent his stature and prestige to those in favor of accepting the report.

The preceding sketches give us an insight into the background and personalities of the important members of the Commission. They were individuals with deep convictions, dealing with problems at the very core of the educational process as it related to the social studies. They were leaders in a time of crisis and they had to play decisive roles and to make decisions. In most cases, they had full teaching assignments or other academic duties.

There were other outstanding educators who assisted in the work of the Commission and they were not official members. They authored or co-authored volumes in the report. William Bagley, Merle Curti, Bessie Louise Pierce, W. H. Kimmel, Harold Rugg and Rolla Tryon were the most prominent of these individuals. Along with these persons, the clerical staffs brought the number of participants in the Commission's activities to over one hundred.

The work of the Commission was an interplay of the individuals and talents of these outstanding educational leaders. Success would depend on their ability to reach a consensus—often at the expense of an agonizing change or restructuring of long held beliefs and convictions.
In the end there were some bruised feelings and "ruffled feathers" but the massive job they set out to do was completed. It will be the purpose of the rest of this work to deal with relationships which developed and to suggest some ways in which they influenced the outcome of the Commission's work. The following chapter will delineate, explain and criticize the social theories expounded by members of the Commission in the volumes they authored.
CHAPTER III

THE SOCIAL THEORIES EXPRESSED BY
THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

The preceding chapters dealt with the social conditions which necessitated the creation of the Commission; the composition of the Commission and the procedures followed in the deliberations of the Commission. Leaving these preliminaries aside, let us proceed to the work of the Commission.

The length of the report precludes studying it in its entirety. Three major aspects of the report will be dealt with in depth. They are: (1) the social theories propounded by the members of the Commission; (2) the educational methods and policies which would be necessary to deal adequately with these social theories and conditions; and (3) the controversial issues surrounding the acceptance of the report.

If one were to succinctly summarize the work of the Commission, it could best be summarized as the interaction of the social environment and the educational process. These two factors were the lynchpins on which the
bulk of the report rested. A major undertaking of the Com-
mission was to analyze and attempt to understand the social
setting in which the educational process took place. The
same careful analysis would be directed by the Commission
on the educational process. Once these procedures had been
accomplished the other aspects of the report would fall in-
to place.

Several members of the Commission felt that a
thorough analysis of American society was necessary before
prescriptions for educational change could be developed
and implemented. Themes stressed in several volumes of
the report were social theory and the impact of social
forces on education. In this chapter the various social
theories expressed by the authors of volumes in the report
will be delineated and analyzed. The following volumes of
the report will be utilized: Charles A. Beard: The Nature
of the Social Sciences; Charles A. Beard: A Charter for the
Social Sciences; Charles A. Beard, George S. Counts and
August C. Krey: Conclusions and Recommendations; George S.
Counts, et al.; Social Foundations of Education; Merle
Curti: The Social Ideas of American Educators and Charles
A. Merriam; Civic Education in the United States.
The works by Beard and Counts are more important because they summarize the views of the authors, as well as members of the Commission. The *Conclusions* was written primarily by Counts and contained the final Report of the Commission. This volume was an outgrowth of the general meetings and committee reports of the Commission. The volumes by Curti and Merriam, while less important, were significant contributions to the then current social views of educators.

At the outset of our investigation, it will be necessary to define the term social theory. There has been no lack of endeavor in writing about and developing social theories. A large part of the activities of sociologists, social psychologists, social philosophers and other academicians has been directed to the task of developing and testing social theories. It would not seem to be practical at this point to deal at any great length with the nature of social theory; an operational definition will suffice.

Melvin H. Marx, a psychologist and specialist in theory construction, in a cogent paper entitled "The General Nature of Theory Construction," described the different meanings of the term. One of the meanings

---

stressed by Marx will serve as our definition of social theory. Marx stated:

Theory is used to refer to any generalized explanatory principle. Ordinarily, this kind of theory consists of a statement of functional relationship among variables. If the variables are expressed in empirical terms, then the term law is more likely to be applied to such a principle. If on the other hand, the variables tend to be more abstract and less directly empirical, the term theory is more often used.

We will use the term social theory to mean an explanation of American society and the direction in which it was developing in regard to the American educational system. The views expressed by the Commission members will be analyzed in terms of this theoretical framework. Members of the Commission felt that it was necessary to delineate the forces acting upon American society and consequently exerting an influence on American education. Any changes in the educational process would have to recognize these forces.

The Charter for the Social Sciences was the Commission's primary statement on the objectives and goals of social science education. It was written by Charles A. Beard, but it also contained the views of the sub-committee.

---

on objectives. Beard chaired this important group which included Commission members, Counts, Ford, Krey and Merriam. Educational specialists Franklin A. Bobbitt, Boyd H. Bode and Harold O. Rugg were added to the sub-committee and contributed their expertise to the difficult task of developing objectives. The sub-committee worked at its task for nearly two years.

It met with the Commission at various times during this two-year period to allow commission members to add their views and to offer constructive criticism. Each member of the sub-committee had the opportunity to present his views on objectives in writing, as well as orally. Once the Commission approved the draft report, Beard was instructed to prepare the volume which would be the statement of the Commission on objectives. While the volume contains the views of the members of the sub-committee, Beard's ideas predominate.

Prior to an analysis of the volume, it might be useful to mention views held by Beard concerning education and the relationship of education to society. Beard felt that the educator cannot separate society from the educational process; education did not occur in isolation.

According to Beard:

A realistic program of social studies cannot be drawn with mathematical precision, therefore, from the realm
of scholarly ideas without reference to actuality - to the prosaic world as a going concern. ³

He saw American society in a process of continuous change. At this point in his intellectual development, Beard embraced a philosophy that has been referred to as skeptical relativism. ⁴ During the years the Commission sat, he was to deliver his famous presidential address to the American Historical Association entitled: "Written History as an Act of Faith," which summed up his philosophical position.

Beard felt that education as a whole could not escape the historical process. As he pointed out a few years later:

Every system of education, like all human institutions, is enclosed in history, is a phase of all culture in evolution. It does not spring suddenly, full blown, out of nothing, and function apart from economy, arms and the arts. Its significance must be sought not merely in its form and spirit, but also in its relations with the rest of society and the world of nations - past and present. ⁵


⁵Charles A. Beard, "Education under the Nazis," Foreign Affairs, 14 (April, 1936), p. 450.
His views were similar to other progressive educators, but they bore the marks of his unique thought. Beard's views on the nature of civilization, historical relativism and the role of progress colored his views on education, which is to be expected. He felt that all societies imposed some form of education on their young. Education, even in our democracy, was a type of indoctrination. This seemed, according to Beard, especially true of revolutionary societies. Russian schools taught communism and all American schools inculcated "republicanism." Education always lagged behind the cutting edge of a society. Since this was so, education was obliged to revise practices and methods in order to keep abreast of these changes. Schools would not be set apart from society as they would be involved in the deeper and wider issues. Educators had responsibilities that went beyond the classroom and the teacher-learner process. Schools and education had and should be aware of the dominant issues and interest of society at any given point in time.  

Beard, in an article in *Social Research*, felt that there were four obligations which education had: (1) to infuse our youth with the moral values of our society, to include those "human ideals" without which democracy would be an "empty shell"; (2) to equip our young people with a "realistic knowledge of our political institutions and practices"; (3) to acquaint the pupils with the unadorned facts of economic life; and (4) to enrich our students' lives with a knowledge of arts, letters, and sciences and all the other "splendid manifestations of the human spirit." These were the goals on which our educational system was to be geared. The system would be judged on the manner in which it prepared students to live and work in their times and circumstances.

*A Charter for the Social Studies* was divided into the following parts: (1) the requirements of scholarship; (2) the nature of the social disciplines; (3) requirements set by the social realities of our times; (4) the climate of American ideas; (5) the framework of law and established programs; (6) the requirements of the teaching and learning

---

process and (7) the supreme purpose in civic education. 8

Parts three and four dealt with Beard's social theory. Beard outlined his theory and proceeded to suggest ways in which educators would deal with the problems posited by these theories. Factors affecting American society were: (1) the changing nature of our society; (2) industrialism; (3) the emergence of rationalism and scientism; (4) the nature of the American government; and (5) the nature of the American school system. 9

Change, one of the constants of the emerging American society, played a significant role in determining the nature of the American educational process. Beard stated the nature of the problem as follows:

With the details we are not here concerned. It is the inescapable drive of change under the accumulation of ideas and traditions, under the relentless impacts of science and invention, that sets the fundamental problem in organizing social studies for the schools. In a fixed regime it is possible to establish duties, rights, and responsibilities with a fair degree of definiteness, effective always, everywhere; but in a changing society such crystallization is not only out of the question, attempts to effect it are dangerous to orderly development. 10


9 Ibid.

10 Ibid., p. 5.
Industrialism was the second major factor influencing American society according to Beard. Students would have to learn to live and work in an industrial society. In many parts of the world people would still be engaged in agricultural activities, hence these societies would change slowly. This would not be true of American society, as occupations would not extend from generation to generation. Many things students learned might be obsolete by the time they leave school. As he remarked:

All industry becomes dynamic, changeful, requiring for its development extraordinary qualities of alertness, mobility and ingenuity. Routine skill is seldom enough; capacity for adaptation is the prime source of achievement. And this new life must be led in the midst of urban centers large and small, not in the open country where our ancestors tilled the fields, spun and wove. It must be lived amid circumstances which dissolve the habits and loyalties of agrarian and village times. Therefore, the assumption that the schools can indoctrinate the pupils with fixed ideas and give them definitive skills good always and everywhere has little warrant in our industrial civilization.\textsuperscript{11}

Advanced industrialization would bring in its wake the use of rationalism and scientism in governmental and educational planning. Beard felt that our society could no longer be regulated by unscientific, non-rational means. He sardonically commented:

The farmer may still hope to drive away insect pests

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 6.
by exorcising evil spirits; but no owner of an automobile expects to start a balky engine by doing genuflections before the carburetor.\textsuperscript{12}

Planning was becoming extremely important and the engineering mentality was beginning to extend into governmental and social arrangements. Beard quoted President Hoover on this change: "We are passing," said Mr. Hoover, "from a period of extremely individualistic action into a period of associational activities."\textsuperscript{13}

The nature of the American government was another important factor in shaping American society. In the United States, emphasis was placed on elective officials. Each citizen was to participate in the elective process at the various levels of government. In practice, the American government operates under the pressure of political parties. In lieu of this, students were to learn how to participate in a democracy. They were to learn the importance of dissent and when to dissent. Free discussion of vital topics must always be maintained and these discussions were to be frank and open if they were going to achieve maximum effectiveness. As Beard forcefully stated:

\textsuperscript{12}Ibid., p. 33.

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p. 34.
The intelligent among them become creative forces in their communities; they make the laws as well as obey them. And the more dynamic become leaders on some scale, for American political institutions cannot function without spontaneous leadership.\textsuperscript{14}

Lastly, the school could not do everything, it was only one social agency. Schools could not be expected to solve the problems of democracy. Beard showed why this was so:

The reason for caution becomes apparent on second or third thought. First of all, there is no assurance that the problems discussed today with such assiduity will be the problems before the country when the children now in the grades have reached the age of maturity. History is in a large measure a record of unexpected crises — at all events of crises not generally foreseen or at best dimly foreshadowed. Forty years ago, the free coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one and the dissolution of trusts were the pressing issues; now they are, at most, of secondary importance. Burning questions of the hour may be ashes tomorrow.\textsuperscript{15}

Beard's relativism came to the surface in the foregoing statement. Social problems are temporary when considered against the backdrop of history. Schools cannot assume infallibility, provide remedies for all social discomforts, and send the children home with dogmatic medicine already prepared. It is not only in and through certain domestic institutions, political, economic and social, that the

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 37.

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 42.
citizen lives and discharges his obligations. American society operates on a world stage. 16

Social education cannot help a given society attain its just ends unless it lays bare the structure of international relations and emphasizes the importance of the kind of national behavior essential to the rational conduct of international affairs. In other words, the domestic scene must be firmly fitted into the world scene. 17 The role of the teacher of the social sciences was to create the conditions which would help the student to realize the obligation and responsibilities which accompanied American citizenship. Students would be prepared to act responsibly in the domestic political arena as well as be conversant with the international political scene. 18

Beard envisioned three social ideas; (1) ideological; (2) utopian, and (3) progressive. The first, the ideological, refers to the fact that the present order is the best of all possible worlds and the business of learning is to rationalize the apparently predominating scheme of

16 Ibid., p. 48.
17 Ibid., p. 51.
18 Ibid., p. 52.
things. This view, according to Beard, degenerated into a rigid social structure with the establishment engaged primarily in preserving particular forms and processes.

The second idea, the utopian, as a theory, saw the state as ideal, a perfect, endemic creation. It accepted the idea, stemming from the French Revolution, of perfectionism here and now. It, too, had the tendency toward becoming static if this state of perfection were achieved. Thus it could become as dangerous as the ideological approach.

The third social idea Beard referred to as "progressive." Progressivism accepted neither the perfection of current ideology nor the perfectionism of utopia. It was, as Beard stated:

...founded on the assumption that what we actually have to deal with in reality is a process, a changing order of things which carries along with it an ideological heritage, and bears within itself the possibilities of a more perfect order of things, never utopian and fixed, but always involving the perils of choice and the advantages of improvement. 19

The teacher of social science had to take the progressive view if the subject matter was to be useful. Beard suggested:

By its intrinsic nature, social science requires some

19 Ibid., pp. 54-55.
pictures of the process in which we live and work and when it is realistically conceived it must deal with what is here and now and also with what is emerging from the here and now.  

The chief objective of social studies education was to be the improvement of individuals and institutions. A major objective of the social studies following in the progressive tradition was, according to Beard:

...it appears that any social science worthy of the name must objectify itself in the development of individuals, institutions, human relations, and material arrangements already in course of unfolding in the United States. The people of this country are engaged in no mere political experiment, as often imagined, but are attempting to build a civilization in a new natural setting, along original lines, with science and machinery as their great instrumentalities of work.

This task would fall largely on the shoulders of the American people as civilization could not be imported wholesale from Europe. Although we were the offspring of European civilization, our society had developed a unique civilization. Beard described this task as follows:

While few critics go abroad for inspiration, while the wise search for idioms wherever they may be found, the great body of thinkers still agree with Emerson that we must stand fast where we are and work out our destiny along lines already marked out -- build a civilization with characteristics sincerely our own, in harmony with historic ideals and yet incorporating novel practices adapted to changing needs.

20 Ibid., p. 56.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid., p. 57.
In achieving this, four major aspects would always be in the foreground—political, economic, ethical and aesthetic. These factors would shape American society as it attempted to deal with future events. Beard was by no means a pessimist. He believed strongly, like other progressives, that progress would continue. His faith was not boundless but tempered by what Henry Steele Commager referred to as a "hard-nosed empiricism."  

Beard summed up his position as follows:

The environment and conduct of men and women can be modified by effort in the light of higher values and better ends. Human relations, constitutions, economic arrangements, and political practices are not immutably fixed. If there is anything which history demonstrates, it is the generalization, all legislation, all community action, all individual effort are founded on the assumption that evils can be corrected, problems solved, the ills of life minimized, and its blessings multiplied by rational methods, intelligently applied, essentially by this faith is American civilization justified.  

The volume was concluded with a summary of the goals which would shape instruction in the social studies. They were:

1. National planning in industry, business, agriculture and government to sustain mass production of goods

---


on a high level of continuity and to assure the most economical and efficient use of our national resources.

2. The expansion of insurance systems to cover protection against sickness, old age, unemployment, disasters, and hazards to civilized life.

3. Universal education from the earliest years of youth to the last years of old age, including public schools, colleges, institutes for adult education, and libraries.

4. The perfection of systems of transportation -- rail, waterway, air, and highway -- linking all parts of the country and facilitating commerce, travel and intercourse.

5. The development of city, community, regional, and state planning, co-ordinated with national designs, with a view to giving to all the people conditions for living and working that are worthy of the highest type of civilization.

6. The development of national, state, and local parks and kindred facilities for wholesome recreation within reach of all, offsetting and limiting the pressures and distractions of commercialized amusements.

7. Expansion of present facilities to include a national program of preventive medicine and public safety to reduce the death rate, diseases, and accidents to the lowest possible minimum, supplemented by universal hospitalization to care for unavoidable cases of sickness and accidents.

8. The conscious and deliberate encouragement, both public and private, of science, letters, and the arts, not as mere ornaments, but as organic parts of the good life.

9. The preservation and expansion of a reassessed equality of opportunity for all men and women to unfold their talents, win rewards, seek appreciation in public and private life, employ their creative impulses, and reach distinction in the various fields of human endeavor within the map of civilization.
10. Co-operation with the other nations of the earth in promoting travel, intercourse, commerce, and exchange on the faith of the declaration that war is renounced as an instrument of national policy and that the solution of conflicts is always to be sought on the basis of peace.  

The foregoing quote is rather lengthy but highly significant. Beard later was accused of being utopian and unrealistic in the goals he proposed. This quotation gives us an idea of the manner in which Beard stated these goals and will be useful for later discussions in this work.

The purpose of *The Nature of the Social Sciences* was to bridge the gap between the various social sciences. Beard was chosen by the Commission to deal with the nature and relationship of the social science subjects which were usually included in the curricula. An attempt was made by Beard to develop a brief statement dealing with the nature of the social sciences and to form a background for the consideration of objectives in social studies education. Views, clearly Beard's, permeated the volume and the work was in no way received with unanimous approval by the members of the Commission.

The work was divided into three parts: (1) an introduction to the general nature of the social sciences;

---

25 Ibid., pp. 79-81.
a section which dealt with a chapter on the following subject matter areas: (A) History; (B) Political Science; (C) Economics and (D) Cultural Sociology; and (3) the determination of objectives.

The first part consisted of Beard's views on the nature of the social sciences. His views on this topic may be summarized as follows:

1. The social sciences comprise the most important area of knowledge related to human affairs. Deprived of this knowledge, modern civilization would sink down into primitive barbarism.

2. The empirical or scientific method is the best instrument for social scientists to use in accumulating knowledge.

3. There can be no neutrality in the study of the social sciences. Even the rigid empiricist is not free from value judgments.

4. The social sciences are broader than the mere accumulation of facts. They are ethical sciences, not empirical, natural or neutral sciences.

5. The social sciences and the natural sciences have two fundamental similarities: (1) neither group has been able to make an all-embracing and final philosophy of the subject matter under its consideration and (2) neither group as a body of empirical thought can declare the uses to which its findings of fact and law should be put by mankind.26

The last section of the work dealt with the determination of objectives for the social sciences. Beard set forth the following broad guidelines which he felt educators should consider in drawing up objectives: (1) an

---

awareness of the changes which occurred in American society; (2) an understanding of the role of the social sciences in aiding the acquisition of knowledge; (3) objectives would never be neutral but would contain moral and aesthetic values; (4) objectives would provide for the future needs of the students and (5) objectives would not be drawn up without careful consideration. Examples of specific objectives were included and the work was concluded with detailed course outlines for the various disciplines.

Summarizing Beard's social theory we see the following: (1) society and education are interrelated; the educational process cannot be separated from society; (2) education is enclosed in the historic aspect of a country's development; (3) industrialization has changed the educational process; (4) individualism must yield to planning as American society moves toward a collectivism; (5) social problems are temporary when considered against the backdrop of history; (6) a progressive view is best in dealing with current educational problems; (7) education cannot solve all the problems of society as it is but one social agency; (8) education must deal realistically with the problems it faces; and (9) progress can take place if it is preceded by the necessary planning and foresight.
George S. Counts prepared the largest and, aside from Beard's volumes, the most influential volume in the reports of the Commission. It was entitled: The Social Foundations of Education. The work was surrounded with controversy during its inception and subsequent publication. Several times during the composition of the volume, Counts expressed his concern to Krey that the volume would be too lengthy. Krey, in his patient manner, advised Counts that allowances would be made for the extended length of the projected work because of the significance of its statement. Counts work was to become a pioneering work in the field of educational sociology; thereby rewarding Krey's patience.

Counts theories of education were influenced by his teachers at the University of Chicago and his colleagues at Teachers College, Columbia. Charles Judd, Albion Small and Charles Merriam were teachers who helped to shape his views. Although he was not their student, Counts was influenced by Charles A. Beard, John Dewey and Thorsten Veblen. Counts close personal friendship with

27 A. C. Krey to George S. Counts, New York, 7 March 1934, Krey Papers, Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Beard led some commission members to remark that he was parodying the ideas of Beard in *The Social Foundations of American Education*. There is no doubt that Beard offered suggestions and helped Counts through difficult stages in the writing of the work, but the work was essentially Counts's. Correspondence between Counts and Beard bore this out. That there would be similarities in their views is understandable, as many progressive educators held like views while adding their unique thoughts to the mainstream of progressive theory. Our primary purpose is not to compare Beard's views with those of Counts, but a few remarks concerning ways in which they differed will clear the air.

Beard stressed the role of economic forces in shaping civilization, while Counts stressed sociological factors. Counts held relativistic views but not to the extent that Beard did. For Counts, it was possible to know and correct the ills of society while Beard seemed to be more skeptical and relativistic. A good example of their positions would be a comparison of their views in two of their

---

works: Counts's views in his *Education and Society* and Beard's views in his "Written History as an Act of Faith." Beard was not as vehement in holding that education should reconstruct society. He saw the interrelationship between society and education, but he did not feel that education could or should alter society to a great extent. Counts felt that this was one of the primary goals of education. Lastly, Beard was a social gadfly and critic but limited his activities when it came to participating in radical groups. Counts, a social critic, felt that once criticism had been offered, the critic should enter the lists and do battle for his cause.

*Social Forces in American Education* is divided into four parts: (1) a preface; (2) basic forces; (3) trends and tensions and (4) philosophy and program. The first three parts contain Counts's views on education and a description of the social forces which have shaped American education. The concluding section of the work dealt with Counts's philosophical analysis of American society and the programs he recommended American education should follow to remedy the situation.

In the preface Counts dealt with educational statesmanship and his philosophy of education. Counts saw education as being a function of time, place and circumstance.
Education was the reflection of the experiences, the ambitions, and the hopes, fears and aspirations of a particular people or cultural group at a particular point in history.  

He continued in a relativistic vein:

In actuality it is never organized and conducted with sole reference to absolute and universal terms........ It possesses no inner logic or empirical structure of its own that dictates either its method or its content. In both its theoretical and practical aspects it expresses the ideals of some given society at some given period in time, either consciously with clear design or half-consciously with hidden and confused purpose. There can be no all-embracing educational philosophy, policy or program suited to all cultures and all ages.  

The first part of the work entitled: Basic forces, is subdivided into three parts: (1) Democratic traditions; (2) Natural endowment and (3) Technology. He proceeded to discuss the influence of these basic forces on the development of American society. The democratic tradition was traced from the beginnings of the nation to the present time. This early society was characterized by the individual farmer taming the wilderness and the mechanic and

30 Ibid.
tradesman dominated village life. Written and oral examples of this tradition could be found in the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Politically, it continued from Jeffersonian democracy through Jacksonian democracy to present day progressivism. While the country changed to meet new needs and challenges, this tradition remained at the core of our development. Counts forcefully stated:

Democracy provides the dominant spiritual note in the development of the nation and may be expected to guide both statesman and educators in the definition of the goals of their practical endeavor. That it is not to be identified with any special set of institutions—economic, political, or social—is one of its merits. Rather is it to be regarded as a point of reference in the creation and reconstruction of all social forms and arrangements—a great ethical principle to be consulted in the formulation of all policies and progress touching the welfare of the American people.31

In the following section Counts dealt with the natural setting and how American development had been influenced by an abundance of natural resources. He described the way in which climate, soil, flora, fauna, minerals, energy resources and the natural beauties had enriched American development. These factors were considered not only in their natural setting but in their social aspects as well. In his analysis he predicted some of the problems relating to the energy crisis of the late 1970's. Full utilization of natural resources would depend on wise and ef-

31Ibid., p. 31.
ficient planning. New developments in science and technology were to aid this process and lead to the more efficient use of our natural resources.

The concluding section of the first part examined technology. Counts began by presenting a brief history of the growth of technology. Basic developments such as the invention of the cotton gin were discussed. He did not settle for mere description but indicated the social implications of these basic inventions. According to Counts, there were two important outcomes related to the growth of technology: First, the nature of the growth; phenomenal in its size and capacity and; secondly, in its longevity; it is not over but will continue indefinitely.

Counts then considered the power of technology. An enormous amount of power had been placed in the hands of men as a result of technology. This resulted in the following changes: (1) man was emancipated from his physical limits; (2) it emancipated the human body from its energy limits; and (3) it emancipated the human from the limits of space.\(^ {32} \) The possibilities of the effects of this power would lead to an indefinite extension of technological development.

\(^ {32} \text{Ibid.}, \text{ pp. 64-65.} \)
The discussion continued with a section on the inner nature of technology. Technology possessed six basic but closely interdependent characteristics in that it was: (1) functional; (2) rational; (3) planful; (4) centripetal; (5) dynamic; and (6) efficient.

Technology was rational and served as a liberating force if given the opportunity. It did not operate according to authority and tradition but to the immediate needs of the present. In doing this, it used empirical methods and rationalist thought and eschewed prejudices, biases and rule-of-thumb decisions. As technology continued to expand, the mentality created by it had a greater effect on social planning and functioning.

Unlike the humanities, technology was functional rather than academic. The problems it dealt with were practical and the knowledge generated was usually put to immediate use. Technologists made constant use of recent research while humanistic studies were often stored away and appeared to be of little practical value in the everyday world.

Planning was necessary if technology was to advance and to be used wisely and efficiently. It could not be successfully applied without careful planning. This was just the opposite of economic developments which occurred
in the pre-industrial age. The result of careful planning was an ever-widening influence of technology on industrial development.

The centripetal forces inherent in technology extended to all areas of society. Since it relied on elaborate planning it could not tolerate chaos in other areas of society. This, in turn, led to a process of standardization which has permeated industrial societies. American industry was now concentrated in the hands of giant corporations.

Technology was dynamic, resulting in almost limitless change in our society. Continual change was one of the major differences between industrial and pre-industrial societies. As advances were made in one area, new problems occurred elsewhere leading to further advances. This dynamism also would affect areas outside a particular industry.

Lastly, technology was efficient. Its most pervasive conception was, according to Counts, the performance of the largest possible amount of work—the accomplishment of the greatest possible result—with the least expenditure of energy. Efficiency, largely impersonal, was highly useful in the aforementioned sense but caused problems in other areas of the society.

\[^{33}\text{ibid.}, \text{pp. 72-73.}\]
Technology changed our civilization in the following ways: (1) it transformed an agrarian into an industrial civilization; (2) it led to the specialization and integration of industry; (3) it led to the development of mass consumerism; (4) it operated independently of economic and social organization; and (5) as technology advanced in application, its thoughts would gain in momentum and over-ride political and economic barriers established in a pre-technological age. It destroyed the individualistic economy of Washington and Jefferson and created the framework of a thoroughly integrated society. 34

Counts then described how American society had been transformed from a pre-industrial to an advanced industrial society. Democracy, natural environment and technology were the forces which had transformed the following institutions: family, economy, communication, health, education, recreation, science, art, justice, government, and world relations. These developments occupied the middle section of the work and Counts carefully illustrated the interrelatedness of these forces. Counts felt that a thorough understanding of these forces was necessary before recommendations could be made concerning new programs and curricular change. One of the major responsibilities of educators was to be aware

34 Ibid., pp. 73-76.
of these changes and to act upon this awareness.

The last section of the work contained three parts: (1) the trend of the age; (2) the new democracy; and (3) the public school.

Counts saw American society as passing through a period of rapid change, "an epoch of profound transition." It is difficult to place limits on this period, as Counts illustrated:

The term 'today,' however, must not be taken literally. It does not mean the present twenty-four hours or even this year, or the period of the great depression, or even that interval in world history beginning in August, 1914, and marked by the most devastating of wars between the nations and by a succession of social convulsions and revolutions throughout the earth. Rather is the term used to designate an age that for America reaches well back into the eighteen-hundreds and may be expected to extend far into the twentieth century - an age that is striving to come to terms with the products, the implications, and all the conditioning influences of science and technology.

These changes would usher in a radical new social order. The old individualism which characterized early American economic development was giving way to an age of corporate, social collective action on the economy.

Counts saw two roots as factors in the formation of American individualism. They were the individualism of the
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freeholder and the rise of the so-called middle class. The traditional order of feudal society was destroyed in the United States by the rise of the middle class which borrowed heavily from the ideas of John Locke. For example, Locke held: "the great and chief end, therefore, of men uniting into commonwealths and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property."  

The middle class also adopted the economic views of Adam Smith, particularly the idea of the free play of economic forces uncontrolled by government interference and thus free to shape the economic structure as they wished. Economic individualism played an important role in the westward movement and in the eventual taming of the western wilderness.

The doctrines of laissez-faire capitalism were ensured and protected by the highest law in the land, the Constitution. Students were indoctrinated in the tradition and virtues of economic individualism. Schools often appeared as guardians of this tradition.

Individualism was breaking down as a result of the onslaught of new technologies and industrialization. This

\[37\text{Ibid., p. 492.}\]
brand of individualism has had a negative effect on American development. There were great inequalities, in the distribution of wealth, the prevalence of poverty, unemployment, slums and the manifold evidences of physical privation among great masses of the population. Lastly, it was the anarchy of individualistic economy that brought the United States to the brink of ruin in the economic collapse of 1929. At that time, the theoretical and practical foundations of economic individualism were undermined or destroyed.

Moving hand in hand with the advance of industrial civilization had been the growth of collectivism. As individualism receded under the impact of industrialization, collectivism filled the void. For example, as the family surrendered some of its functions, the state, the community and school assumed various areas of activity. Activities formerly carried on by the family had been assumed by the local, state and national governments. This was true of the school. People did not expect the school to intervene in areas which were once the exclusive province of the family. This was especially true in the areas of education and communication. Health services were now largely

38 Ibid., p. 498.
in the hands of the local, state and national governments. Technology had greatly accelerated this process.

In modern society a collectivism of disaster had emerged. The individual was helpless in the face of social forces which were sweeping through the country. The depression was a good example of this. Nearly everyone was touched by this great economic debacle. As Counts pointed out: "Whether men wish it or not, they live today in a world in which they must share increasingly both prosperity and adversity." 39

It was an age of confusion. The movement from a loosely organized society to a closely integrated society had produced chaos, confusion and bewilderment. The changes had been psychological as well as economic. This resulted in an enormous need for mental as well as social reconstruction. It will be one of the tasks of educators to lead the way in this project. As Counts showed:

The central responsibility of public education in this situation is to bring the mentality of the American people into accord with their surroundings to prepare them for life under profoundly altered circumstances, to encourage them to discard dispositions and maxims

39 Ibid., p. 506.
derived from the individualistic economy, and to refurbish their minds with a stock of knowledges, attitudes, and ideas capable of functioning effectively and harmoniously in the new reality.40

The new reality was primarily in the area of economic development. American society was moving from economic individualism to collectivism. Educators needed to recognize these emerging realities and to take a three-fold course of action: to dissociate democracy from its historical connections with the individualistic economy of the past; to free it and voluntarily accept the interdependent economy out of knowledge and understanding; to aid in the organization and administration of the economy in the popular interest.41

To summarize Counts views: (1) education took place at a particular time and place in the history of a particular society; (2) profound changes were taking place in American society; (3) a new form of democracy was replacing that of an earlier era as society moved from economic individualism to democratic collectivism; (4) the anarchy of capitalism would have to change if the society was to endure; (5) education would have to reconstruct

40 Ibid., pp. 507-508.
41 Ibid., pp. 527-528.
society to meet the new changes; (6) American society had been shaped and transformed by three factors: (a) democracy, (b) natural environment and (c) technology; (7) Americans had an unrealistic view of their schools and; (8) education had to be on the cutting edge of the changes moving through society.

The major thrust of Counts argument was the effect of society on the educational process. Most of the problems which faced the country and American education were due to the breakdown of an outdated economic individualism. This breakdown was going to lead to the emergence of a democratic collectivism. Planning and educational statesmanship would be needed to deal with these nascent social displacements. Counts, an advocate of collectivism, was to be severely criticized as it was felt by his critics that he was leaning towards Communism. This was not true - as Counts made clear in his later works. His critics apparently misunderstood his use of the term collectivism. Despite the controversy the work was to remain as an important statement of the effect of social forces on the educational process.
Merle Curti, an important American intellectual historian, was not a member of the Commission. Along with other educational experts, he assisted the Commission in its research and deliberations. A midwesterner by birth - Papillon, Nebraska, September 15, 1897, Curti received his academic training at Harvard where he completed all his degrees, receiving his Ph.D. in 1927. He spent a year abroad at the Sorbonne during the 1924-25 academic year. He began his teaching career at Smith College where he was Professor of History during the time the Commission sat.

Curti left Smith for Teachers College, Columbia, in 1937 and remained there until 1942. He then taught at the University of Wisconsin until his retirement in 1965.

Author of several works on intellectual history and historiography, Curti's most influential work was *The Growth of American Thought*, one of the leading textbooks in American intellectual history. During his long career, Curti was visiting professor at leading American institutions such as the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Chicago, etc. He also received numerous scholarly awards and honors which included fellowships from the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation and the Huntington Library. He was President of the Organization of American Historians.
While at Wisconsin Curti was involved with a group referred to during the 1960's as the "old left". Curti's social views were similar to other progressives and left of center liberals in the twenties and thirties. While not a Marxist, he espoused a social conflict theory of society. The upper class's attempt to suppress social advancement would produce class antagonism. Reactionary forces would seek to dominate the less fortunate members of society. American society, while moving towards greater democracy, had often been reactionary. These views predominated in the volume he prepared for the Commission.

Merle Curti's *The Social Ideas of American Educators*, an historical study of the social ideas of American educators from colonial times to the present, was intended to complement Counts volume. While Counts dealt with the impact of social change on the school, Curti examined the social ideas of educational leaders. Curti used the historical approach, eschewing the topical approach often used in works of this type. Earlier chapters surveyed American educational history up to the ante-bellum period. Following this era, chapters were devoted to educational leaders such as Horace Mann, Henry Bernard, Booker T. Washington, William T. Harris, Bishop Spalding, Francis W. Parker, G.
Stanley Hall, William James, E. L. Thorndike and John Dewey. Major historical events were interwoven with the highlights of their careers. The final chapter, entitled "Post-War Patterns", dealt with the views of Judd, Kilpatrick, Counts, Rugg, Sneddon and Cubberley. Curti used the same format as in earlier chapters in dealing with these educators.

In the introduction Curti discussed the social ideas he intended to examine in his analysis. First, he limited his study to the purpose of elementary and secondary education. He felt that social ideas covered a broad field. For example:

Even the conception of education as an individual matter, as a means of enriching the child's life, of preparing him for some vocation or profession, or of enabling him to survive in competition with his fellows, implies significant social attitudes.42

Secondly, he was interested in the manner in which educators responded to the purely social aspects of education. Curti felt that the social aspects of education fell into three categories:

...education to perpetuate the existing pattern of economic and social arrangements; education to modify

---

or reform the established system; and education to completely reorganize affairs in such a way that a future differing fundamentally from the past and the present can be achieved. 43

Third, he dealt with the views of educators toward minority groups - the negro, the Indian and foreign immigrants, women and labor groups. Fourth, he considered the views of educators towards nationalism and internationalism. Fifth, their attitudes towards individualism and the way they perceived socialism and collectivism was another topic he dealt with. Sixth, cultural ideas and values held by the educators were discussed. Lastly, the ethical and religious ideas of educators were examined.

Curti was highly critical of American educators and the manner in which they related ideas to practice. Educators thought of the school as a social institution but did little to relate it to other institutions in society. They neglected to relate the school realistically to other social institutions and made little effort to meet the students' social needs. Little attempt was made to extend equal opportunity to all students regardless of social class. Attention was directed to the upper and middle class student, while the lower class and handicapped student was ignored.

43 Ibid., p. xvi.
American educators had tended to side with the established order and had solicited support from the upper classes. They had done this on the grounds that they were protecting these classes from possible danger. Reforms that had been initiated had been of a conservative nature. American educators lagged behind other more progressive groups in advocating and initiating social change. This had been done largely out of fear of alienating the powerful groups in American society. Liberal leaders such as Mann refused to permit the schools to deal with certain controversial issues.44

Progressive educators such as Dewey had been misunderstood and the truly democratic aspect of their views had not been introduced into the American school system. Programs that had been initiated had been watered-down so as to perpetuate the established order. It is only in recent years that educators have honestly tried to deal with these shortcomings.

Educators had not initiated policies but had tended to follow politicians and men of affairs rather than striking out on their own. They had tended to be cautious and conservative. Planlessness had characterized education—

44 Ibid., p. 584.
al policies. If plans had existed they had tended to be shortsighted and related to limited goals rather than broad, comprehensive plans which might have effected the necessary changes.

Attempts to realize truly democratic ends were not successful. The major technique used to achieve this had been character training. This had proved to be inadequate because it depended largely on religious training. Religion was playing a diminishing role in American society, thus rendering this training anachronistic. The realities of American society also showed the inadequacies of this approach. This was due to the fact that: "The prizes in actual life frequently have gone to men who violated the moral precepts which the schools tried to inculcate; and these men have not infrequently received general social approval."45

One of the principal ways in which educators attempted to transform American society had been the fusing of learning and doing, theory and practice, culture and vocation. They believed that true democracy could be achieved if the contradictions in American society could be broken down. Two factors in American society had worked against this approach. First, the weight of tradition, and secondly, certain actualities in American society had stood in

the way. Curti stated:

In point of fact, children of the less well-to-do classes have, by reason of economic necessity, been compelled or at least encouraged to prepare themselves in school for a narrowly vocational life; and the influence of business has not been conducive to a truly cultural conception of the more humble vocations. 46

American educators did not unite to achieve reform, but they had worked at an individual pace. The school was expected to make the student a self-sufficient citizen upon completion of training. This would save the individual from poverty or a life of crime and would make him or her a useful citizen. He would be able to meet the realities in a changing world. This did not work out because it assumed that individual security could be achieved in a changing world without social security. 47

Conservative educators were to have a greater influence than reformers on American education. They tended to relate student achievement and success to the status quo, and thereby negated the efforts of reform-minded educators. Reform-minded educators had often neglected to point out the inequalities which existed in American society.

46 Ibid.
Reformers had relied on voluntarianism and co-operation which were effective in an agrarian but not in a highly industrialized society. Curti illustrated this as follows:

The reformers have failed to see that while the Jeffersonian tradition has supplied the words and ideals, the Hamiltonian tradition of aristocracy and the spirit of business enterprise have with greater frequency governed practices.  

Influenced by the business ethic in American society, educators were reluctant to alienate economic leaders. An outstanding educator such as Horace Mann was careful not to alienate economic interests to the detriment of educational programs that he was interested in implementing. Mann and others seemed to be influenced by business interests as Curti showed:

It would seem that science, religion and philosophy were less important in determining the social thinking of educators than the pressure, however unconscious, of the dominant economic forces of the days.

Curti concluded on a hopeful note. In spite of the overwhelming influence of conservative educators, there were liberal educators who expressed their views and developed their programs. In the future, it appeared that progressive forces would have a greater influence in

---

48 Ibid., p. 537.

49 Ibid., p. 539.
determining American educational policy. These educators had realized the contradictions between theory and practice and were aware of the limitations of education as an agency of social change. Curti agreed with other members of the Commission that education was only one agency that was bringing about social change. Educators had been misguided in placing emphasis on training that would further individualism. American society was moving towards a collectivism and educational policies would have to be changed to deal with these emerging trends.

Charles E. Merriam was a life-long progressive, but not in a rigid sense as he was sophisticated enough to change with the times. Government service during the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations illustrated his willingness to alter his views to accommodate the changing nature of American society. As a progressive, he disliked ideology and ideologues and opposed doctrinaire solutions to political problems. Enlightened citizens and faithful public servants fulfilling their constitutional tasks would alleviate any problem facing the republic. Like other progressives, he believed in the perfectability of American democracy and institutions. Merriam's views may be summed up by this statement from Samuel Eliot Morrison:
Common to all Progressives was belief in the perfectability of man, and in an open society where mankind was neither chained to the past nor condemned to a deterministic future; one in which people were capable of changing their condition for better or worse. 50

The progressive philosophy dominated Merriam's approach to the problems of civic education. An enlightened citizenry would be developed through civic education; a civic education that would stress the practical rather than the theoretical aspects of politics. Since he did serve in public office, Merriam feared overemphasizing theory at the expense of practical action.

In the volume he authored for the Commission, Charles E. Merriam sought to relate the role of civic education to American society. The volume, entitled Civic Education in the united States, emphasized the practical aspects of civic education rather than the theoretical. Merriam expressed the purpose of the work as follows:

...to study the needs and possibilities of civic education in the United States with a view to determining the general direction, scope and temper of such education rather than the details of the program. 51


51 Charles E. Merriam, Civic Education in the united States (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934) p. xix.
Merriam felt that it was necessary to explore the problem areas of American democracy before specific programs were developed. Once these problems were defined the school could develop the technical programs to deal with them. In the past, educators had developed programs without fully understanding the problems which dictated them. He sought to avoid these shortcomings by carefully examining the problems confronting civic education.

The work is divided into three sections. First, factors which necessitated reorganization of American civic education were considered. Second, the role of concurrent agencies such as the home, church, community and how they could be integrated with civic education were explored. Third, Merriam dealt with the special instruments of civic education, ways in which the student would become familiar with recent trends in government, recent techniques of the power process and the role of realism and idealism in the study of government. The last section concluded with a discussion of the relationship between the student and the teacher.

Merriam had participated on the committee which drew up the *Hoover Report on Recent Social Trends* (1933). He used the report as background material for the first chapter; "The Problems of American Democracy." There were
two major problems confronting the nation: First, the development of a corporate society which was becoming intertwined with political agencies. Government had become involved in many sectors of society and the trend continued. Second, the development of a science of human behavior could lead to the possibility of further government control. The social sciences and life sciences were discovering new facts regarding man's behavior. While these developments, through education, might liberate man from his superstitious past, there was the darker possibility of increased social control. These discoveries would have a profound effect on the social and political order; more so than the puritanical constraints of the nineteenth century.\(^\text{52}\)

These problems would generate three tasks for government. The government would have to face the problem of social control; it had to deal with social change without stifling personal liberty and it would have to confront a future that was only vaguely discernible. Having defined the problems of civic education, Merriam then explored ways in which educators might deal with them. The remainder of the work discussed ways in which educators might deal with

\(^{52}\)ibid., p. 32.
A new orientation had to take place in civic education. Rigidity and tradition in government needed to be changed to allow for adaptation and adjustment to the new technology. Merriam's views on rapid change, cultural lag and a burgeoning technology were compatible with other members of the Commission. In agreement with them, he felt that we had to develop a new set of values, traditions and symbols which would enable us to meet and to adapt to the emerging developments.

There was a strong need to develop new forms of social and civic education to deal with the problems confronting our society. Rapid change had produced a cultural lag which traditional values, symbolisms and theories could not deal with. To meet those demands, social science, as well as natural science, would play a greater role in the organization of government and would have a dominant role in determining the social education of the citizen. Merriam forcefully stated:

It is important to make it perfectly plain that civic education faces a revolutionary change in its largest orientation - the change from the backward to the for-

---

53 Ibid., p. 81.
ward look made possible by experience and innovation; from a system of transmitted tradition to one or reorganizational of traditions in the light of science and invention; from a religion of governmental rigidity to an expectation of flexibility and adaptation. The implications of this are far reaching both for the future of government, and the training for civic education.54

Distinctions which were felt to stand in marked contrast in the past were intertwined in the present scheme of things. It was felt that there was a sharp dividing line between politics and economics. This was not so today, as the spheres occupied by economics and government had become enmeshed as these two organizations dealt with present day problems. This overlapping would have a profound effect on the citizen and his values. Government involvement in the everyday activities of the individual had increased and would continue to do so in the future. Merriam summed it up thusly:

...once again it may be repeated that the most fundamental need of civic education in our day is the orientation of such training toward the future in terms of realities of modern social and economic life. This is the master key to the whole situation, unlocking the door that leads into a new world of social and civic advance.55

54 ibid., p. 21.

The need was urgent as revolution was already upon the society. Changes were altering the traditional ways of life beyond the speculations of the radicals of previous generations. Merriam succinctly pointed out:

We cannot choose whether we shall retain our old ways of social organization; the changes are already here, good and bad as we view them, and they will continue to come.

The changes were more radical than anything predicted in the past. Scientific and technological radicalism was more radical than economic radicalism and more revolutionary than the political upheavals of earlier periods of history. The wildest pronouncements of radicals in the past would seem conservative when compared to the changes wrought by science and technology. These changes could only be dealt with through a reorientation in civic education. These changes and the manner in which they would occur are described by Merriam:

The new orientation, then, is possible in a type of civic education directed toward a future characterized by rapid social and political change; toward invention, adaptation and readjustment in the world of government on an equal basis with invention and change in the world of technology, whether machine or social. This involves change from control by tradition and tabu to control by design and purpose and plan; to a situation in which government is dominated by the spirit of science, and

56 Ibid., p. 27.
animated by values growing out of the new world of discovery and invention.\(^{57}\)

Merriam was deeply concerned about the ultimate goal of civic education. He felt that the following questions should be asked: To what end is civic education to be reorganized? What values are to be related to it? This seemed to be the crucial question. It came down to a conflict between a central system of values on the one hand and indoctrination on the other. Merriam stated the controversy in this manner:

Is a distinction to be drawn between conscious and unconscious indoctrination of ideas and values in the process of instruction; and what cognizance shall we take of this in the organization of a system of instruction.\(^{58}\)

It was on the issue of indoctrination that Merriam parted company with other members of the Commission, particularly Counts and Beard. He realized the complex nature of indoctrination. As he stated:

The question may indeed be raised whether there are any effective social skills and techniques on education taken apart from the value system of the given social culture. Is there any drive or force in the intellectual position apart from the emotional values with which behavior is associated? Here it is evident we approach a profound problem both in the learning process and also in analysis of human behavior.

\(^{57}\)Ibid., p. 35.

\(^{58}\)Ibid.
A nearer approach shows clearly that indoctrination is by no means a simple flower, but a highly intricate pattern unfolding a series of complex meanings. 59

Indoctrination had several meanings which would depend on the individual’s point of view. It could be an aid to knowledge but could also work in a negative fashion.

Merriam distinguished three kinds of indoctrination: (1) indoctrinations that were provisional as against those that were dogmatic and final; (2) by distinguishing between values and skills in the field of instruction, and (3) between indoctrinations in the inner core and outer core of political behavior. 60

Merriam conceded that some indoctrination would have to take place, particularly in child rearing and in the early phases of the educational process. Indoctrination would also be necessary for developing social cohesion which he referred to as the inner core of civic instruction. As he illustrated:

Few would object to imposition of the traits and aptitudes favorable to interdependence and cooperation in political life and behavior, as such, and in that sense such training is almost interchangeable in western states. 61

59 Ibid., p. 34.
60 Ibid., p. 35.
61 Ibid., p. 37.
Inculcation of values would be acceptable to developing and fostering local cohesion, but it would not be compatible with the later education of the individual. This area was referred to as the outer core of civic education. Merriam saw the society rather than the school shaping and educating the individual. The role of special interest groups in our society could not be ignored. Civic education had to prepare the individual for these realities. This could not be accomplished through indoctrination. It could only be done through an open discussion in the Deweyan sense. Civic education must, in Dewey's words: "...insist that education means the discriminating mind or mind that prefers not to dupe itself or be the dupe of others."62 The purpose of civic education then was to provide the social intelligence so as to allow the individual to adequately meet the needs of the day. Merriam's progressivism showed through in the conclusion:

It is then around the democratic ways of life that the values of the next generation may be expected to develop, and to provide the general objective which is essential in any moving system. Faith in the possibilities of common humanity will be the ideal around which the training of the coming generation in ways governmental revolves.63

62 Ibid.
63 Ibid., p. 49.
The concluding chapters of the work dealt with the ways in which these instruments of social intelligence might be developed by teachers and concurrent agencies. Merriam's social theory was similar to that of other progressives and liberals. He was aware of the vast changes the country was facing and was sympathetic to those who wanted change. He was opposed to any doctrinaire approach that might stifle liberties gained in the past. Progressivism, as a political philosophy, was still adequate to deal with the problems which faced the country. It would be flexible enough to take into account the sweeping changes that would change the political, social and educational landscape in the future.

The Conclusions and Recommendations contained a summary of the social theory espoused by the Commission. It was composed of thirteen paragraphs located in the chapter entitled "The Frame of Reference." The views expressing social theory might be divided into three parts. They were: (1) the nature of American civilization, (2) changes which occurred in American civilization, and (3) trends which emerged in American civilization.

The American nation was a distinct, geographical, political and social entity. It was an offshoot of European or Western civilization. Popular democracy with the ideals of personal dignity and liberty were the condition-
Profound changes were sweeping American and western civilization, as they were in the process of moving to a world civilization. At the same time, American society was moving towards a complete physical unification and the integration and interdependence of the economy, social activity and culture. The American society was changing from a society marked by economic individualism to a society marked by a democratic collectivism. The concentration of business in a few hands and the growth of large corporations had brought an end to classical laissez-faire economics. Independent farmers and workers in American society had lost some personal liberty in the process by becoming dependent on the government or the corporation.

The emerging age was one of transition and, as yet, the shape and contours could not be clearly delineated. There were conditions of inequity and deprivation in the world which could lead to conflict and war. Social conflict would continue until adjustments were made between social thought, social practice and economic realities or society would fall back to a more primitive order of economic life.
The implications of the social theory for education were as follows:

1. A frame of reference embracing things deemed necessary, possible, and desirable conditions the selection and organization of materials of instruction in the social sciences.

2. The validity of statements of fact within such a frame of reference can be tested to-day by methods of scholarship; the validity of interpretations and judgments can be fully tested only by the prolonged verdict of the generations.

3. Although the Commission has discovered no all-embracing system of social laws which, imposed upon the educator, fixes the objectives and practices of the school, it believes its frame of reference to be entirely consistent with the findings and thought of contemporary social science.

4. It believes further that this frame of reference conditions the tasks, the responsibilities, the content and the method of education.64

The social theory proposed by the Commission was an attempt to deal in a rational manner with current social realities in the American society. It was not radical but realistic. Members of the Commission wanted to avoid a do-nothing or conservative approach to the trends emerging in American society. Counts was admonished by members of the Commission

to make a bold statement. The term collectivism alarmed some opponents of the report and was misunderstood by others. This controversy will be dealt with in a later chapter. Some were disappointed with the fact that the Commission did not come up with a definite system or theory of society. The Commission felt that a statement of this type would lead to discussion and the development of alternate programs. What was felt to be most important was that educators would become aware of the social forces acting upon American education. This would be significant in itself.

The Commission sought to develop a frame of reference which was both realistic and idealistic. Previous curriculum committees had failed to deal adequately with the social conditions influencing American education. Educators needed to know why contemporary society failed to function satisfactorily. Members of the Commission attempted to do this in the social theories they developed. In the following chapter, we will deal with the educational programs they proposed to deal with these changed social conditions. They suggested ways in which our educational system could be geared up to

---

65 Charles E. Merriam to George S. Counts, New York, 7 August, 1931, Merriam Papers, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, Illinois.

the task of dealing with a newly emerging social order.
CHAPTER IV

THE COMMISSION'S VIEW OF THE ROLE OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN SOCIAL CHANGE

The social theories expressed by the members of the Commission were an attempt to describe the realities facing American society. The Commission members were not content merely to theorize but recommended bold, new programs which suggested how social education could cope with the changed conditions. While they often presented differing views, they agreed on one point — the paramount role to be played by social studies education. Education, particularly social education, they felt, should take a dominant role in helping to pull the United States out of the abyss of the depression into which it had fallen. The views expressed on social education and the manner in which it was to be taught were controversial and were attacked from within and without the Commission.

Social issues and social education were uppermost in the thoughts of Commission members. A majority of the volumes in the report dealt with some aspect of social education as a perusal of the titles would indicate. A
description and analysis of these social education programs will be presented in this chapter. The sources used consist of the volumes of the Commission's report and the final report. They will include: Charles A. Beard: *A Charter for the Social Sciences*; Charles A. Beard: *The Nature of the Social Sciences*; George S. Counts, et. al.: *The Social Foundations of Education*; Charles E. Merriam: *Civic Education in the Social Studies* and; Ernest Horn: *Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies*.

Charles A. Beard wrote cogently about the role civic education should play in preparing American youth to confront social change. His views were contained in a chapter entitled "The Supreme Purpose" in *A Charter for the Social Sciences*. Beard felt that education, and particularly civic education, should alleviate the distressing situation facing the country. American schools could not escape their historic mission. A heritage had developed which by this time had become a part of the social environment. The average American looked to the schools to aid the society in times of change and crisis. Teachers could not sit idly by but should speak out where ethical and moral values were concerned.1 Beard made this clear in his presidential address to the American Historical Association. The aim of civic

instruction, according to Beard was:

to strengthen democratic institutions, make clear their working, point out defects generally agreed upon, provide more effective leadership, illuminate every possible corner of the political scene, and promote habits of critical fairness among the electorate. This can not be done by reciting creeds and repeating ceremonial formulas, but by making realistic studies of the actual pressures operating in politics and government and the concrete issues behind the verbalism of partisan oratory.2

Beard levelled his attack on the essentialists and traditionalists in American education. He felt that the present programs and approaches used in social education were static and outmoded, not capable of meeting the needs precipitated by the problems facing American society. Many educators continued to respond as if nothing had happened and seemed to ignore the crisis facing the country. The methods and techniques employed in teaching reflected a lack of concern.

One of the major goals of social studies instruction was the preparation of students who would be equipped to meet the realities of the world in which they were to live. Each political unit had its own particular power structure. Adequate social studies instruction would enable students to function properly within these political

2 Ibid., p. 48.
structures. Social studies instruction must take into account this factor because of the ever-changing nature of society. No society wanted to drift but rather wished to master change and progress to higher levels of attainment. Educational programs must be flexible enough to account for these aspirations.

A fixed program of instruction was inadequate to deal with a changing world marked by rapid technical transformations and political conflicts. The historical period from 1890 to the present had been marked by pervasive change in all areas of American society. Methods of instruction which social studies teachers used at the beginning of this period were now obsolete. Beard suggested that a perusal of civic education textbooks bore this out. 3

In modern industrial societies the individual had to make many difficult decisions. No system of education can foresee the decisions needed in the future nor can it provide corrective measures to remedy an unstable social order. No fixed program can succeed when confronted with the ever-changing nature of American society in the preceding forty-year period. Beard felt that many programs

3Ibid., p. 95.
were mere words that did not lead to action. With this in mind, he pointed out:

In the wider range of social relations it is not words that count, but capacity to understand, analyze, bring information to bear, to choose, to resolve, and to act wisely. Competence in the individual, not dogma, is our supreme objective.4

Any program to be worthwhile must keep the foregoing items in mind.

Having laid the groundwork, Beard then proceeded to the primary purpose of social studies education. The major purpose of social studies education was the development of the latent powers of the individual. As Beard stated:

Our fundamental purpose here is the creation of rich, many-sided personalities, equipped with practical knowledge and inspired by ideals so that they can make their way and fulfill their mission in a changing society which is part of a world complex.5

In order to develop the rich, many-sided personality, the social studies instructor had to inculcate seven skills in students. They were: (1) the ability to obtain knowledge; (2) the ability to analyze social situations and materials of instruction; (3) habits; (4) method; (5) attitudes of patriotism and loyalty; (6) imagination and (7) aesthetic appreciation.6

---

4 Ibid., p. 96.
5 Ibid., pp. 96-97.
6 Ibid., p. 98.
The personality who was well-informed would be an active, creative person. This process of awakening latent powers would be followed throughout the student's school career. It would be the job of all branches of the social studies. Beard commented:

It is the function of each branch of social science to say what are the rightest and truest fragments of knowledge which those who call themselves intelligent should possess in that discipline. It is the business of philosophy to eliminate, to give unity, perspective and balance to these fragments, and of letters to make them vivid and human.7

Beard then proceeded to discuss each of the seven skills which the social studies should impart to the student. Knowledge, like society, was ever-changing. What might have been significant in a particular field in the past, may be obsolete today. The advancement of learning in many fields was burgeoning. In light of this reality, Beard forcefully stated:

Yet, speaking summarily, we may say that the primary information which social science must supply through the schools to individuals is information concerning the conditioning elements, realities, forces, and ideas of the modern world in which life must be lived. Any representation of them is bound to be partial and out of perspective, such is the frailty of the human mind, but it must be attempted in textbooks, supplementary works, maps, motion pictures, and every possible apparatus for conveying information vividly and realistically to the immature mind.3

7 Ibid., p. 98.
3 Ibid., pp. 98-99.
Most important in developing the ability to obtain information was a knowledge of how to acquire knowledge. This was a skill which could be used throughout life. The school had to teach the student how to gain access to information—the use of encyclopedias, authorities, documents, sources, statistical collections. This process would be continued throughout the educational process. As the student progressed, the exercises would be made more difficult in complexity and abstraction.

Along with the ability and skill to acquire knowledge was the development of analytical skills—the ability to break massed data or large themes into manageable units, and to get at irreducible elements in any mass of data under observation. Other factors which should be stressed were synthesis and memory. Teachers had to inculcate in students the ability to synthesize—to put elements together and draw inferences from them. Memory was a capacity which could be developed, like others, through practice. These skills of analysis, synthesis and memory were not limited to the social studies but could be used in all fields of endeavor.

---

9 Ibid., p. 99.

10 Ibid., p. 100.
Extremely important in the modern scientific, technological world was the scientific method. The school had to teach about this important tool. Advances in civilization have largely, especially in modern times, resulted from the application of the scientific method. It was a powerful tool for discovering conditional truth. It liberated human intelligence in dealing with animate and inanimate objects and helped to produce and amass knowledge. While Beard accepted the role of the scientific method in the developmental process of the modern world, he did not feel that it could be applied to the humanities or to the formulation of historical laws.

Continuing in a relativistic vein, Beard them emphasized the role of habit in social studies instruction. The inculcation of proper habits included personal cleanliness, industry, courtesy, promptness, accuracy, and effective cooperation in common undertakings. They were to be developed in the following manner:

To some extent these habits may be encouraged by precepts drawn from the data and conclusions of social science; perhaps to a greater extent, by organized experience in the classroom supplemented by community action in positive, if limited form. Civic instruction should not be confined to the printed page while the laboratory of life lies at hand.

\(^{11}\) Ibid., p. 102.

\(^{12}\) Ibid.
Closely related to habits and equally important to achievement and the development of social skills are attitudes. According to Beard, attitudes include:

...such tendencies and propensities as respect for the rights and opinions of others, zeal for truth about many things large and small, pride in the achievement of individuals, communities, America, and mankind, admiration for heroic and disinterested deeds, faith in the power of men and women to improve themselves and their surroundings, loyalty to ideals, a vivid sense of responsibility in all relations, a lively interest in contemporary affairs, a desire to participate in the world's work, far and near. 13

The most important attitude to be cultivated by social science teachers was love of country or patriotism. Beard hardly appeared to be the radical he was accused of being when he made statements such as this one. For Beard, the teaching of patriotism was something that teachers should not take for granted but should make every attempt to advance this valuable goal.

It was not to be a chauvinistic patriotism marked by fireworks and ritual, but a genuine feeling associated with love of country. It was incumbent upon social science teachers to inculcate patriotism as a rational, not an emotional process. Beard described it in this fashion: "The loyalty which history and social science can instill

13 Ibid., p. 103.
is, then, the loyalty of reasoned affection, not the loyalty of tribal prejudice." To emphasize his point Beard quoted an example from Woodrow Wilson:

"if you have taken an oath of allegiance to the United States," said President Wilson to foreign-born citizens at Philadelphia in 1915. "Of allegiance to whom? Of allegiance to no one unless it be God. Certainly not of allegiance to those who temporarily represent the great Government. You have taken an oath of allegiance to a great idea, to a great hope of the human race." This is the type of patriotism that Beard wanted teachers to cultivate in their students.

To complete the development of the many-sided personality, Beard added two ingredients — will power and courage. How can will power and courage be taught by education? Beard was not sure but offered a suggestion. While no one can really describe the proper way to teach will power and courage it might be done in the following manner:

But it is safe to assume that, like other faculties, they can be stimulated by the citation of notable examples from the biographical role and by such exercises as the classroom and its collateral activities can provide.

The sixth skill would be imagination — the capacity to compare, contrast, to combine and to construct. The

14 Ibid., p. 105.
15 Ibid., pp. 105-106.
16 Ibid., pp. 106-107.
17 Ibid., p. 108.
historical use of imagination as it delves into the growth of ideas. Concluding this section, Beard remarked: "All rich personalities are imaginative, and if education is conceived with the making of them, it must cherish those who can dream dreams and see visions."\(^{18}\)

Related to imagination is another element of the many-sided personality - aesthetic appreciation. The role of aesthetic appreciation in the development of other civilizations can be brought under review and the minds of pupils filled with zeal for the best and finest products of genius.\(^{19}\)

The development of rich, many-sided personalities is an important aspect of the role of the social studies instructor. They must not lose sight of the importance of developing leaders. In any group there will be a few at the top; the geniuses who brought about the inventions which change and move civilization. Social studies teachers must be aware of this, as Beard showed:

Hence it is one of the inescapable duties of teachers in social science to discover, draw forth and inspire students with capacity for leadership and creative work.

\(^{18}\)Ibid.

\(^{19}\)Ibid., p. 109.
From this source came the continuous renewal that gives freshness and vigor to civilization.  

Conformity, discipline and regimentation are useful social values but they must not be overdone. The development of independence of judgment among citizens is necessary to survival in a democratic society. The major purpose of social studies education is the development of the latent powers of the individual. This is not only important to the individual but also to the group as a whole. As Beard stated:

Particularly is this true in our technological age when new inventions are constantly introducing novel factors into the social scene, forcing readjustments in productive and distributive processes, and indicating lines of more efficient performance.

Students should be instructed to deal creatively and to develop flexibility in dealing with social problems and in engaging in political activities. This is especially true in the area of government, which is far more rigid and traditional than industry. As Beard asserted:

The ideology which surrounds political institutions generally runs against the notion that social inventiveness is an essential quality of the good citizen. It

---

20 Ibid., p. 110.

21 Ibid., p. 111.
sanctions the transmission of achievements already accomplished and attempts to stamp them as stereotypes good for all time.²²

Because of this social studies instructors had to teach the significance of criticism and inventiveness as utile forces enabling students to deal effectively with the emerging society.

In the final analysis, social studies instruction had to do the following:

No scheme of instruction can vividly portray to pupils all the coming situations of their lives in which they must make fateful decisions. Nor is it possible so to objectify ideas institutionally as to eliminate the hazards of selection and rejection. Hence the inevitable necessity for laying emphasis on freedom of opinion and the liberation of intelligence as a scheme of thought, affection and practice.²³

The ultimate goal of civic education should be related to the famous dictum uttered by Alexander Hamilton:

"Whatever fine declarations may be inserted in any constitution respecting it (liberty) must altogether depend upon public opinion and on the general spirit of the people and of the government. To contribute powerfully to the making of this opinion and this spirit is an undoubted task of civic instruction in the schools." ²⁴

²² Ibid., p. 112.
²³ Ibid., p. 116.
²⁴ Ibid., p. 117.
In the *Nature of the Social Sciences*, Beard dealt with the frame of reference which would serve students of social science as a cultural guide to action. Two fundamentals must be taught to the students. First, an accurate description of social reality. Second, an accurate portrayal of the movements and changes occurring in this social situation. Teachers would have to help students develop a sense of development in time. Primitive societies lived from day to day but modern societies must look to the future and seek to provide for it. Social studies education had to play an important part in preparing students for the future.

In actual operation it is impossible to separate the two fundamentals. The study of history is important because it creates the necessary perspective through which a situation can be observed; first, as it presently is and, second, as it has developed through the passage of time. Beard stated it thusly:

> Contemporary thought without history is impossible and history unrelated to contemporary knowledge and thought is likewise impossible. And either, if possible, would be undesirable in any frame of reference.25

---

The role of the teacher became paramount in Beard's scheme. He remarked:

The informed and trained teacher will know this conception and fact in advance and treat each special subject, topic, or theme, set up of necessity for convenience, in the light of this finding. Thus the training of teachers in contemporary knowledge and thought becomes the key to the effective realization of objectives.26

In order to achieve these objectives, the frame of reference had to be kept in focus as it provided the necessary criteria that would guide the use of materials and thought-categories.

Beard proposed the following course sequence for high school social studies curricula:

1. Geography - to be taught during the first year.
2. Economics - to be taught during the second year.
3. Cultural Sociology - to be taught during the second year.
4. Political Science - to be taught during the third year.
5. History - to be taught during the fourth year.

Each course would summarize the accumulated knowledge in the discipline from the basic facts to the complex issues currently facing the discipline. History would be last in the sequence because it embraced all others, hence, it would be the most difficult. Properly conceived and taught the history course, according to Beard, "adds the sense of development in time which transforms them from static into dynamic, that is, realistic subjects." 27

26Ibid., pp. 190-191.
27Ibid.
In conclusion: Beard proposed a tough, no-nonsense program of social education. History was to retain its dominant position in the curriculum with the other social sciences serving as its handmaidens. If social education were taught in the manner he prescribed, students would be trained to be useful, patriotic citizens capable of meeting the demands of a changing society. The curricula and methods he proposed (Beard felt) were flexible enough to meet the ever-changing environment of American education.

In the concluding section of *The Social Foundations of American Education*, George S. Counts proposed a program which he felt American educators should take in dealing with current problems. According to Counts, educational policy must relate to the society in which it occurs — as society is the major force in determining educational policy:

If education were merely a form of abstract contemplation, unrelated to the world of men and things, the social situation might be disregarded altogether. This, however, is clearly not the case. At bottom and particularly in a highly complex and dynamic social order, education, in discharging its function of inducting the child into the life of the group, stands at the focal point in the process of cultural evolution — at the point of contact between the older and younger generation where values are selected and rejected.\(^{23}\)

---

American educators faced the important task of formulating an educational policy in light of the foregoing statement.

The educator had to understand the relationship between education and social action. Having an almost limitless faith in the school, Americans have placed too much faith in the efficacy of education. One of the major aspects of Counts's theory of education was the view that the United States was passing through an age of crisis. Unbridled economic, technological and social changes were exerting profound influences on traditional American society. In the troubled times of today many individuals looked to the school to lead the American people to safety. Certain educators called upon the school to build a new social order to reconstruct society and to prepare it for the future.

The purpose of American education has shifted throughout our existence as an independent country. The primary purpose of early American education was to eliminate illiteracy. It was felt that the ability to read would lead to the development of an enlightened citizenry. An investigation of the American political system would show this to be untrue - as powerful interests tended to subvert the written word for their own purposes. Those in power twisted education goals for their own interests.
The American educational system was controlled and used to benefit the propertied classes. For Counts: "literacy made possible the age of propaganda." The schools claimed to be for everyone while in reality they favored the establishment.

Having shown the one-sided nature of the American educational system, Counts then turned to the progressives. Many progressive educators contended that each generation must be taught anew while teachers removed the biases of past generations. Education should be value free and the child must decide for himself what to accept and what to reject. In Counts's view, value free education was impossible and impractical to achieve. An educational program without social content would not solve the pressing problems of the day. Counts forcefully stated:

Education, emptied of all social content and conceived solely as method, points nowhere and can arrive nowhere. It is a disembodied spirit. When education is thus generically conceived, it is a pure abstraction. Moreover it is not education. A practicable educational program or theory cannot be generic; it must be suited to a particular time and place in history.

In order to achieve Counts's desired goal, careful planning had to take place. There had to be some degree of imposi-

29 Ibid., p. 533.

30 Ibid., p. 534.
tion. Whether imposition would occur or not is not important since it depended on what was to be imposed. Counts felt that the nature of the teaching process made imposition inevitable. In any case, there had to be a generous provision for the free play of intelligence.

Counts then related the school to other educational agencies and to the total educational task of society. Education had to be radically changed to meet the needs of the coming age. Economic changes had irrevocably changed the nature of public education. The school had to attune itself to a society that was moving from individualism to a democratic collectivism. The major purpose of public education would be as follows:

Public education in the United States therefore will not only work within the limits of the emerging reality; it will also assume that the evolving order will make paramount the welfare of the great rank and file of the working men and women of the nation.31

In the past, public education favored the upper classes to the detriment of other groups. The aim of future education would be the achievement of social equality. One group would not be treated better than another group. With this in mind, Counts argued that the public schools should achieve the following:

---

31 Ibid., p. 541.
The great purpose of the public school therefore should be to prepare the coming generation to participate actively and courageously in building a democratic industrial society that will cooperate with other nations in the exchange of goods, in the cultivation of the arts, in the advancement of knowledge and thought, and in maintaining the peace of the world. A less catholic purpose would be certain sooner or later, to lead the country to disaster.32

Social science instruction was to be organized within the frame of reference provided by the ideal of a democratic collectivism. The social science curriculum should include: the history and fortunes of the masses of the people, the evolution of peaceful arts and culture, the development of the ideal of democracy, the rise of industrial civilization and collective economy, the conflicts and contradictions in contemporary society, and the thorough examination of all current proposals, programs, and philosophies designed to meet the needs of the age.33

Social studies educators had failed to deal adequately with the problem of course content. As a consequence, some important problems still remained in this area. They were: (1) improvement of course content; (2) the organization of various courses; and (3) the specific function of teachers in social education. In order to develop social competence in the students, the school had to deal effectively with these problems. This would be a difficult task, as

32Ibid., p. 544.
33Ibid., p. 549.
the school had to steer its way through competing forces in society. Students had to be made aware of the social forces competing for dominance in American society. The highest qualities of educational leadership would be needed to resolve these pressing problems.

Counts did not outline a specific curriculum, but he did feel that course content was more important than the methods or techniques used. There had to be an increase in the depth and breadth of the ideas in general circulation. This could be done by advancing the quality of the content of social science teaching in American schools. Content, not method, would determine how well the job was to be done. As Counts pointed out: "It is sheer folly to assume that the world will be much improved by doing mediocre or irrelevant things excellently."34

The materials to be taught must be organized and should follow a definite plan. Any plan of teaching, to be effective, had to take into consideration the learner's experience, abilities and interests. The development of the child from birth to maturity was a most useful guiding principle. Counts stated this view as follows:

Beginning with the cradle he gradually pushes back the boundaries of his world along the two dimensions of

34Ibid., p. 553.
space and time and in so doing widens his knowledge and deepens his powers of thought and action. Through manipulation, explanation, travel, reading, social intercourse, and converse with his peers and elders, he moves out from the immediate and the present into the very widening realm of geography and history.35

Social science instruction should build upon this process. The child should be led systematically from his neighborhood, community and state to the wide world beyond. The genetic method, which stresses the unfolding of social processes from their inception to the present, should also be utilized in the development of the intellectual grasp of the student. Social studies teachers would have to move back and forth from the past to the present in their instruction to develop these abilities. Social studies courses should form an even line of development from kindergarten to graduate school.

To achieve this program, large quantities of printed materials were needed. These materials would not be limited to textbooks but would also include literature that contributed to social understanding. Many classics, while worthwhile literature, did not contribute to the child's social awareness and hence should not be used. As Counts stated:

...a considerable proportion of the reading matter employed in the lower grades to train children in the

35Ibid., p. 554.
habits of literacy possesses neither literary merit or useful content. The great need is for rich materials written with charm and simplicity and designed to give to children authentic information regarding the human past and the world of today.\textsuperscript{36}

It was in this foundation that a more systematic study of the social sciences was to be organized.\textsuperscript{37} It was the school's primary role to make the child aware of the world around him and to prepare the student to meet the challenges of an emerging democratic collectivism.

Critics of the Commission's Report found much to criticize in Counts's views on social education. They opposed his theory of imposition and particularly disliked his views on the role of the school as an agent for social change. They felt that these views showed his sympathy for Communist Russia. Others complained that his proposals did not emphasize specific curricula or methods. Educators related to teacher-training institutions were upset over his remarks favoring content over method or technique. Despite the unfavorable criticism, most members of the Commission felt that Counts had made a significant contribution to social education.

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., p. 555.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., p. 555.
Charles E. Merriam, in *Civic Education in the United States*, did not outline a specific program of civic education but rather concentrated on the needs and possibilities of civic education and the directions these tendencies might take. He felt that it was necessary to explore fully the factors influencing civic education before developing programs. But putting the pieces together we might get a better understanding of the total problem. Articulation of the theoretical with the practical aspects of civic education was the foremost area of Merriam's expertise and the field in which he felt most comfortable.

For Merriam, the school was the most important agency for social training. Of all the agencies affecting the training of the individual, it alone would best prepare the individual for the future. Merriam felt:

> the Church, the family, the group or gang, the culture system in the broadest sense of the term, all contribute to the training of the oncoming generation, but the heaviest burden is laid increasingly upon the educational institutions of the land.33

Civic education comprised a part of the total social education a student received. It was closely related to political behavior, to citizenship preparation and to political behavior. Political behavior was an aspect of social training.

---

In some cases, it was not easy to separate the two of them. The two were often intertwined and formed the core of civic education. They could be separately analyzed but sometimes this obscured understanding.

Merriam felt that civic education must be integrated with the other social studies courses. This would be accomplished by combining instruction in the theoretical aspects with the practical aspects of the field. For example, students would learn about the nature of elections and, if possible, would perform tasks such as voter registration, canvassing, etc., during an election campaign. Civic education must be taught in this fashion in order to overcome the problems of overcompartmentalism and specialization. There were difficulties blocking the way, especially in the area of integration of school life with the life experienced by the student outside the school. The school must compete with these outside agencies for the student's attention.

Religious instruction was undertaken outside the school and this presented problems in character education. There was a gap between business codes and political practice and also the civic code taught in the schools. The success of civic education depended upon how well integration was concluded.

One of the major aspects of civic education was to develop in the student a keen sense of political realism.
Since there was a wide gap between theory and actual practice, this problem took on an exaggerated importance. Many problems which confronted the student of government were not mentioned in the Constitution and other statutes. This added to the student's confusion, and made it difficult for the teacher to teach accurately a realistic point of view.

In order to teach a realistic point of view, the teacher had to examine the underlying elements of democratic cooperation in society. This examination included a discussion of the meaning of liberty, tolerance, the nature of the freedom of speech, the nature of leadership and its qualifications and responsibilities, patriotism and nationalism and a discussion of militarism and pacifism. In conclusion, Merriam remarked:

"Citizens find useful and adequate statement of all competing views upon practical problems, and a choice among competing ways of thought and action. In a world of thought it will prove impossible, even for those disposed to do so, to prevent discussion of the foundation principle of political action; and every gain in such direction, or what seems to gain, is in fact a loss, for it only postpones the day of consideration to an hour less favorable."

Controversial questions had to be studied before citizens took action. Their avoidance could not be the

---

39 Ibid., p. 147.
basis of intelligent or dynamic citizenship. Since these controversies were often waged on an highly emotional level, it was important that they be separated and analyzed in the calmer atmosphere of the school. There was also the possibility of adding new information and views to the study and analysis of these questions.

Merriam's views of the school's role in the teaching of controversial questions was one of detachment. This was in sharp contrast with Counts's views on the same topic. The school, according to Merriam, should deal with controversial issues but not by taking direct action. These issues should be discussed in the detached atmosphere of the classroom – not in the arena of political or social action. The opposite approach was stressed by Counts. Schools and teachers should not only discuss controversial issues, but they should take the lead in restructuring society to make these issues social realities. By comparing the views of Merriam and Counts on this issue, we can get a clear insight into the ideological differences which separated their approach to civic education.

The student would have to study the physical composition of political jurisdiction. This would enable him to understand the problem of districting and redistricting. Knowledge of this process was vital to the development of
political acumen. Merriam continually emphasized that students should learn both the theoretical and the practical side of politics.

Special agencies of government should be studied, such as agencies concerned with agriculture, mining and forestry. These agencies should be studied on both the state and federal level. The student should understand how the various levels were integrated to deal with long range problems. Stages and processes of planning should be studied to give the student an understanding of how the system really worked.

Financial affairs of the government were another fertile field of study. Many Americans were naive when it came to an understanding of the financial underpinnings of government. As Merriam pointed out:

> The central point in realism is the establishment of a vital relationship between the facts of politics and the facts of life, of a comprehension of these relations and the synthesis of political behavior with social behavior. This I may hasten to interject is not a problem confined to politics alone, but it exists in the field in a more aggravated form perhaps than anywhere else. 40

Types of problem solving might be developed in relationship to types of leadership, personalities, conferences,

40 Ibid., pp. 152-153.
patterns of administration, morale, adjudication, etc. Parliamentary procedures might be reenacted to develop a more clear understanding of the process. Aside from these patterns, there were many other examples which could be placed before the student to communicate to him the knowledge of the political process.

An imaginative use of literature might be helpful in the development of political insight. There were numerous works, such as Butler's *Erewhon* and Wells's *Shape of Things to Come*, which teachers could use to make students aware of certain political processes. Works relating to utopias were always valuable, as they gave the student an opportunity to see how a political situation developed in an unorthodox fashion. The cruder the utopia the greater was its value in developing understanding.

In conclusion, Merriam mentioned three areas which should receive consideration:

1. The obvious contrasts and paradoxes in the world of American government may be reconciled so as to avoid later disillusionment and perhaps hypocrisy in the mind of the coming citizen, by free and frank discussion of the basic questions at issue, without attempt at concealment of divergences.

2. The basic problems of government may be illuminated through the use of current data bearing upon problems in fields where important facts may be had without too great difficulty.

3. Use may be made of the numerous devices by which experience both direct and vicarious may be brought into the lives of the citizens of the new generation.41

41 Ibid., p. 161.
Merriam did not develop a curriculum for social education. He felt that social education had an important role in the coming years, but before this could be attempted social educators needed a sense of direction. As Merriam stated:

This is not a plan for a new curriculum, but for a new orientation, a new goal, a new spirit— as it seems to me more important at this time than the teacher and the text, important as they are... my purpose will be fully served if effective attention is directed toward the emerging problems of political education as they present themselves in this changing world, and if fruitful thinking and planning follow.\textsuperscript{42}

A new orientation, not a new curriculum, was to be the goal for social educators. Merriam felt that he had laid the groundwork on which the civic and social education curricula could be built.

Ernest Horn, in his \textit{Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies}, examined the significance of social education. The work was a comprehensive approach to the various methods used in social science instruction. He began the work by pointing out that methods must be viewed in terms of the social framework:

The methods of social education in the schools, broadly

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., p. 182.
conceived, include all the instrumentalities through which social purpose, knowledge, attitudes and behavior are effected. 43

While he focused on methods of instruction, Horn argued that instruction could not be viewed apart from other interrelated factors. Method had to be related to social purpose according to the final report of the Commission:

Since purpose gives direction and meaning to every educational undertaking, it follows that method apart from purpose lacks both direction and meaning; that the best method linked to inferior, irrelevant, confused or unsocial purpose, as judged by some accepted frame of reference, can give only, inferior, irrelevant, confused or unsocial results; and that method, like knowledge, must be conceived, applied and appraised in terms of purpose. 44

The problem of what to teach, according to Horn, revolved around the use of indoctrination and propaganda. Teachers were concerned by the conflict of social theories and the efforts of pressure groups to influence what was taught and disseminated in the classroom. Various groups would seek to control public opinion and have their pet projects aired in the classroom. In the final analysis, it boiled down to the use teachers and the school made of indoctrination and propaganda.


44 Ibid., pp. 2 and 3.
While the terms were easily understood they had become charged with emotion as the long struggle for religious, social and political freedom unfolded. They were seen to be detrimental to cherished causes and synonymous with bad teaching. Horn defined propaganda as the apologetics devised by special interest groups to further their causes or programs. Indoctrination was defined by Horn as the attempt of these groups to impose their ideas on the various elements of society. Those in opposition tended to see indoctrination and propaganda as inherently bad. Horn did not feel that this was always the case. Propaganda and indoctrination might be good or bad, depending upon the situation and the intent to which they were to be used. As he pointed out:

Propaganda for the reduction of fire hazards is an illustration of good intent; propaganda for the use of a worthless nostrum or for the promotion of the interests of a vicious political ring are illustrations of bad intent. Good intent is identified with the interests of society, bad intent with its exploitation.

Good method uses evidence justly and avoids distortions and falsifications. Methods carefully planned and understood.

---

46 Ibid.
47 Ibid., pp. 31-32.
would limit the possibility of using the more flagrant types of indoctrination and propaganda. Students should be made aware of the motives and interests of individuals and interest groups.

Much of what was written concerning indoctrination and propaganda did not get to the heart of the problem. The terms were used rather loosely and there was often no attempt to specify exactly what was objectionable. This led to a clouding of the issues and the failure to deal adequately with the serious questions these issues raised. These issues were:

First, shall the schools set up a social program and attempt to realize it through the inculcation and control of attitudes, habits, knowledge, patterns of thought, and value norms: i.e., shall they inculcate "sound doctrines"? Second, shall controversial issues be studied, and if so by what methods? Third, shall freedom of teaching and discussion prevail? Fourth, shall the school teach pupils what to think or how to think? Fifth, shall symbolism, slogans, conditioning, or emotional appeal be utilized; and if so, in what manner?48

Horn then attempted to answer these perplexing questions.

It was the school's responsibility, Horn felt, to present students with a social program that was explicit, unified,

---

48 Ibid., pp. 83-34.
and dynamic. The school would give a valid description of modern society — its phenomena, its processes, its trends and its problems. Moreover, the school would select and inculcate value norms rather than leaving the task to other social agencies. It, the school, would set up a plan whereby the ends and instruments of social living were to be seen in one intelligible and integrated pattern.

It was difficult to get a valid understanding of the modern social world, as this world often transcended our powers of comprehension. Commentators, such as Harold Rugg and George S. Counts, have vividly pointed this out. This was not only true of students but individuals of all ages have been baffled by the problems confronting them. Primitive societies which seemed so static and unchanging were difficult to understand, so it was no wonder that it was difficult to comprehend individual aspects of the social process such as race relations or social mobility.

As a result of the foregoing, simple models would have to be used to convey the necessary understanding. They

49 Ibid., p. 84.
50 Ibid., p. 84.
51 Ibid., p. 84.
had to be developed in a pragmatic sense and thus make possible both efficient thought and action. They had to be as close as possible to social reality and must not overlap any aspect of the social process. As Horn illustrated:

Thus the concept that we have on marginal lands, to remain authentic and dynamic, must constantly be related to soil, rainfall, and location of specific areas; to the invention of machinery and new methods of farming; to markets; to the quality of life of the farmers of such lands; and even to social policy. This last relationship is especially significant, for the social studies pertain not merely to objective circumstances but to custom, social interest, and human purpose.52

The challenge of building an authentic and acceptable model of social reality called for wisdom and scholarship of the highest order. Such an enormous task required technical skill, as well as the necessary basic data and resources that science and philosophy could bring to bear on the matter. Groups, such as the Committee on Recent Trends, had suggested that a permanent body be set up to deal with this task. Educators would take a leading part in the deliberations of such a body, but it could not be left to education alone.

As yet there was no accurate description of the goals and instruments of American society. Despite this, the schools had to operate. Educators had to make the best possible

---

52 Ibid., pp. 35–36.
decisions they could concerning the social realities which faced the student. The schools had other problems of a purely educational nature. They were: the determination of the role of the school in the development of public opinion, the decisions as to what and how much social education the school should undertake, the making of curricula and the adaptation to different levels of development, the selection of instructional equipment, the adoption of efficient methods and the appraisal of results.

On the question of whether controversial issues should be taught, Horn pointed out the pros and cons surrounding the question. To begin with, Horn felt that there was no consensus on the question. Views ranged from the opinion that no controversial issue should be taught to the view that all sides of an issue should be presented. Answers to the question often would depend on the background of the individual.

School policy on the teaching of controversial issues was a matter of debate. The fact that there was no consensus of opinion would lead some to say that one ideology should prevail. This dominance would be achieved
by the scholarly authority of leaders in social thought, by centralized educational control, or even by political power, as in Soviet Russia, Fascist Italy or Nazi Germany. Their opponents felt that the school should not be called upon to do something which society as a whole could not, namely, to resolve social differences. They advocated two alternatives: one, eliminate controversial issues; or, two, include all issues and let students form their own opinions. Regardless of how they were dealt with, these issues would, Horn felt, be dealt with and the debate would continue.

It was beyond the realm of possibility that differences of opinion regarding social issues would ever be entirely resolved. Throughout our history there were examples of divergent views which related to social problems. For example, this was true during the War of Independence. Since these issues could not be settled once-for-all, we must be open-minded, must provide free discussion, and must seek progressively and experimentally to discover better solutions. As a result of this line of reasoning, social policies must always be tentative.\(^{54}\)

\(^{53}\)Ibid., p. 89.

\(^{54}\)Ibid., p. 91.
To deal with the study of controversial issues, Horn used the Deweyan concept of intellectualization. Dewey used the term intellectualization to denote detachment and an unbiased approach to a problem. Most students approached the study of controversial issues from an emotional or prejudiced position. The need for training in the intellectualization of social problems was paramount. The successful resolution of this problem constituted one of the best reasons for including controversial issues in the school. Student training could not be dealt with by dealing with abstract principles but must come from the direct and careful consideration of the issues themselves.

It was difficult to develop objective thinking about controversial issues, but this could be achieved through the use of two safeguards long recognized as fundamental to research in the natural sciences – the use of the negative hypothesis and the search for negative data. These safeguards had to be used carefully in the social sciences as they through custom, prejudice and wishful thinking hamper the process of intellectualization. As applied to controversial issues, the negative hypothesis might well be the

\[55\text{Ibid.}\]
opponent's point of view, and the negative data the facts and arguments he presented. The student would come to see, moreover, that these two principles were more than techniques; they were ideals — the foundation of intellectual honesty.56

Like Counts, Horn believed that indoctrination was inevitable. Indoctrination occurred in two ways. First: through the selection of courses and the content to be covered in social education. This included courses which were supposedly limited to the presentation of facts and subject to the choices made by the instructor. Horn stressed that: "Indoctrination, although indirect, is inevitable, and, indeed it may be more effective because of its very subtlety and indirection."57 He did not advocate its use as Counts did; but he realized the role that indoctrination would play in social studies education.

History and historical writing were good examples of this, according to Horn. No historian, however knowledgeable, knew all that there was to know about the phase of civilization with which he was dealing. Historians were continually rewriting history, not because of new data but because of changing opinions and times. Each rewriting

56 Ibid., p. 91.

57 Ibid., p. 92.
called for a different selection and interpretation of the data. Omission of certain events or views could color the interpretation and give a biased view. Witness the trend in American textbook writing - the movement away from military and political history toward economic, social and cultural histories. Even when history or geography and civics were well taught, it was difficult to remove the bias of the teacher.

Second: the belief that we could eliminate controversy and prevent indoctrination by limiting teaching and study to the descriptive aspect of society. Teach the facts, it was urged, and let the students judge for themselves. Facts were needed, but they did not arrange and organize themselves. These processes were performed by individuals who worked under some norm, sense of value and some hypothesis, conscious or unconscious. This could often be an insidious process of which the teacher and learner remained unaware. Horn was clearly aware of the subtleties of and biases involved in the teaching process.

He continued - even a course that purported to be purely descriptive was subject to the same pitfalls. Some facts would be presented while others would be omitted.

53 Ibid., p. 99.
which would lead to prejudice. Facts might be falsified or distorted in mere description. The teacher who might wish to indoctrinate may very well choose description rather than exhortation.

The schools would do well to teach controversial issues, as recent studies had indicated. They would be supported by a majority of voters in the country. No other course was open to them if they were to deal honestly and realistically with social problems. The student had to learn as much about each side of a question as it was possible to do so. He should also attempt to form a conclusion, no matter how tentative. This would be hard to do, and the teacher should assiduously avoid imposing his views on the student. In conclusion, Horn remarked:

While he should studiously avoid imposing his views upon the students, the frank expression of his reasoned convictions need not be incompatible with the sincere desire to encourage and bring about the fairest possible presentation of points of view other than his own. Candor is the best policy.\(^5\)

Horn did not deal with any specific programs or curricula. His awareness of the latest findings in social science research is indicated by his emphasis on relativism and social awareness. While recognizing the nature and

---

\(^5\) Ibid., p. 96.
incidence of imposition, Horn did not feel it should be pursued openly. History did not occupy the central position in Horn's conception of the social studies. Teachers and students were to be socially aware, but the school or teacher were not to be involved in changing society. Counts certainly would have thought otherwise. In the light of his position vis-a-vis the Commission's final Report, his views on social education were moderate and opposed to his earlier essentialist position.

The views expressed by members of the Commission agreed on the importance of social education. To a man, they extolled the benefits which would accrue to American society if these courses were diligently pursued by the nation's educators. They did not outline specific programs but tended to expound broad goals and calls to action. Beard, in his two volumes, stressed the centrality of history in relation to the other social studies. The others tended to deal with social studies as a whole.

Surprisingly, aside from Counts's views on imposition and his insistence that the school become directly involved in social change, the views expressed were moderate. All agreed that one of the primary outcomes of social education was the development of good, patriotic citizens. Society's role in shaping the school was also stressed, as well as the
role of competing institutions. Emphasis was placed on the relativistic approach in teaching and the value of teaching social awareness was touched upon in each of the volumes. All agreed that allowances had to be made for the changing nature of American society. The day of individualism had passed and social educators had to prepare students for the changed realities. Lastly, they pointed out that the schools should make opportunities available for all students and not concentrate on the middle and upper classes. The criticisms levelled at their views on social education will be dealt with in a later chapter.
CHAPTER V

REACTIONS OF THE MINORITY MEMBERS
OF THE COMMISSION

In preceding chapters, we have discussed the organization and work of the Commission. The magnitude of the Commission's work limited the scope of our inquiry. Emphasis was restricted to the social theories and social studies education programs advocated by members of the Commission. When the investigations of the Commission were finished a final report was prepared. A special committee was set up to handle this important assignment. During the preparation of the final report, friction developed between members of the committee and members of the Executive Committee of the Commission. This chapter will deal with the controversy which surrounded the preparation and acceptance of the final report of the Commission. The origins of the controversy and the views of the dissident members will receive special attention.

One of the major problems faced by Krey and his adherents on the Commission was the acceptance and signing of the final report. The report, written primarily by Counts, went through several revisions before it was circulated.
among the members of the Commission for their acceptance or rejection. There were some anxious moments as the report made the rounds of Commission members. In the end all but four members: Edmund Day, Charles Merriam, Ernest Horn and Frank Ballou, signed the report; and one member, Isaiah Bowman, signed with reservations. The final report was accepted by the American Historical Association at its December, 1934 meeting, thereby ending the eight year work of the Commission. All that remained was the editing and publishing of the remaining volumes in the report. One other task faced the group – the defense and popularization of the final report. This was to consume another two years until the dust raised by the controversy had settled.

The controversy over the signing reached into many areas of secondary education and into non-academic segments of American society. Harry Elmer Barnes, the noted historian, wrote a critique of the report which appeared in the "New York World-Telegram" on Feb. 1, 1939. The critique also appeared in other papers in the Scripps-Howard chain, thus giving national prominence to the Commission's report. Educational and civic groups throughout the country discussed the merits and shortcomings of the report. Members of the Commission were besieged with letters from educators and other interested persons who wanted an explanation of their views. Members
of the Commission were also asked to make personal appearances before teacher organizations, other educational groups, and concerned civic groups to air their views. Some members of the Commission were more accessible than others. Some wanted to forget about the whole affair and let the Report speak for itself. Adding to the confusion over the meaning of the final Report was the refusal of the dissenters to make public statements concerning their refusal to sign the Report.

This chapter will examine the views of the minority members of the Commission. Some of the material has just recently become available, having been withheld until the death of the participants. Some members did not fully explain their reasons for not signing, so we can only speculate on the reasons for their actions. Isaiah Bowman signed with reservations which were appended to the final Report. Frank Ballou was the only dissenter to make a full disclosure at the time the Report was issued.¹ Horn wrote his reasons which were not made public until his death. Edmund Day and Charles E. Merriam steadfastly refused to explain fully their reasons for not signing.

¹He was later to retract some of his statements during questioning before the Maverick Committee in 1937.
The relationships between the various members of the Commission were marked by congeniality, mutual respect and professionalism. There was much give and take and good-natured joshing in their relationships. For example, Beard referred to Krey as his "nephew." Krey, in turn, fondly referred to Beard as "Uncle Charly." Minor irritations and personality clashes did occur due to the peripatetic nature of the meeting sites, publication deadlines and differences in philosophical outlooks. While the proceedings of the Commission enjoyed smooth sailing most of the time, there were moments when the "ship" was beset by storms. Krey, like many a good captain, was able to bring the ship and its crew safely to shore but not without some tension and anxiety.

There were three areas of contention which led to controversy over the final Report. They were: (1) the philosophic orientations of the various members of the Commission; (2) the position taken on tests and testing and (3) the views expressed in the Report concerning collectivism. The first area was discussed in a preceding chapter, so it will be touched upon lightly. It revolved around the views of those who had humanistic leanings as opposed to those who

---

2 Krey to Beard, Sept. 17, 1934, Krey Papers, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
wanted to make educational practices and methodology as scientific as possible. These orientations conditioned the views of the members of the Commission on other controversies.

The second area was related to tests and testing. It centered around the work of the Committee on Tests and the views taken on tests and testing in the final report. Members of the Commission were deeply concerned with tests and testing from the onset of the Commission's work. Their positions concerning the use and value of tests were often colored by their philosophical outlooks.

There were those on the Commission who felt that a new-type test technique might be developed to aid in the problems of social science instruction. The new-type test would yield a one word answer, thus making it easy to quantify and to be used in statistical analysis. The essay type examination could not be used in this fashion. A. C. Krey, Frank Ballou, Ernest Horn, Edmund Day and others felt this breakthrough might be possible. On the other hand, there were those individuals such as Charles Beard who were opposed to any attempt to develop comprehensive tests or to deal scientifically with the problem. Their humanistic leanings were compatible with a relativistic approach. After all, as Beard often remarked, how could you measure values and ideas which were relativistic.
Truman L. Kelley, Professor of Education, Harvard University, formerly of Stanford University, was appointed to the position of Advisor on Tests in September of 1929. Kelley, a former student of Thorndike, was one of the pioneers in Psychometry and the application of statistics to psychological analysis. He was a respected scholar in the field, as Charles Roback alludes to in his *History of Psychology*. Kelley felt that adequate tests could be developed for the use of social studies teachers.

Later in the year an Advisory Committee on Tests was appointed by the Commission. The first meeting was held in November, 1929. Commission members appointed to the Committee were Frank Ballou, Isaiah Bowman, Ernest Horn, Henry Johnson and A. C. Krey. Other members were Howard C. Hill, Assistant Professor of the Teaching of the Social Sciences, University of Chicago; and Ben D. Wood, Professor of Psychology, Columbia University. Frank Ballou was appointed the chairman of the committee. The Committee worked closely with Kelley during the seven years of its existence. The Commission set aside one major division of its work with tests to the preparation and application of new-type tests.

---

Kelley's first assignment was to determine the nature and construction of tests now in use. From this search he was to recommend tests which could be useful to social studies instruction throughout the country. If possible, he was to develop tests which could be used in a comprehensive fashion. Kelley and his staff examined numerous tests before they reached their conclusions. He recommended the following tests be used: for instruction in History, a test devised by Marion Clark; for Geography, a test devised by R. D. Calkin and Edith Parker; and for measurement of character traits, he devised a test aided by M. R. Trabue and A. N. Jordan (referred to as the Kelley-Trabue Test).

Kelley presented his recommendations at the April 8, 1930, meeting of the Committee on Tests at the Faculty Club, Columbia University. The following members of the Committee were present: Ballou, Bowman, Horn, Wood, Kelley, Kimmel and Krey, who presided over the meeting. The Geography test and the History instruction test were accepted with little debate. The Kelley-Trabue Test met with opposition when Horn raised the question of the test's validity. Could the test accurately measure character traits? Ballou, speaking forcefully for the acceptance of the test, pointed out:

...traits were not peculiar to the social studies but to all students. I would be in favor of accepting the test even if it yielded no results. The discovery that there
was no relation between a given trait or all of the traits in this test and social studies, should such be the outcome, would be of great value. If positive relationships were proved, it would be even more valuable.⁴

Ballou's statement helped to carry the day for the Kelley-Trabue Test. The Committee accepted it with the exception of Horn. His intransigence did not last, as he later accepted the use of the test. The first dispute over testing was ended, but it would not be the last.

In order to avoid further disputes and to allow for the smooth functioning of the Committee, Kelley's status was specifically spelled out by the Commission. This was an important item on the agenda of the next executive meeting held at the Stevens Hotel in Chicago on October 28-30, 1930.

...the committee on tests was to be unrestricted in its consideration of the testing program; that it was to be free to recommend any changes in the policy of psychological assistance to be employed; and that in view of these considerations, Mr. Kelley, should not be regarded as a member of the Committee.⁵

Kelley and his assistants were to have the full cooperation and assistance of the members of the Commission as they proceeded with their tasks.

⁴Minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Tests held at the Faculty Club, Columbia University, April 8, 1930, Merriam papers.

⁵Minutes Executive Meeting, Merriam papers.
Kelley and his assistants, Luella Cole Pressey, Edgar B. Wesley, Mary G. Kelty, Nellie E. Moore, Edith Putnam Parker, Marion Clark, M. R. Trabue and A. M. Jordan worked diligently to develop a battery of tests which would bring about the desired goals of the Committee. The work performed by Kelley’s group is chronicled in Kelley and Krey, Tests and Measurements in the Social Sciences. The work contained six chapters describing the tests, how they were administered and the conclusions reached by the Committee. Each participant wrote a chapter dealing with his particular contribution to the work of the Committee. Krey wrote the final chapter, summarizing the work of the Committee. Kelley was upset with the final report on tests and testing and was allowed to air his views in an appendix to the work.

Kelley presented the following general plan for the measurement of values in the social science field, focusing attention upon the individual expression of these outcomes of instruction. He pointed out that the individual must be observed in a time-space continuum as the individual is undergoing growth and change. There were basically three traits of intellectual activity which could be measured; meta responses (habits), attitudes and problem solving (approach to novel situations). These traits could be related to the study of social science. A test or sub-test could be con-
structured to measure continuity, historical sense, sense of evidence, interpretation of the present and interrelationships.

The hopes of Kelley and the Committee were not to be realized. After seven years of research they could not come up with a comprehensive test to measure social studies skills. They could not convince the subject-matter specialists of the values of the new test. In the conclusions written by A. C. Krey, the following views were set forth. Krey pointed out the limited nature of the study:

The study of testing in the social studies will doubtless continue. The work of the Commission must necessarily end. Any conclusions offered at this time must be regarded as an inventory of progress at the point where the Commission ended its labors. No finality is or can be claimed for them. Further work will certainly modify them and may prove some of them wrong.⁶

Krey discussed seven questions studied by the Committee. They were: (1) Are tests necessary?; (2) Are existing tests adequate?; (3) the relation of tests to objectives; (4) the interrelation of the types of objectives in social science subjects; (5) suitability of different types of questions to test types of objectives; (6) modification of tests to school grade learning and (7) the possibility of developing standardized tests.

To the first question, he concluded that it was not important to ask whether tests were necessary but whether they would be put to the proper use. Tests were here to stay and every effort should be made to see that they were properly and effectively utilized. The work of the committee showed that existing tests were not adequate. Krey placed special emphasis on this finding. The committee felt that tests were inadequate when compared to the wide range of objectives found in social science subject-matter areas. Tests should be constructed to illustrate the interrelation of the types of objectives in the social sciences. The new-type test could measure the possession of information. Values, attitudes and interests were the most difficult to measure in this fashion. Findings seemed to show that social learning followed some order of development and growth. Definite changes in student attitudes and interests would change as they became ideologically mature.

Standardized tests would be desirable and could be used throughout the country. The technology was available but it was difficult for the individual teacher to do it. The whole process broke down in the consideration of values. Specific information could be tested but values were elusive. They could not be measured by the new-type test. The committee could not solve this problem.
At the conclusion of the work of the Committee on Tests, Kelley and Krey had to admit failure. A comprehensive test could not be developed. While some progress had been made in testing techniques, Krey had to admit that the problem was nowhere near solution:

The value of the new-type test as a supplementary device in school instruction, whether during the progress of the work as in the examinations at the close of instruction, seems established. Its deficiencies, however, are still so many that it cannot be used as a substitute for all other tests at either of these stages.7

The chapter on tests and testing in the final report made use of the committee findings. Counts and those who helped him with the final report, notably Beard, were not as enthusiastic over the use of tests. Tests were necessary but rather limited. As Counts observed:

The Commission wishes to emphasize from first to last the fairly obvious, though very important and often neglected, fact that the final appraisal of any program of social science instruction will be made, not in the school, but in the life of society which the school is expected to secure.8

The controversy arose over the position taken by the Commission in the final report.

7Ibid., p. 431.

The Commission did not want to pass judgment on the testing movement as a whole but only insofar as it related to social science instruction. Three new types of testing instruments were considered; tests of intelligence; tests of character and culture and tests of classroom products.

Tests of intelligence were discussed first. Some felt, Counts wrote, that these tests were accurate indicators of intellectual quality or ability. Recent studies seemed to show that there was disagreement as to what the tests actually measured. The intelligence test had been used in schools for three major purposes: (1) for the diagnosis of educability at a particular moment; (2) for the classification of pupils into "homogenous" instructional groups and (3) for the guidance of children into vocational curricula and into occupations. It was felt that the first use of tests fell out of the competence of the Commission and that the second use was of little significance. Hence the Commission concentrated on the third use, the influence of the intelligence test on occupations and the related problems of social organization. 9

The Commission was highly critical of the role of intelligence tests on occupations and social organization. It came to the following conclusions:

9 Ibid., pp. 90-91.
Since the arrangement of occupations, activities, modes of life, cultural apparatus or other social phenomena in any order of importance or of assigned mathematical value is not determined by the intrinsic nature of the thing being rated, as in the case of the correct scale of atomic weights, but is made of necessity by some person or group of persons of given occupational or interest affiliation, the social sciences will rightly insist on knowing the judges who judge the judged and will proceed to an analysis of the social ideas and circumstances which condition their judgments.10

It would be folly to think that social scientists would not carefully analyze the credentials and backgrounds of the test-makers. In conclusion, the Commission remarked:

In the light of the social sciences the rating of an engineer or a Y.M.C.A. secretary as more important or more valuable than a skilled artisan is to be regarded as utterly beyond the competence of objective determination.11

The views of the Commission were just as devastating regarding tests of character and culture:

Finally, as in the case of the intelligence tests, if the findings and measurements of testing with respect to character and culture are taken at their face value, no conclusions with respect to social policy and action automatically emerge from such findings and measurements.12

10 Ibid., pp. 93-94.
11 Ibid., p. 94.
12 Ibid., p. 96.
The views on testing contained in the final report caused a furor among the members of the Commission. A meeting was held in Chicago, October 12th to the 14th, 1933, to deal with this problem. The major outcome of the meeting was the appointment of a sub-committee to issue an alternative statement on the role of tests and testing. The sub-committee was chaired by Ernest Horn. Other members of the sub-committee were Truman Kelley, Ben Wood and E. F. Lindquist. A conference was held by the sub-committee for the purpose of preparing a suitable alternate statement. Horn also held individual conferences with G. M. Ruch of the University of California; Dr. George Stoddard, Director of the Child Welfare Station, University of Iowa and Dr. Frank Ballou, Chairman of the Commission's Standing Committee on Tests. The statement was prepared by Horn and was read and approved by members of the sub-committee, with the exception of Kelley. Kelley was in agreement with most of the views expressed in the statement; but he still felt that there were some serious defects. Kelley expressed his views in the appendix to Tests and Measurements in the Social Studies.

Copies of the report were sent to the members of the Commission. The sub-committee on tests recommended that the alternate chapter be inserted in the final report as the chapter on tests and testing. Horn felt that the recommenda-
tion of the sub-committee would be heeded, so he did not press for a vote on the matter at the December, 1933, meeting of the Commission. To the consternation of Horn and his supporters, most of the important recommendations were not included in the final report. In fact, it appeared to Horn that the works of the sub-committee on tests was largely ignored.

The alternate report was moderate and conciliatory in tone as Horn deliberately sought the middle ground in the controversy. Since the report was not incorporated in the Commission's Conclusions and Recommendations, it was published in its entirety in the January, 1935 edition of Social Studies. In the report, Horn did not demonstrate undue enthusiasm for the test movement, but instead tried to show that it had a place in the learning process similar to other techniques and methodologies.

Dissatisfaction with the section on tests was intermingled with negative attitudes towards collectivism. The inclusion of the material on tests and testing and the use of the term "collectivism" led to the refusal of some members of the Commission to sign the final report.

Counts used the article on "Collectivism" written by Walter H. Hamilton in Volume Three of the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences to support his views presented in the
final report. To some of the dissidents, the remarks were too radical and they felt that this section would lead to controversy when it was disclosed to the general public. Merriam and Day were especially upset with this part of the report. Merriam alluded to his remarks on individualism in the volume which he authored for the Commission. Special emphasis was placed on the topic of individualism by Merriam in a chapter of his volume. Day did not publicly air his objections, but he did allude to the radical views of Beard and Counts in a letter to Merriam in April, 1932. There were others who were to raise similar objections, notably Franklin Bobbitt.

Isaiah Bowman at first appeared to be willing to sign the report. Krey wrote him a congratulatory letter when his volume in the report was published. In the letter Krey lauded Bowman's work, calling it an important contribution to the study of geography. Krey then asked for Bowman's support and expressed the hope that he would sign the document. Krey wrote:

I hope that you will find it, as I do, a document which all of us can be proud to sign. Probably everyone will feel that he has been called to give up some pet idea; probably everyone, too, feels that if he alone were writing the document it would be somewhat different. Any composite document will necessarily be of that nature. I personally feel more than satisfied that we have finally obtained a document which will commend universal

---

respect - liberal enough to command the confidence of the people whose children go to the public schools, and conservative enough to reassure our taxpayers, both light and heavy, that the nation can solve its problems and meet emergencies without departing from the traditions which it has cherished for more than a century and a half and without resorting to any violence in the process. If you feel as I do about the document, I hope that you will take the occasion to congratulate both beard, who has done so much, and Merriam, whose determined opposition led to the elimination of those things which many of us would not have been proud of.14

Bowman did not heed Krey's advice at first, but after much pleading and cajoling relented and signed the report. He was allowed to add his reservations at the end of the document.

Bowman was not in sharp disagreement with the report, but he did feel that some items should be changed and amended. His criticisms revolved around two topics: (1) geographical education and (2) the idea that the report was too vague and utopian. There were eleven changes which Bowman wanted made. Most of the changes requested by Bowman related to alterations of the text. First, he felt that the views expressed on "the artificiality of political boundaries and divisions" should be omitted, as the topic was too complex to be treated in a report of this nature. He was also upset with the views concerning international conflict. Bowman stated:

I observe that international conflicts and wars take place not alone because of struggles among nations for markets and raw materials. How can we eliminate such struggles except in utopia? We can regulate the relations of

14 Krey to Bowman, Minneapolis, Minnesota to New York, New York, Krey Papers, Archives University of Minnesota, Mpls., Minn.
nations, diminish the intensity of the struggle and come to working agreements with our neighbors. It is not necessary in constructing a framework of good relations that the individualism of nations should be eliminated. World society is like national society in this respect. Regional diversity is one of the blessings of the world and the boundaries between countries express the idea of neighborhood or region in the large senses.\textsuperscript{15}

Continuing his criticism, Bowman lashed out at the utopian nature of the document. For example: "as to the future of society, this is again one of those vague terms that has very little meaning unless defined. How distant a future?\textsuperscript{16} He disliked a statement that suggested freeing the ordinary man from the long working day. Bowman responded: "Decidedly this is not a promise of the future. Who wants to be so freed? This reads as if we wanted to give every man eternal rest. What we want is to free the ordinary individual from the too-long day of the one-task type.\textsuperscript{17} Another jibe at utopianism was delivered by Bowman:

‘individuality for great masses of people’. This is a bit of utopian yearning. The ‘great masses’ have no such individuality. The statement is wrong in the historic sense as well as from the realistic standpoint of today in spite of all the general education that we have had.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} The American Historical Association, Conclusions and Recommendations, pp. 164-165.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 165.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 165.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 165.
Bowman was upset with the Commission's view of regionalism. He felt that the report contained an inaccurate view of the importance of regionalism. According to Bowman, the following change should be made:

I would omit... the common problems of mankind and the significance of international relations and insert instead: The national and regional settings of people that give their problems an individualism that has to be harmonized with the common welfare.\textsuperscript{19}

Continuing his criticism, Bowman felt that the final report contained a lack of understanding regarding certain geographical regions. He was upset with regards to a statement concerning Asia:

Who has the temerity to write that Asia is being brought within a common orbit of civilization? That phrase was written in metropolitan New York and not by one whose shoes still carry the dust of Asia. Asia has borrowed some of our tricks. Its people are not swinging in an orbit in even the modest sense of that phrase.\textsuperscript{20}

He was disturbed with the idea that the study of the child's neighborhood, town and community should be studied ahead of world geography. Bowman felt that the child knew about his immediate surroundings and hence would find home geography dull. Students should be taught the following geography course, according to Bowman:

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 165.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., pp. 165-166.
They like to know about strange places, peoples, and it appears that some of the remote peoples of the world live under such simple conditions that they form ideal cases for the study of the simple forms of life that may be taught in useful contrast to the complex forms of which we are a part.21

He felt that the chapter on the teacher was deficient, particularly the ending of the chapter which appeared to be vague and incoherent. The training of the teacher was not specific and was cluttered with emotion. The truly scientific aspect of teacher education was neglected. Bowman concluded his criticism with the following statement:

I know that this is a pale generalization and that the ready answer is 'What are the specific possibilities?' This is not the place to set them forth or argue the matter at length, but shouldn't the committee have had the question in mind in making their last revision.22

Bowman's criticisms were not dramatic or based on broad philosophical or methodological considerations. There was, however, one exception, his comments regarding the recent scientific developments in teacher training. His criticisms were confined primarily to his area of expertise and his personal idiosyncracies. It seemed as though he was going to say something just to be saying it, as a college president

21 Ibid., pp. 166-167.

22 Ibid., p. 168.
might make concluding remarks after the commencement address by a distinguished visitor. He did not comment or publish any other material on the Commission. By this time he was engrossed in his duties at Johns Hopkins. His volume in the Commission's Report was a significant contribution to the field of geographical education. The same could not be said for his critique of the final Report.

Edmund E. Day did not sign the final Report nor did he reveal his reasons for not signing. Up until the last minute Krey felt that Day would sign, since it was Day who made the two motions at the Chicago meeting to forward the Report to the American Historical Association for its approval. Others, Comstock, Hayes and Ford felt that he would sign even though he disliked the liberal nature of the final Report. Day cooperated with the Executive Committee of the Commission until the end. At the final meeting in Chicago, when the going was rough, Day was most helpful. According to Krey:

...Day indicated that, while there were some things about still which he did not like, many of his objections had been met and he was most helpful in facilitating the work of the meeting...it was Day who offered the two motions or suggestions calling for the presenting of the document and allowing the members of the Commission a
Despite the helpful position he took at Chicago and his seeming agreement with contents of the document, Day did not sign the final report.

The reasons for Day's refusal to sign can be inferred from his attitude towards members of the Commission and his philosophic approach. Three letters would seem to reveal the reasons for Day's actions: two letters from Day to Merriam and one letter from Krey to Beard. The letters from Day to Merriam are three years apart, but they reveal Day's attitude towards Counts and Beard. In the earlier letter to Merriam, Day revealed his displeasure with the liberal views of Counts. Day believed that Counts would become radical if he was not checked in his views. He mentioned to Merriam: "Counts might run away with it as Krey is too lenient. Perhaps Judd can temper Counts' ideas." Judd did not become a member of the Commission and Counts was supported in his endeavors by Krey and others on the Commission. In a second letter to Merriam, Day again expressed his displeasure with Counts' role as Director of Research and his position as the princi-

---

23 Letter from Krey to Avery Craven, Krey Papers, Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

pal author of the Commission's final Report. He felt that Beard and Counts specifically expressed views that could be considered radical. Day felt that Beard encouraged Counts's radical nature rather than trying to curb it. As he put it: "instead of checking each other they reinforced each other." 25

Krey, in a letter to Beard, pointed out Day's reasons for not signing:

Day's position is, of course, particularly difficult. He is connected with the General Education Board, which has sponsored so many of the things specifically condemned in our draft. He is also connected with the Rockefeller Foundation which carries other implications. Fundamentally, of course, he is by nature conservative and were he writing the document, it would probably have a very different tone. 26

Apparently it was Day's conservatism and his loyalty to the organizations to which he belonged which precluded his signing the final Report. To his credit, Day did not utter or write any acrimonious statements and urged his fellow dissenters to follow the same cautious course. He felt that continuing the quarrel would open new areas of disagreement and that in the end it would discredit the work of the Commission. Since some critics felt that it was a radical document, he wanted to dissociate himself from the Commission as soon as possible.


26 Krey to Beard, Winslow, Arizona to New York, Krey papers, Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Charles E. Merriam did not issue a formal statement as to why he did not sign the report. There were clues in the correspondence between Bessie Louise Pierce and Merriam, Merriam and Ballou, Horn and Merriam, as well as Merriam's statements in the volume he authored for the Commission, which helped to show why he did not sign the final report. As the final report neared completion, Bessie Louise Pierce wrote to Merriam warning him about the content of the report. She was alarmed about the "radical" nature of the report, as she stated:

I fear very much that should this report with its avowed sponsorship of inculcation of collectivism in the school be published that it would destroy much of the validity of the other work of the Commission. I am wondering if much more could be accomplished by omission of the word 'collectivism' which certainly is anathema to many Americans as well as being misunderstood by others. The section on tests is also not without faults.27

This letter seemed to confirm in Merriam's mind his objection to the report. He felt that collectivism achieved through indoctrination would be a vital threat to the democratic way of life.

In a letter to Ballou, Merriam offered an explanation as to why he did not sign the report. Merriam wrote:

---

In my own case I feel that my views are fully expressed in my volume Civic Education in the United States, and I have an earlier volume on the Making of Citizens. It is quite possible for anyone who is interested in my views to ascertain them through these channels.28

These views were discussed in an earlier chapter, particularly in the chapter related to Merriam's views on social education. Later in the letter to Ballou Merriam discussed the possibility of future statements by the dissidents:

The difficulty with additional statements at this time is that such statements might only call for further counter-statements and make the situation still worse. For example, the procedure of the association in dissolving the whole Commission, thus cutting off full and free deliberation is a very difficult point. If Beard and others should come back at us sharply we should, of course, have to reply again, and so on indefinitely, perhaps with increasing bitterness.29

Another factor to be considered concerning Merriam's actions was his antipathy for Beard. The letters from Day have previously been noted. Merriam did not dislike Beard but felt that Beard got more publicity than he did. Barry Karl made this point in his excellent biography of Merriam.30 We might conclude then that Merriam's dislike of the use of "Collectivism", imposition and his professional jealousy toward Beard prohibited his signing of the final report.

28 Charles Merriam to Frank Ballou, Horn Papers, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

29 Ibid.

The only dissenter to make public his reasons for not signing the report at the time was Frank Ballou. Ballou felt very strongly about the scientific movement in education. In a letter to Merriam, Ballou pointed out that he had earlier entertained misgivings about the final report of the Commission:

From the beginnings of our efforts to prepare a report I have been confident that the report would be a disappointment. That feeling has increased rather than diminished as I have observed the reactions which the report has promoted.31

Ballou made a statement pointing out why he did not wish to sign the report. The statement appeared in the June 7, 1934 issue of School and Society. It was not a detailed report as it covered one page and a fraction of another in the journal. Ballou’s criticisms were concerned primarily with the Commission’s views on current educational practices and the scientific method in education.

Ballou felt that the report criticized current educational practices but did not adequately study them. Having done this, the Commission failed to present a constructive program of instruction which would improve the conditions it so severely criticized. To Ballou, this should have been the major aspect of the report.

31 Ballou to Merriam, Horn Papers, Iowa University, Iowa City, Iowa, Sept. 21, 1934.
The chapter on "Tests and Testing" was unacceptable to Ballou. In his view, it did a serious injustice to the scientific movement in education. As Ballou pointed out:

This chapter is not based on any thoroughgoing investigation of testing in general or on any conclusions reached in the discussions of the Commission. The rigorous protests made by me and some of my colleagues against the chapter have been to a large extent ignored in the final revisions as published. 32

A greater disappointment for Ballou was the fact that the chapter was not based on the conclusions reached by Krey and Kelley in their volume prepared for the Commission.

Ballou went on to criticize the chapters dealing with the teacher, selections and organization of materials of instruction. Ballou thought that the chapters did not deal adequately with the complex problems facing educators in these areas. There was no attempt to outline specific areas of course content and objectives. No mention was made of ways in which educators could improve existing conditions. At times the discussion was so general that it was difficult to tell which level of education the report was considering.

Finally, Ballou felt that a school system relying on the report for curricular changes would be disappointed. There was little in the report to aid the curriculum planners.

He quoted his supervisor for social studies for white pupils, George J. Jones. Jones felt that the report was unsuitable to the problems facing modern day educators. He had held up the development of Washington's social studies program in hopes of incorporating the new views. Jones stated:

The report was a sad disappointment to me. For two years I have withheld the printing of our social science courses (grade 7 to 12 inclusive) waiting for the report of the Commission. I expected that these would be definite recommendations. I will now give the manuscript to you about June 15th and I might say that after studying the recommendations not one change will be made in the manuscript for the course of study.33

Ballou did not feel that further statements should be made by the dissenters. He was in agreement with Merriam when he wrote:

...I agree with you that any statement which anyone of the four dissenters may make regarding their reasons for not signing the report is likely to result in other statements from those who did not sign or from those who support the report. I think this endless chain program ought not to be promoted by any of us.34

This was where the matter stood. Both sides refrained from issuing counter-statements and the controversy eventually died down.

33 Ibid.

34 Ballou to Merriam, Horn Papers, Miller Library, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, Sept. 20, 1934.
Ernest Horn did not issue a statement at the time the report was issued, although he did prepare one. While Horn hinted at its contents he did not allow it to be made public until after his death in 1967. Prior to that time he did issue partial statements. Horn agreed with the other dissenters that it would be wise not to enlarge the controversy. This may have been an important reason for the withholding of his statement. He was particularly upset over the failure of the Commission to include his revision of the chapter on tests in the final report.

His reasons for not signing are included in a detailed paper of seventeen typewritten pages. It was never published and was not made public at any time before Horn's death. There was speculation that it might be published in one of the educational journals, but this did not come to pass. It was shown to certain selected individuals, but they were sworn to secrecy and did not reveal its contents.

Horn felt that there were many items in the report with which he could agree, but he could not sign the document unless it would be revised. To sign it as it stood would be, Horn felt, to do more harm than good. His objectives fell into two areas: (1) objections to the overall report and (2) objections to specific chapters.
To begin with, Horn felt that the volume was not a summary of the work of the Commission. Some of the volumes had not been published and some of the issues dealt with were not discussed adequately during the Commission's deliberations. Second, there was no general meeting of Commission members to approve the final draft. The draft was approved by the Executive Committee and then sent to individual members for their approval. This proceeding, in Horn's view, precluded adequate discussion and revision of the final draft. Third, the volume was vague or evasive on certain fundamental matters which were clearly the responsibility of the Commission. On the other hand, the Commission was explicit and dogmatic pertaining to matters outside its sphere of influence. For example, little help was given in developing curricula that pertained to the "frame of reference". Teachers and administrators were expecting the Commission to do this. While outside its jurisdiction, the report urged teachers to adopt a more militant form of professional organization and suggested that the weaker normal schools be closed.

Fourth, the volume oversimplified or omitted pertinent factors in several chapters. This was true in the chapter on the "frame of reference", and in the chapter on tests, on teacher training and on public relations. 35

35 Horn Papers, Iowa University, Iowa City, Iowa.
Fifth, the volume was prepared in a prejudicial rather than in a judicious tone. This was particularly true in the chapters on teacher training institutions and public school administration.

Sixth, while espousing cooperation and integration in educational activities, the conclusions presented in the volume, Horn thought, would in reality be divisive and would set various professional groups and interests at each others throats. 36

Seventh, the use of contrast was employed instead of coordination. For example, professional training in education was contrasted with scholarship and effective school plants with good teaching. 37

Eighth, the volume exhibited a limited grasp of the realities and difficulties facing American educators. As a result, there were many statements which were inaccurate, misleading and subversive. Following the foregoing overall criticism, Horn then analyzed each chapter.

Horn felt that the concept "frame of reference" was not fully explained nor shown applicable to the solution of existing school problems. In addition to this, he felt that

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.
there were other defects. They were: an over emphasis on economic collectivism. The old order was too easily "liquidated" and the collectivistic order was too comfortably set up. Second, the emphasis on change needed to be balanced by an emphasis on the persistent values in our social heritage. Not all the old order was passing. Third, the basic social conflicts should be recognized and the "frame of reference" adjusted accordingly. Fourth, the inherent difficulties involved in setting up instrumentalities, governmental or otherwise, for securing integration or social endeavor were ignored. 38

Horn concluded this section:

The pervasive influence of economic collectivism noted in the "frame of reference" is revealed anew in the inferences drawn for the philosophy of education. Here also appears the overemphasis on change: 'the old order is passing.' A changing world and an emerging collectivism, even if real and desirable, should not be allowed to dominate the philosophy of American education. 39

Horn regarded the chapter on selection and organization of instructional materials as totally inadequate. It ignored the problems faced by those responsible for developing and administering the public school curriculum. Where problems were not ignored, they were evaded with obscure generalizations. The recommendations which were made were

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid.
impractical and did not pertain to necessary practical decisions.

Horn found the chapter on methods to be the best in the report. It was especially important for its insistence that method must not be divorced from the knowledge, thought and purpose which would give it meaning and vitality. Horn made a similar point in his work on methods for the Commission. He felt that the chapter was lacking in its critique of teacher training institutions. Horn admitted that these institutions were far from perfect, but that conditions were not as bad as the report charged.

The chapter on tests was the object of Horn's major criticisms. He had not forgotten the cavalier treatment of his revised chapter on tests. Horn pointed out:

The entire chapter on tests shows so little understanding of recent developments in testing as to expose the summary report to the ridicule of every person who has a competent knowledge of the field of appraisal. Its shortcomings are so serious and so marked as to make it ineffective in the achievement of even the destructive purposes it set out to attain. It is out of harmony not only with the Commission's volume on tests but also with the report of the special committee set up by the Commission to draft a substitute statement. 40

40 Horn Papers, p. 6.
Continuing, Horn saw the major deficiencies of the chapter as being: (1) new-type of tests were belittled and condemned; (2) the chapter assumed that new-type of tests would supplant other types of appraisal; (3) the report felt that weaknesses in the new-type of test were inherent in that type of test rather than in the competence of those constructing the tests; (4) the report was vague and did not deal with the real issues in the test controversy; (5) it contained statements which were contrary to fact, such as the new-type test strived after "the elimination of all subjective and personal factors from the appraisal of pupil performance on the tests", and the assertion that the new-type of tests were based upon "the assumption that tests may be constructed mechanically from materials at hand without reference to some philosophy (grand or petty) behind the entire program of instruction." The report belittled all tests on the grounds that the ultimate test was in the remote future. If we followed this, Horn asserted, it would be futile to try to teach. The school had to think of the here and now; (7) the chapter did not present a desirable or feasible testing program; (8) the effect of the chapter was to disparage the use of tests now and in the future. It seemed to ignore the real need of testing programs.

\[41\text{Ibid., p. 7.}\]
The chapter on teacher training was inadequate according to Horn. It assumed that there was a lack of compatibility between scholarship in the social sciences and teacher institutions. It further implied that teacher training institutions had been lacking in appreciation of the vital importance of sound scholarship. This was not correct, as those involved in the administration of teacher training institutions were well aware of the importance that scholarship played in the preparation of teachers.

Horn felt that the leaders of teacher training institutions and those in administration would find much to agree with in the chapter. Like the Commission, they would favor a reorganization of social science courses with general, balanced courses to replace overspecialized courses; reorganization of education courses along similar lines; insistence that persons engaged in training teachers in various branches of learning should, first of all, be competent scholars in these fields; a reevaluation of subject matter and methodology with reference to social purpose; and the necessity of close cooperation between "subject matter specialists" and "educational specialists." 42

42 Ibid., p. 9.
The chapter was weakened, Horn pointed out, by a continual sniping at teacher training institutions. As Horn insisted:

It is not true, for example, that teacher training in the United States has been 'conceived in terms of the practice of a narrow technique which is to be mastered in all of its rigid detail', or that it has been 'essentially a matter of the mastery of techniques and formulae'. It is doubtful also whether the rise of the objective study of education has contributed, as here charged, to 'the separation of methodology from knowledge and thought'.

The next topic touched upon by the final report dealt with the concept of a "science of education." Horn felt that it was a waste of time to argue whether education was a distinct science or not. The important thing was to deal with the problems that existed with regard to teacher preparation. These topics were not dealt with in the report and this detracted from the significance of the final report.

The section on supervision grossly misrepresented the role of administrators, Horn believed. In Horn's view, administrators and supervisors had worked diligently to improve teaching conditions in recent years. The final report failed to recognize the efforts of supervisors and administrators. The problems that remained in this area could not be solved unless all concerned cooperated and worked together for their resolution.

43 Ibid., p. 10.
Chapter eight of the report, which dealt with public relations and administration, was accepted by Horn with reservations. Although he felt that there was little in this chapter that would be unacceptable to American educators, Horn did identify some objectionable statements. The view that the Commission took on educational and philanthropic institutions was particularly offensive to Horn. They were classified with those groups seeking to exploit through propaganda. Day had apparently found this section objectionable also. Views expressed concerning the power and authority of school boards were erroneous according to Horn. It was not necessary for teachers to have more control over the educational process than elected officials or the taxpayers. Some of the plans advocated by the report for the improvement of teaching would be echoed by administrators and supervisors.

The constant belittling of administrators in this section led Horn to remark:

The statement that 'the Commission places its trust in the improvement of the teacher rather than the perfection of the technical aspects of administration' is an illustration at once of an unhappy use of contrasts and of the improper use of innuendo and duplication. Why set up a choice? The improvement of teaching is almost always coordinated with the improvement of administration in all its aspects, including those of a technical character.\footnote{Ibid., p. 13.}
Horn went on to criticize the remaining references on the role of administrators in public education. He was particularly upset with the idea of the report that administrators should come from the ranks of social science teachers and teachers of philosophy. He ended his remarks on this section as follows:

Important as are social science, social philosophy and statecraft in this professional education, it would be tragic to place a school system in the hands of men and women whose training is in social science and philosophy. More emphasis, not the emphasis, should be placed on training in these fields. This concluding statement illustrates again the lack of appreciation, shown throughout the volume, of the fact that the members of the teaching profession have unique responsibilities which differentiate their services, and therefore their training, from the services and preparations of the members of other professions. ⁴⁵

Horn agreed with other critics when he lamented the Commission's failure to include a curriculum or curricula which would coincide with the "frame of reference." Many school systems were holding up curriculum revisions and other changes in anticipation of the Commission's report. The Commission's failure to act would bring about disillusionment. They had the right to expect more from the Commission but their sincerity was not rewarded.

Horn found little to like concerning the report. His most severe criticisms were directed to the areas of the

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 15.
report connected to the committees he had worked on. The criticisms revealed the philosophical differences between Horn and the group which prepared the final report. They also bared his antipathy towards the subject matter specialists. In conclusion, he felt that many of the issues raised in his paper could have been resolved if time had been allotted for this. The report, as it stood, he felt would do more harm to the cause of social education than good. It would, Horn replied:

become a dangerous weapon in the hands of certain interests whose motives are primarily vindictive and destructive. It will arouse the antagonism of the very groups into whose hands the various reports of the Commission must be placed and through whose efforts the recommendation must be carried out. It is hoped that these groups will be more discriminating in their criticism of the report than the report has been in its criticism of them.46

Horn's paper reflected his biases and clearly shows why he did not sign the final report. It was a thorough, if highly critical, critique of the Commission's final report. Had it been made public at the time it was written, controversy would surely have followed. Had this happened, it might have cleared the air and thus allowed the final report to have a greater impact. The opportunity did not occur and members of the Commission and other educators speculated on Horn's reasons for not signing. In the passage of time, Horn's views have lost their sense of importance and urgency, even if

46 Ibid., p. 19.
they do clarify his actions.

The dissenters presented their views concerning their reasons for not signing the final report in one way or another. Bowman was the only one to attach his views to the final report. His criticisms centered around his concern for geography and the way in which the discipline should be taught. He did not attack the philosophic or methodological positions asserted by the Commission in the final report. In a way, his remarks were superfluous and added little to the understanding of the report. This his remarks were included at all illustrates the fairness with which Krey and his associates treated those who dissented. Had the other dissenters so wished, their remarks would have been included.

Day and Merriam chose not to explain their actions. A careful reading of Merriam's book and references made to the report in his correspondence make his position clear. The same may be said for Day. His correspondence with Merriam revealed his dislike for the views of certain members of the Commission and the course of action they might have taken in performing their duties on the Commission. The pressures which could be brought to bear by organizations he was associated with must be carefully considered when we assess his reasons for not signing. He was the representative
of the traditional, conservative element in American education, sitting alongside the liberals and progressives in the deliberations of the Commission. It must have been a galling situation for him to go through. Philosophically, Merriam was faced with a similar situation. He detested ideas concerning imposition and the approaching collectivism. When it came to affixing their signatures to a document containing these ideas neither he nor Day could do it. The gulf was apparently too wide for their mental visions to bridge.

Ballou was straightforward in stating his reasons for not signing. Having spent an important part of his career in developing and popularizing the scientific movement in education, he could not be expected to support those who sought to destroy it or, as in the final report, to ignore it.

A large portion of the chapter was relegated to the views on testing and Horn's reaction to this. The view taken in the final report on tests and testing, and the denigration of teacher training institutions appear to be the major reasons for Horn's refusal to sign the final report. Horn, although he did not release the material at the time, was the only dissenter to go deeply into the reasons for his actions. It would have made the task of Krey, Counts and Beard easier if the others had done so.
The task of completing the report and having it approved by a majority of the members of the Commission was a difficult chore for Chairman Krey. This chapter has dealt with the problems he encountered in this process. Special emphasis was placed on the views of the dissidents. An attempt was made to show why they refused to sign the final report. These actions were significant events in view of the dispute surrounding the signing and acceptance of the report. Accusations were made concerning the role the American Historical Association played in the signing controversy. The following chapter will deal with the relationship of the American Historical Association to the Commission. Among the factors to be considered will be the role of the American Historical Association in accepting and approving the final report.
CHAPTER VI

RELATIONS OF THE COMMISSION WITH THE
AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

We have described the deliberations of the Commission which resulted in the preparation and acceptance of the final report. What role did the American Historical Association play in these events? This chapter will deal with the relationships that developed between the Commission and the professional organization. Was the Commission able to act independently in reaching its conclusions, or was it manipulated by the Executive Committee of the American Historical Association? This chapter will focus on these questions and show their effect on the work of the Commission.

The Commission on the Social Studies was a standing committee of the American Historical Association. As could be expected, a close relationship developed between parent and child. Chairman Krey reported the progress of the Commission at the annual December meeting of the Association. The Carnegie Foundation funded the work of the Commission. The funds were disbursed through the American Historical Association. While Krey, Kimmel and Counts had a great deal
of freedom in the use of funds, the Association had to give its approval. This was done through the action of the Executive Committee. Unused funds reverted to the Association when the Commission was dismissed at the conclusion of its work. Members of the Association, such as Conyers Read, Dixon Ryan Fox and Samuel Flagg Bemis, were involved with the Commission, as well as the members who served on the Commission. Charles A. Beard was president of the Association during 1934, the crucial last year of the Commission's existence.

The dissidents and others who criticized the final report accused the Association of using the Commission to further its own ends. They felt that the Association wanted to ensure the dominant role of history among the social science disciplines. They also felt that the Association wanted to preserve the traditional methods of teaching rather than supporting innovative techniques developed by the progressives, colleges of education and teacher training institutions. The Association, they felt, dismissed the Commission too quickly to avoid debate over the inclusion of new techniques of education and innovative curricula. It is self-evident that the Association had a big stake in the deliberations of the Commission. This was in part its reason for being. The important question to be asked is, to what
extent did the Association interfere in the work of the Commission? Did the Association try to impose its views on the Commission and secure a report favorable to the historical profession? This chapter will attempt to answer these questions and to analyze the educational views of the Association and its relationship with the Commission.

The chapter will be divided into three parts: the background of the Association's involvement with the Commission; the educational views of the Association as reflected in the final report, and the relationship of the Association with the Commission as seen through the correspondence of Conyers Read, George S. Counts, Charles A. Beard and A. C. Krey. The proceedings of the Association and the minutes of the Executive Committee meetings of the Commission will also be used.

The American Historical Association was organized as a response to the enthusiastic interest in historical thought and writing generated in part by the Civil War. It was founded on September 9, 1884, at Saratoga, New York, and was incorporated by an Act of Congress in 1889. Earlier attempts to found an organization had met with failure. The American Historical Society, founded in 1835, after a promising beginning, floundered and went out of existence. The Social Science Organization, concerned with the entire spectrum of social science disciplines, was organized in 1865. A group of prom-
inent historians felt that the social science group encompassed too large a field for their interests and set about organizing a group limited to the discipline of history. The social science organization's leader, General John Eaton, wanted the historical association to exist as an appendage to his group and not as a separate entity.

The founders of the American Historical Association, led by Herbert Adams, Professor at John Hopkins, were opposed to this view and went ahead with their planned organizational meeting at Saratoga.¹ The American Historical Association, unlike its predecessors, was to enjoy a long and productive existence.

At the first meeting of the American Historical Association, decisions were made which helped to shape the philosophy and program of the organization. The major issue facing the newly organized Association was whether it should try to be as big as possible or as good as possible. The founding fathers of the Association decided on a democratic approach. Persons from all walks of life would be included for membership in the Association, thereby delineating the control of

an elite. Eventually the professionals did take over the positions of influence in the organization, but membership has remained open to anyone with a genuine interest in history and historical scholarship.

From its inception, the American Historical Association was to play a vital role in social studies education. Since the Association was devoted exclusively to a subject-matter speciality, it could expend much of its energy furthering the role of history in secondary education. At first the American Historical Association had the field to itself. This situation was to change with the enormous expansion of secondary education in the concluding decades of the nineteenth century. Several groups began to take part in the debate of what should be taught in the social studies. Beginning with the Committee of Ten, a series of curriculum committees grappled with the problems of social studies education. The reports of some of these committees had far-reaching effects, while others were forgotten soon after their publication. The work of these committees has been dealt with in earlier sections of this work. Is it possible to discern a trend or movement affecting social studies education?

In the early years, the various groups worked together and there seemed to be little rivalry or professional jealousy. By the time the Commission began its deliberations,
a cleavage had developed. The National Educational Association had been organized in 1857, but its domain covered the entire range of secondary education in the United States. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, the two groups had worked together. The American Historical Association and the National Educational Association collaborated on the Committee of Ten Report. The report essentially assured the control of the high schools by the colleges; favoring the traditional college preparatory curriculum. There was little or no mention of courses which could be designed for the lower class youngster or the practical aspects of life. The work of the Committee of Seven (1905) continued this loose alliance with the National Educational Association. The National Educational Association was inactive in social studies curriculum work during the period from 1897 to 1916. The American Historical Association continued its involvement by sponsoring the Committee of Eight, 1905, and the Committee of Five, 1907.

The National Educational Association reasserted its leadership in social studies education by taking steps toward the creation of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The Commission was composed of seventeen committees, fourteen of which were concerned with the various subjects offered in high schools. The Committee
on Social Studies consisted of twenty-one members, thirteen of whom were in public school work. The work of this committee was to bring important changes to the social studies curriculum. On the high school level, the committee recommended two revolutionary changes: (1) the new course in "Problems of democracy, social, economic, and political," and (2) the full year's course in American History. In most schools, it had been a half year course; it was now doubled in length.

The report of the committee had other repercussions. It restored the National Educational Association to a position of leadership in social studies in education and helped to destroy the idea that school subjects must faithfully and fully reflect the scholarly bodies of materials from which they are drawn. Furthermore, it helped to develop the idea of providing for the needs of students and to emphasize the desire for pupil growth rather than merely storing up information for the future. It demonstrated that a national committee could safely recommend new and relatively untried courses. Lastly, it had considerable effect in loosening the rigid control which the colleges exercised over the high schools by means of entrance requirements.

The American Political Science Association sponsored several committees which were interested in the problems of
civic instruction. As early as 1905 the Association published the results of a test given to ascertain the extent of civic knowledge of the college freshman. Items included in the test were felt to reflect the knowledge the average persons should have concerning civic education. The results were an eye opener to political scientists and civic teachers. The astonishing ignorance of the students convinced the Association that the quality of civic instruction in the schools should be improved.

The American Political Science Association continued its activities in this field. A Committee of Five was appointed in 1906 and its report was published in the 1908 proceedings of the society. The report did not have a lasting impact. In 1911 a new committee on instruction was appointed with similar objectives and goals. From the tenor of the committee's report, it bore more than a chance connection between the Committee and the Social Studies Committee of the National Educational Association. In 1926 another committee of the APSA published a report designed to delimit the meaning of the word "civics." The outline submitted by the committee succeeded, however, in demonstrating the broad connotation of the word; and the Association did

---

not formally accept the report. The report of the committee was published in the "Historical Outlook" in 1922.

In 1918, steps were taken to organize a new committee for the purpose of studying the changed situation in the teaching of the social studies brought about by the World War. The NEA requested the National Board for Historical Science to initiate the work, and in the same year the American Historical Association assumed responsibility for the new inquiry. The committee eventually consisted of Joseph Shafer, Chairman, William C. Bagley, Frank S. Bogardus, J.A.C. Chandler, Guy S. Ford, S.B. Harding, D.C. Knowlton and A.C. McLaughlin. It endeavored to prepare a curriculum for the elementary grades, as well as for the junior and senior high schools. The changed situation was reflected in the committee's concern with Americanization, education for citizenship, and with the work of committees in the other social studies. The committee issued a preliminary report in May, 1919, and three subsequent progress reports. The final report was rejected by the AHA and the committee was disbanded. The report was published in the "Historical Outlook" in March, April, May and June, 1921. It was apparently too "historical" for the followers of the Social Studies Committee and too "social" for the rank and file historians. The failure of the 1921 report to receive
wide acceptance encouraged many local and regional groups to design their own new curricula.

In 1923, the AHA sponsored the History Inquiry to ascertain the status of the social studies in the schools. The report of the director, Edgar Dawson, published in the "Historical Outlook" in June, 1924, reviewed the work of various national committees, and in a statistical summary showed the frequency with which social studies courses were taught. The "History Inquiry" revealed many disquieting facts about social studies teaching. Several persons, and particularly Edgar Dawson, Director of the inquiry, urged a more comprehensive survey of the social studies.

Various organizations, in addition to those mentioned here, were interested in the social studies curriculum. The Department of Superintendence devoted space in several of its yearbooks to the subject, as did the National Society for the Study of Education. Formal committees were appointed by other social science organizations. In 1918, the American Sociological Society appointed a committee to deal with the problem. It issued a report two years later. The report contained no new proposals, and exerted little or no influence. This was due to the fact that the report appeared in the relatively restricted limits of the official publications of that society. In 1909, the Associa-
tion of American Geographers made a brief and uninfluential report on the teaching of geography. The National Municipal League, the American Economic Association, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Business, and the American School Citizenship League also made surveys or reports on the teaching of the social studies.3

By the time the Commission was organized and functioning, several trends had developed. Other agencies were preparing social studies curricula. Courses, such as "Problems in Democracy", were gaining ground and turning attention away from the history course. The Association hoped to reverse these trends and to restore history to its position of prominence. In the absence of activity from the professional organizations, local school districts were going ahead and developing their own programs. Teacher colleges and schools of education were gaining a greater share in the determination of educational policy. While the Commission was given a free hand, it would be difficult to deny that these motives were not in the background of the Association's involvement. In the absence of specific documentation, the views of the Association must be extrapolated from the final report of the Commission.

3 Ibid., p. 100.
The educational objectives of the AHA were stated in the frame of reference of the final report. The frame of reference was concerned with three factors: (1) the nature and functions of the social sciences; (2) necessarily conditioning factors in American life and (3) choices deemed possible and desirable in the present and proximate future.4

The Commission took a broad view of the social sciences as they were seen as comprising the entire range of human history, from man's beginnings up to the present. They, the social sciences, embraced all societies and customs of all peoples. While each discipline in the social sciences was significant, they were interrelated in their goal — the knowledge of man and society.5

The final report contained statements of the Association's views on educational aims and purposes. There were two fundamental objectives and purposes in secondary school history and social studies instruction. They were: (1) education for effective citizenship, and (2) development of critical thinking. It was felt by the Association that these goals could best be accomplished through the study of social studies generally and American History more specifically. Nowhere in

---


5 Ibid., p. 6.
the committee reports does the American Historical Association spell out exactly how this has been determined. Apparently they felt it was self-evident or could be determined under the rubric of using common sense. Critics would point out this discrepancy and harp on it incessantly. This criticism has continued to the present day and is reflected in the decline of history offerings and the lack of popularity of history in general.

The second major aim of social studies teaching was the development of critical thinking. In the reports in which historians took part, it was not clearly shown how training in historical method influenced critical thinking. It was always alluded to but never illustrated from practical examples. While these objectives are commendable, the Association failed to articulate the ways in which they could be developed and used. This appears to account for the relative ineffectiveness of the reports of the Association after the Committee of Seven (1907) until the work of the Commission on the Social Studies.

Moving from objectives, the final report shifted to the topic of methodology. The Association maintained its traditional stance on methods of teachings. The reasons for maintaining these views related to three factors: (1) a belief in and acceptance of the theory of faculty psychology or mental discipline, (2) the use of drill and repetition which was felt to be a truly democratic method of teaching because it applied to all levels of individual competence, and (3) in order to discern the true value of history students had to develop a mastery over the data.7

The Association felt that teacher training institutions stressed methodology over knowledge. Teacher training institutions were obsessed with formalistic methodology at the expense of knowledge. As the report stated:

In the measure that method is dissociated from appropriate content or knowledge of pupil growth, education becomes shallow, formal or capricious, or all three. There is no procedure that can render substance unnecessary; there is no technique of classroom legerdemain that can take the place of scholarly competence; there is no device of instruction that can raise the quality of the educative process above the purpose, the knowledge, the understanding, the vision of the teacher who employs it.8

7 Ibid., p. 130.

8 Ibid., pp. 71-72.
Having criticized the role of teacher training institutions, the report examined the role of the teacher. The Association's view of the teacher stressed academic freedom and the need for creative teaching. Teachers should be aware of the conditioning factors affecting the classroom situation. They also should be aware of and allow for individual differences of students. Concluding the section on the teacher, the report stated:

...the competent teacher will strive to emulate, even though his power be relatively feeble, the methods of great thinkers and teachers of all ages - will become acquainted with the classics and fundamental works in the given field, will know how to use bibliographical and library apparatus in the acquisition of knowledge, will know how to apply the engines of scholarly criticism; verification and authentication to facts true and alleged, will know how to analyze complicated documents and social situations, will know how to take weigh testimony by the judicial process...Above all, the competent teacher should know thoroughly the subject matter which he professes to teach, should see its relation to the life of mankind, and should have an infectious enthusiasm about it - to this, all teaching methods are subordinated.9

Since there was nothing new nor startling in the presentation of views of the teacher, critics claimed that the Association had neglected research on improving teaching methodologies. It may be, critics reasoned, that educational research had become too complex, comprehensive and demanding; hence the Association did not comprehend it or

9 Ibid., pp. 33-34.
ignored its significance. The Association remained conserva-
tive and adhered to those methods which were understood and
tested on the anvil of time.

The most controversial section of the final report
concerned the section on tests and testing. The Association
rejected recent advances in this field and insisted on the
value of the old type of examination. It was felt that the
new type of tests could not adequately measure the results of
the classroom experience. As the report stressed:

In the final analysis the actual testing of a program of
social science instruction is not conducted by teachers
in the schools, but rather by the responses of the in-
dividual to social situations throughout life and by the
course of social events in which children so instructed
participate.\(^\text{10}\)

New type tests were of no use because they could not measure
the social implications of classroom instruction. The rejec-
tion of the new type of test seemed to contradict the views
Association members held on the validity of new methods of
social education instruction and the implementation of the
programs they advocated.

If the view of testing was inconsistent with the view
taken on methodology and program implementation, the philosophy
of education expressed in the final report was a greater con-
tradiction. The philosophy of education proposed in the final

\(^{10}\text{Ibid.}, p. 101.\)
report tended to sever the link with the conservative philosophy of earlier committees. It placed a great deal of emphasis on the effect of the social order on the educational process. The school, according to the Commission's philosophy, was to become the agency of social change. A relevant educational philosophy, the report stated, would depend on: "...the findings of the social sciences, findings pertaining to the nature, trends and thought of that society in its regional and world setting." In order to achieve this, society needed to be changed and the school should take the lead in this reconstruction project. The school should react against the materialistic nature of society and emphasize the creative and social forces, while deemphasizing the acquisitive drives of American society. The influence of Counts and Curti can be discerned in these statements. The school would have to become deeply involved in the changes taking place. It could no longer play a passive role. Teachers could not be neutral on issues, as they would have to lead the movement for social change. Teachers could be expected to take the lead and indoctrinate and train students in the way society should move. Educators should become educational statesmen.

11 Ibid., p. 32.
Critics of the final Report were particularly disturbed with the views of the Commission regarding tests and testing, the criticisms levelled at teacher training institutions, the seemingly radical notion that teachers and the school should be used to change society, and the vagueness and contradictory aspects of parts of the Report. They interpreted these statements as an attempt of the American Historical Association to restore the teaching of history to its once dominant position in the social studies curriculum. They felt that these views would place the scientific movement in education in jeopardy.

In reviewing the development of social studies education, two patterns seemed to predominate at the time of the deliberations of the Commission: (1) the view of the Association emphasizing the significant role which social education should play in the future; a social education which would be the handmaiden of history and would be taught in a humanistic, dynamic and somewhat conservative manner. This view would be espoused by the subject-matter specialists on the Commission; and (2) the other trend would be represented by those who believed in the scientific movement in education. They wanted to incorporate new findings in educational research and move away from the humanistic, traditional approach favored by the Assn.
In a sense, the deliberations of the Commission, while its publicly stated purpose was different, revolved around these positions. These issues were never far from the surface as disputes which arose during the proceedings and the debate over the final report would seem to indicate.

To what extent is the charge that the Association tried to limit the inclusion of disparate views in the final report valid? Some critics, particularly Ernest Horn, charged that the Association cut off the work of the Commission so that views favorable to the scientific movement would not be included in the final report. The direct evidence concerning this matter is meager, as the Proceedings of the Association deal primarily with the mechanics and the formal procedures of the meetings. The "real disputes" are not included in the minutes. In the correspondence of the participants, they are often overlooked or treated in an oblique fashion.

Certainly the motives existed for a showdown between the two groups. The Association felt that its position of leadership in social science education was being eroded on all sides. Krey, in his report to the Association which led to the formation of the Commission, alluded to this situation. The role of the Commission would be an attempt to restore the status quo in the field of social education. It
was hoped that the challenge of the educationalists would be turned aside and that the position of historical studies would be secure into the foreseeable future. Historical studies would be taught in the relativistic vein stressed by Beard and Curti. The traditional military and political history would be set aside to accommodate the new approach. In the end, the aims of the Association were not fulfilled, as the future belonged to the educationists and the teacher training institutions.

While the questions posed in the preceding paragraph seem plausible and likely, there is no hard evidence that the Association desired the aforementioned outcomes. The proceedings of the Association did not indicate any sign of dissatisfaction between the Association and the Commission. Krey dutifully submitted a report of the Commission's activities at each of the annual meetings of the Association. The reports were accepted with little or no debate. As the work of the Commission neared completion, tensions began to develop.

The task of preparing the final report fell almost by default to Counts and Beard. Beard commented to Counts on their predicament:

I feel that we are in a hell of a jam despite all of the running, digging and wheezing that has been done. Somebody must sit down and finish this summary. Of course any two or three half-educated birds could have done it
without the "research", but such is the American system of bluff.\(^{12}\)

As a result of their close collaboration, the report came to be known in Commission circles as the Counts-Beard proposal. Counts did the bulk of the writing on the final report, with the assistance of others: notably Beard, Hayes, Newlon and Johnson. Opponents felt that it included the particular views of Counts and Beard on the topics dealt with by the Commission and not the views expressed by the other members of the Commission, particularly the dissidents: Horn, Day, Merriam and Ballou. They reasoned that the Counts-Beard proposal was a distortion of the Commission's work. As has been previously indicated, the views on tests and testing were particularly upsetting to the opponents of the Counts-Beard proposal. Throughout the year 1933, meetings were held to try to develop a version of the final report that all members of the Commission could accept. The meetings were often quite stormy as opposing positions hardened and both groups sought vindication for their views. This was true of the meeting held at Princeton university on October 22-23, 1933. The minutes do not reveal the seething turmoil that remains hidden in the clear, concise prose of the proceedings. Those

\(^{12}\)Beard to Counts, Counts-Beard Correspondence, Southern Illinois Library, Carbondale, Illinois, August 14, 1933.
opposed to the Counts-Beard draft were able to force the passage of a resolution which would allow revisions to the final document. Counts, Beard and their adherents: Hayes, Newlon, Johnson and Craven agreed to revise the final report. They felt that it should be the final revision. In a letter to Counts, which will be examined later in this chapter, Beard was adament in his refusal to accept further revisions.

An examination of the Beard-Counts correspondence revealed the reasons for the positions taken by Beard and Counts in the controversy. They did not want the final report revised in a manner which would reflect favorably on the educationist position. Beard was dead set against including any material on testing. In a short note to Counts, Beard made the following observation:

...My opinion is that testing is an academic racket irrelevant to our purposes and should be flatly opposed in all professions above a fact seeking level. Besides it is an enemy of teaching and thinking. It is, loose in Horn's hands, a mechanistic conception of values.

---

13Minutes of the Princeton Meeting, Krey Papers, Archives University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

14Counts-Beard, Correspondence, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, November 23, 1933.
Beard's view on testing was consistent with the position he had taken earlier in the work of the Commission. He had helped to prepare the section in the final Report on testing. He had wanted to include a stronger condemnation of the test movement. As he remarked to Counts:

I take note of your note on the testors and have decided to omit my blast entirely, especially in view of the fact that you cover the conclusions on tests and testing. I abominate that crew of blockheads more than a communist does a Y.M.C.A. secretary, but I shall hold my tongue for the sake of the Commission and its cause.15

Counts replied to Beard's tirade in a calmer vein and suggested revisions to Beard's statement:

I have also been looking over your original statement with some care. It seems to me that you have left out of the picture those so-called educational tests, although in your conclusions your comments suggest that you have them in mind. It is not true that the greater part of the attention of the testors has been devoted to the development of the so-called intelligence tests. This statement is true only if the educational tests are not included and the discussion is confined to the so-called psychological tests.16

Beard took Counts's suggestions and used them in his revised report, but he did not soften his opposition to the validity of tests and testing. Beard's view was to prevail and remained in the final Report.

15 Ibid., August, 1933.
16 Ibid., August 3, 1933.
Following the Princeton meeting, Counts revised the document and the stage was set for the winding up of the work of the Commission. Fearing that the dissidents might try to push through further revisions, Beard proceeded, using his position as President of the American Historical Association. At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Council, held in Urbana, Illinois, December, 1933, the machinery was set up to end the work of the Commission. The resolution passed by the Council was to be referred to as the Urbana Resolution. The Resolution, because of its importance, is included in its entirety.

Whereas the term of the Commission on Social Studies expires December 29, 1933, be it resolved that:

1. The Executive Secretary convey to members of the Commission and especially to the Chairman, A.C. Krey, the appreciation of the American Historical Association for their unselfish and indefatigable labors and to the Carnegie Corporation the renewed thanks of the Association for its generous financial support;

2. The unexpended balance after the settlement of outstanding accounts is hereby appropriated to the use of the Historical Outlook, in case the consent of the Carnegie Corporation is secured for this appropriation;

3. The Executive Committee of the Council, in cooperation with A.C. Krey, make all arrangements for winding up the affairs of the Commission, including publication of reports and the selection of editor, if deemed necessary;

4. In the matter of the controversy over the final report, the Executive Committee of the Council of the A.H.A. shall act as a reviewing body, hold one or more meetings of the Commission, if deemed necessary, secure from members or groups of members within sixty days affirmative and
dissenting opinions from all parties and publish this set of opinions seriatim without alteration within ninety days. 17

Prior to the urbana meeting, Beard relented in his opposition to Horn's substitute chapter on tests. In a letter to Counts, he remarked:

One more point. Horn played square with us in that he put up the proposition of dissent and affirmation which he wished to substitute. Hence, I think, you should add to our sacred text as an appendix, Horn's program as he wants it, and state that it is his proposition. I dissent from Horn's program only in that by his emphasis he leaves the door open for the mechanics crowd in education. 18

While relenting on his rigid stance vis-a-vis Horn, and the substitute chapter on tests, Beard had no intention of allowing future revisions of the final report. It is clear that Beard intended to use his position as President of the A.H.A. to further the Counts-Beard draft. Later, in the previously quoted letter, he made his intentions quite clear:

Get Johnson, Newlon, and Hayes together as soon as possible. Clean up proof add Horn's program as appendix and have a new one pulled. Then ask the others whether they will sign it. Do not let them file dissent, for they have no right to do that now because they have never presented a constructive proposition for the consideration of the Commission.

---

17 Counts-Beard Correspondence, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

18 Ibid., December 24, 1933.
I shall let you know results of the execution. Resolutions of decapitation are drafted and on my desk. Go to it. If Day and Merriam want to play power politics, others may play it too.19

Beard was probably fatigued from the work he was carrying on with other groups as well as with the Commission. He was upset by the renewed attempts of the dissidents to revise the final report, hence, he acted hastily and decisively, if not judiciously, towards his opponents.

The dissidents had sensed Beard's probable course of action and had persuaded Krey to request for a time extension so that the Commission might finish up its work. Krey appeared before the Council at urbana and asked for an extension of the Commission's term. He was turned down. Beard related this event to Counts:

As I wired you, Krey presented his petition for an extension of Commission time. After he left I moved immediate and unconditional decapitation and resolution carried with a bang. By this time you have heard from Krey and Conyers Read. Get our draft ready soon and send it around...

Beard had hoped that his course of action would wind up the affairs of the Commission and gain the approval of the revised Counts-Beard draft.

19Ibid.

20Ibid.
The battle then shifted to the fight over the possibility of revising the final report. The Counts-Beard forces had the urbana Resolution as their chief weapon, while the dissidents were to rely on Krey. Once again Krey would find himself in the center of controversy. He was sympathetic to Counts and Beard, as he had developed a close relationship with both individuals. On the other hand, he had also worked closely with Day, Merriam and Horn on the Executive Committee of the Commission.

The dissidents feared that the Executive Committee of the Council would interfere with their attempts to revise the final report. Day appealed to Krey to guarantee that the revisions agreed upon at Princeton would be included in the final report. The dissidents insisted on another meeting of the Executive Committee of the Commission to see that this was completed. They also would have liked to add further revisions. In a letter to Professor Dixon Ryan Fox, a member of the Council of the American Historical Association, Krey pointed out Day's concern. Krey reassured Day that members of the Commission: Hayes, Counts, Johnson, Newlon and himself were hard at work preparing the revised document. This revision would be submitted to the Executive Committee of the Commission at the February 22, 1934, meeting. Krey had been successful in getting the Council to permit one final meeting. It was Krey's impression (he confided to Day) that no member
of the Executive Committee of the Council was disposed in any way to intervene in the matter. The Executive Committee of the Council, as well as other members of the Commission, wanted to complete the affairs of the Commission as soon as possible. Krey then asked Fox, as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Council, to confirm the Council's position in a communication to Day and other dissidents. Krey lacked the authority to act unilaterally in this matter.21

The meeting in Chicago was made possible by an oversight. Copies of the urbana Resolution were not sent to all members of the Commission. The dissidents ardently raised this point in pressing Krey for the extra-legal meeting. In a letter to Beard, Counts related the events which led to the arrangements for the February 22, 1934 meeting. Since the urbana Resolution was not sent to the members, Krey proceeded to call the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Commission. At first glance, Counts felt that Krey had acted without the permission of the Executive Committee of the Council. Later he learned through Conyers Read that the meeting had been authorized and that Krey was acting with the authority of the Executive Committee of the Council. Counts apprised

21 Krey Papers, Archives university of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, February 17, 1934.
Beard of the situation:

The situation now stands as follows. The Executive Committee will meet in Chicago on February 22nd. Both Hayes and I will be there, as I understand it. Krey assures me that he goes to Chicago clearly resolved not to accept any changes of any importance in our document. He proposes that he make such a statement at the very beginning of the session. And I know that such is the spirit of Newlon and Hayes. 22

While they were unable to prevent the meeting, Counts and Beard remained steadfast in refusing to contine any attempt to change the document.

Beard outlined his views concerning the Chicago meeting in another letter in the Counts–Beard correspondence:

About the meeting of the Executive Comte. of the Comm. in Chicago, Feb. 22, I say that under the Urbana resolutions that meeting is illegal and I have telegraphed Read to enforce the Urbana Resolutions and to stop that meeting, at least to the extent of repudiating it and refusing to allow for expenses. 23

Beard had apparently lost all his patience and was in no mood to relent on his position. He then confided to Counts the probable actions he would take if the Committee revised the document:

I have written Krey that I will not sign a word or line of any report doctored by the executive committee. In my opinion it is nothing but a dodge to enable Ford, Merriam and Day to write or doctor up a shilly-shally report and try to slip it over. I have played square with them. They had their say and have the right under the Urbana

22Counts–Beard Correspondence Feb. 12, 1934.

23Ibid., Feb. 17, 1934.
resolutions to say anything they want in the final report, but they have no right to run a backstairs game, and I will not stand for it. 24

Beard wrote to Krey and apologized for his actions and utterances regarding the use of tests. In the letter, Beard stated his position regarding the final report. In a sense he was issuing an ultimatum:

Now about the concluding volume. I wrote George Counts that we shall stand absolutely pat on the draft he sent, for endless tinkering is out of the question. Let those sign it who want to sign it. Let others sign it with reservations. Let others dissent, if they want to do so. Print also anything Horn wants and Ballou too, as their document. I should like to see Kelley's wallop printed also, for he and I agree on beautiful disagreement. Let us avoid the frightful experience of the Wickersham Report, and the extreme caution of the Hoover trends report findings were put out of date by history after March 4, 1933. 25

Beard then went on to relate his feelings towards the dissidents:

Now, you have helped me keep my shirt on enough to know that I am not going to hold anything against Ford, Merriam, Day, or anybody else. I reserve the right to cuss 'em out. But, honest Injun, don't I give everybody the same right? At least when I am well and in my right mind. Surely, on the Charter, I took blows from all sides, including Ballou's complete wallop. Surely at Chicago, George and I took everything, including stinks and sadism. So I don't think that I shall have or cherish any grudges. 26

24 Ibid.
25 Beard to Krey, Counts-Beard Correspondence, SIU, January 30, 1934.
26 Ibid.
Krey was resolved to get the work of the Commission finished at the Chicago meeting. In a letter to Conyers Read, he pointed out the difficult task which remained:

The first problem I have before me tomorrow is that of explaining to Day and Merriam by what right all this work of revision has been proceeding since December 29th and by what right our Committee is meeting there. In my explanation it will be necessary for me to avoid any basis for the notion that the Executive Committee of the Council is taking a partisan attitude in the matter of which they have no real knowledge. The Executive Committee's interest in having the work terminated in a particular way is something which can scarcely be justified. I will try to do my best.27

The situation was volatile and Krey feared that the whole thing might blow up, thus endangering the work of the Commission. He outlined his plans if things should go awry:

...should things blow up, there is, of course, the question of which version is to be submitted to the members of the Commission. There is the technical view which was raised by Mr. Day that the only version we have a right to send out is the one which was submitted at Princeton. I do not share this view, and I think I can justify my own judgment in the matter. I shall rule that we must submit to the members of the Commission the best version which we have at the time the action must be taken. Should this somewhat drastic action be necessary and a version be sent out, please wait until you hear from me. Do not send out the version as it is, for there are more, though minor, imperfections in it which can be corrected.28

27Krey to Conyers Read, Krey Papers, Archives university of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., February 21, 1934.

28Ibid.
Krey's fears were not justified, as the meeting was not a repeat of the Princeton gathering. Although it lacked the fireworks of the Princeton encounter, an aura of friendliness did not prevail. Present at the meeting were Day, Merriam, Ford, Newlon, Krey, Counts and Hayes. The report, which had been revised by Counts, Hayes, et al., was gone over page by page and changes had to be approved by Counts and Hayes. When this process was finished, the original manuscript with the corrections was handed to Mr. Read by Mr. Krey. The long and sometimes bitter struggle over the revisions to the final report was ended.29

On March 1, 1934, Krey wrote a covering letter to Read. He described the nature of the final report accepted at the Chicago meeting:

The draft is a revision of that presented at the Commission's meeting at Princeton last December. It embodies certain "rearrangements" and alterations urged at Princeton and certain amendments and rephrasings proposed by Messrs. Craven, Horn, Johnson, Krey and Newlon; all of which were coordinated with the original by Messrs. Hayes and Counts. The Executive Committee, which had been empowered by the Princeton meeting to supervise the revision, postponed meeting until this work could be done. The Committee met yesterday and considered the whole draft in detail. Further changes were

29 Minutes of the meeting of Executive Committee of the Commission, February 22, 1934, Chicago, Illinois, Krey Papers, Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
suggested by each of the members, Messrs. Day, Ford, Krey, Merriam and Newlon with the concurrence of Messrs. Counts and Hayes, who had been instructed to be present, they have been incorporated in the "final draft" herewith submitted.30

Essentially, the Counts-Beard draft with a few minor revisions was the version submitted by Krey. The events leading up to the conclusion of the Commission's work have been described in great detail. In view of the facts available, it would seem that the allegations of the dissidents were correct. Beard appeared to be the leader of those who wanted to end the work of the Commission. His motives were not entirely clear as his position wavered back and forth. At one point he wanted the draft published intact. Later he relented and instructed Counts to include dissenting views. He stretched the point further by asking Counts to include Kelley's views. This is a bit confusing, since Kelley was not a member of the Commission.

While the actual reasons for Beard's behavior may be beyond the nature of historical research, three reasons seem to emerge: (1) Beard's strong dislike for the scientific movement in education influenced his behavior; (2) Beard was under severe stress from the pressure of his work on the Commission and other projects (he spent several weeks in Southern

30 Krey to Read, March 1, 1930, Krey Papers, Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Californians recuperating); (3) Beard was essentially a humanist with a strong sense of fair play and not given to precipitate actions. This might account for his refusal at first to incorporate the materials on tests and testing and his later insistence that Counts include this material. The foregoing analysis may also explain his rude actions towards Krey and other members of the Commission and his subsequent regret for his actions.

Beard's status in academic circles and in the affairs of the American Historical Association, plus the fact that he and Counts were in a large part responsible for the final report, made his position unassailable. Krey apparently realized this as the controversy reached its final stages. He had to back the Beards-Counts proposal or risk losing the hard years of work and research that had gone into the deliberations of the Commission. On the other hand, as is often the case in the role of the Chairman, Krey felt an obligation to the dissidents. As Chairman, he felt that the final report should be acceptable to all sides. Conyers Read was in favor of this as his letters to Krey indicate. It was felt that a show of unanimity would enhance the work of the Commission in the eyes of the general public as well as in the other academic disciplines. Krey confided this position to Ada Comstock.
in their exchanges of correspondence.  

The answer to the question posed at the beginning of this section is not easily answered. The Association did not interfere directly in the affairs of the Commission. Krey and his colleagues on the Commission did have a lot of freedom in which to pursue their activities. Critics often referred to ideal conditions in which the Commission pursued its activities. The role of the Executive Council of the Association in ending the work is clear. The question which is difficult to answer is whether the Council's action represented a consensus of the Association's membership? Judging from the lack of criticism in the Council's actions, the views expressed must have been acceptable to the membership. Kinzie did not raise these issues in his dissertation. Soderbergh alludes to Beard's role in the termination of the Commission, but he did not have the benefit of the Beards-Counts correspondence.  

When viewed in the perspective of the passage of time, it seems that the action of Beard and the American Historical  

---

31 Krey to Comstock, Krey Papers, Archives, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, March, 1934.  

Association was too precipitous. Ballou and Horn were probably closer to the pulse of secondary education than others on the Commission, hence their views should have carried more weight than they did. Many of the criticisms levelled at the report concerned the points raised by Ballou and Horn (lack of specific curricula and a biased view on tests and testing). Certainly Beard and Counts did a masterful job in preparing the final Report; but shouldn't they have deferred to others with greater expertise in the area of tests and testing? They wanted to issue a bold statement, but were not Counts's ideas on collectivism a bit strong for a country that still harbored a naive view concerning the political realities of the day?

The American Historical Association could point with pride to its role in social studies education. Reports of the various committees and commissions were important milestones in the progress of social studies education; however, the Association missed an opportunity to retain its dominant role in social studies education. At the conclusion of the work of the Commission the two groups, educationists and historical subject matter specialists, tended to go their own way. Perhaps the gulf between the two groups was too great to be bridged by common effort on an educational project. The differences would not be a matter of concern to the
historical profession until the late 1960's when it was hit with the crisis of declining enrollments and the drying up of the job market for historians. It seems in the long run that the educationists had been more in step with the realities of secondary education in the United States.

The controversy over the signing of the report and the role of the American Historical Association in its preparation have been dealt with. This controversy was transferred to the public arena when the final report was published. Numerous articles in journals and newspapers have either praised or condemned the work of the Commission. The concluding chapter of this study will deal with the reception of the final report by educators and concerned laymen.
CHAPTER VII

REACTIONS OF LEADING SECONDARY EDUCATORS TO

THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION

We have described the events leading up to the acceptance and publication of the final report of the Commission, entitled Conclusions and Recommendations. This chapter will deal with the reception accorded the final volume by secondary educators. Criticisms advanced by prominent critics will be discussed and analyzed. The reactions of members of the Commission to these views will be mentioned. The storm which surrounded the acceptance and signing of the final report broke out with renewed frenzy as the members of the Commission and their partisans answered their critics.

The publication of the Conclusions and Recommendations set loose a flood of criticism both favorable and unfavorable to the work of the Commission. Reports of preceding committees had appeared at more propitious times and were accepted without much fanfare by seemingly appreciative educators. The Conclusions and Recommendations appeared at a critical time in the history of American education. With the growth of the scientific movement in education and the continual upgrading of professional requirements, American educators had
developed a more sophisticated approach to the work of national committees. Since the work of the Commission had received much advance publicity, it would be held up to close scrutiny by secondary educators throughout the country. Educational organizations and civic groups interested in public education would use the final report as the theme for their meetings. Many educational symposia, forums and panel discussions were held by educators to discuss the meaning and significance of the final report. The Commission was in session for five years and it seemed as if the debate and controversy generated by the final report would last as long. As late as April, 1937, three years after its approval by the American Historical Association, the report was still making headlines.1

Professional educators from various shades of opinion directed their criticisms or praises at the content of the final report. Some, like Franklin Bobbitt, could find little to praise in the report; while others, like Edgar Wesley, found little to criticize in the report. The true significance of the report probably lay somewhere between these two extremes. Most educators in reading the final report found it hard to remain neutral and joined in the debate. The final report was a "hot issue" both in and out of the classroom and lecture hall.

The report of the Commission consisted of fifteen volumes and the Conclusions and Recommendations. The vast amount of criticism was directed at the Conclusions. Most of the volumes in the report received favorable reviews by critics. Some of the volumes have become classics in their particular educational field and remain in print today. Despite the notoriety and success achieved by these volumes, it was the slim volume containing the final report which was to become the center of attention and controversy. Educational journals devoted parts of several issues to the controversy over the final report. This was particularly true of School and Society and The Social Studies. The Commission members had hoped to make their wishes known but not to that extent. Once the controversy began, it seemed to gain momentum as charges and counter charges were published in successive issues of various journals. Surprisingly, the major figures in the controversy, Beard and Counts, did not join in the fray, nor did the dissidents: Merriam, Day, Ballou and Horn. Krey and Newlon and their supporters presented the views of the Commission; the dissidents did not break their silence. Each side felt that the controversy might get out of order in the hands of those who had not taken part in the deliberations of the Commission.

The criticisms of the report seemed to coincide with the same issues that sparked the controversy in its signing
and acceptance. Criticisms of the Report came from all quarters of the field of secondary education - from professors of secondary education to the classroom teacher. In dealing with the voluminous sources of these criticisms, this chapter will be divided into four parts: (1) the nature of the criticism directed to the report; (2) unfavorable criticism of the report; (3) favorable criticism of the report; and (4) an analysis of the criticism.

In a Dickensian sense, it was the best of all reports and it was the worst of all reports. Most of the criticism tended to concentrate around four points: (1) the "frame of reference," (2) "collectivism," (3) "tests and testing," and (4) the lack of specific curricular programs for the schools. Other areas of the report were criticized but not with as great a frequency or intensity as the above-mentioned points.

One of the major purposes of the Commission was to state a social philosophy and to analyze the contemporary situation in the country. The resulting philosophy espoused by the Commission was referred to as the "frame of reference." This concept seemed too intellectual and, as such, annoyed some critics and commentators. The Commission, in the words of its critics, was accused of deserting scientific objectivity and of devising a rigid set of principles that it undertook to thrust upon the schools. The "frame of reference" was
thus interpreted as an attempt at direct indoctrination. To others the term was unclear and had tones of over-intellectualization. ²

In an attempt to describe the emerging American society, the Commission used the term "democratic collectivism." This concept was interpreted to mean that the Commission was radical, communistic and socialist. Critics could not agree as to whether the word "collectivism" described, prophesied or advocated. ³ These criticisms seem to reveal the naivete of Americans concerning alien systems of thought.

As has been indicated in a previous chapter, the criticisms which the Commission directed at tests and testing brought forth the most vehement counter-criticisms of the final Report. The views expressed in the report concerning intelligence tests, homogenous grouping and tests of attitudes brought forth a hail of criticism. Critics concentrated on five areas of disagreement concerning tests and testing. They


were: (1) that the Commission was guilty of the straw-man argument; (2) that it missed the real reason for the growth of the testing movement; (3) that it sought to drag in a red herring by its repeated statement that the real test of school programs would be the later conduct of the pupils; (4) that it had next to no evidence to justify its denunciation of homogenous grouping; and (5) that all the valid criticisms of objective tests applied with equal force to essay examinations. 4

Criticisms which were unfavorable to the report will be dealt with first. Since it will be impossible to deal with all the derogatory criticism only the most influential remarks will be considered. Franklin Bobbitt's criticism appeared to set the tone for those who criticized the report. Boyd Bode zeroed in on one aspect of the report, the frame of reference, and, like Bobbitt, his views had far reaching effects. Merle Haggerty was Dean of the School of Education at the University of Minnesota, hence his views carried a great deal of weight with professors and deans in the education departments throughout the Midwest. Edward Gells was a classroom teacher. His views were first presented at a national convention of social studies teachers - giving them a wide audience. R.O. Hughes,

---

4 Ibid., pp. 125-126.
Curriculum Director of the Pittsburgh Public Schools, criticized the lack of direction which the final report gave to curriculum planners and directors. This was to become a common complaint of educators working in this field.

One of the earliest and most devastating criticisms of the report was delivered by Franklin Bobbitt. Bobbitt was a Professor of Education at the University of Chicago and a respected figure in university and public education. He had helped the Commission in its early phases, serving on the subcommittee of objectives chaired by Beard. His paper on "Objectives for the Social Sciences" was used by Beard in preparing the volume: A Charter for the Social Studies. Bobbitt's critique set the tone of the responses of other critics and, in turn, elicited a vast amount of counter-criticism.

Bobbitt's criticism appeared in School and Society, and it was the forerunner of numerous articles concerning the Commission's final report to appear in that journal. The article was divided into four parts: (1) the introduction; (2) a criticism of the Commission's view of collectivism; (3) a criticism of the Commission's plan for American education; and (4) the conclusion.

The paper began on a highly critical note; and Bobbitt sustained this tone throughout the paper. He stated:
"A rather startling document has recently made its appearance. It seems important chiefly as evidence of the decay of strength and soundness of one of the factors upon which the future of our nation depends." The factor Bobbitt referred to was social intelligence. Since the country had developed into a complex, political, social and economic institution, social intelligence had assumed great importance. According to Bobbitt, the public school's primary role would be to inculcate social ideals in the students and to raise the level of social intelligence.

A vast array of specialists, economists, sociologists, and geographers were the custodians of the accumulated wisdom of mankind relative to the management of social affairs. This was their role in the life of our society. Bobbitt pointed out: "Society supports them for that work. It is for them, then, as their function, to extend this wisdom by research, to keep it organized and to place it at the disposal of all our citizens for their guidance." It was up to the social science specialists to lead the way and to show American society the errors and dangers that should be avoided.

---


6 Ibid.
American society had entered into a crisis situation, a situation brought about through mismanagement of economic and political affairs. Bobbitt remarked:

Clearly, our people have not attained the degree of enlightenment that is now necessary for guiding its social affairs with wisdom and competency. The custodians of social understanding either have been lacking in their supply of it or there has been inefficiency in distributing it to the population.

The American Historical Association had recognized this deficiency and set up the "Commission on the Social Studies" to deal with it. The duty of the Commission was, according to Bobbitt, twofold: (1) to note the route along which the nation should be guided in its progress forward, as shown by their social science; and (2) to explain in sufficiently detailed and understandable fashion the educational program necessary for so educating the population that it can follow the route which is indicated by the social science. The Commission was given five years and a generous grant from the Carnegie Corporation to complete its work.

Bobbitt pointed out the gravity of the work of the Commission:

If the Commission has succeeded in its work, the thought of this document should be memorized by every citizen in the land; it would show them the way forward to which they

7 Ibid.
are to hold, and the qualities and powers they must maintain within themselves in order to keep the course.9

Conversely, if the Commission had failed in its task it would show that the social studies specialists were unequal to the demands placed on them and would leave the nation's educators groping about in the fog and darkness like a rudderless ship. Without intelligent guidance, the nation which thought of itself as moving toward the promised land would instead move toward the abyss.

Bobbitt began his criticism by deriding the Commission's use of the term "collectivism". The Commission did not make clear which form of collectivism the nation was moving toward. Since the Commission refused to name the countries it was to resemble in this process, it had to be therefore assumed that it was moving toward the repressive anti-democracy of Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany or Communist Russia. If the Commission did not mean this, Bobbitt reasoned, it should have stated so clearly.

Bobbitt then went on to illustrate the Commission's leanings towards totalitarianism:

The Commission seems to be divided in mind whether this collectivism toward which we move, rightly in their judgment, is to take the form of Communism by the 'limiting or supplanting of private property by public property'.

9 Ibid.
or some type of fascism in which there is to be the preservation of private property, extended and distributed among the masses.\textsuperscript{10}

The Commission was antipathetic to private property, unless it was distributed among the masses. American citizens were frequently referred to as the masses, a phrase Bobbitt found particularly irritating. Other examples of Communistic leanings could be seen in the Commission's frequent references to state paternalism. These views were often disguised through the use of phrases such as "integration" and "interdependence." State paternalism had replaced the earlier belief in individual reliance in the Commission's Report. In Bobbitt's manner of reasoning, this was another example of the radical road the Commission had followed in preparing the Report. Rather than naming the type of collectivism the country was moving towards, the Commission, Bobbitt charged, disguised its intentions through the use of terms and phrases such as "integration and interdependence," "closely integrated society," "an economy managed in the interests of the masses," "the new order," and "the steadily integrating social order." The use of these terms revealed that the Commission had little respect for the intelligence of the American people.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 207.

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 203.
Bobbitt cited passages from the Report to back up his claim of ambiguity in the final Report. Why didn't the Commission say what it really meant? Why didn't it give democracy a better hearing? These were searching questions which Bobbitt hurled at the Commission. It seemed that the Commission was merely giving lip service to democracy. Bobbitt concluded this section of the paper by stating:

> It is difficult to explain, in a way favorable to the Commission, their frequent lip service to democracy, when the whole tenor of their report is denial both of its legitimacy and of its desirability. One can not believe that they are uninformed relative to the differing natures of collectivism and of democracy and of their total irreconcilibility.12

He then concentrated on the Commission's failure to formulate or suggest a plan of education that could be used to help the nation out of the predicament into which it had fallen. Rather than rely on the individualism of the past which stressed self-help and self-reliance, the Commission instead saw the individual as the "nursling of the state."13 In the emerging state, individualism would be replaced by planning and management by experts.

---

12 Ibid., p. 205.
13 Ibid., p. 205.
In order to achieve this, students had to be indoctrinated with the spirit and philosophy of state paternalism. Some of Bobbitt's harshest criticisms were stated in this section. His sharpest barbs were directed at the Commission's views on indoctrination. He felt that the Commission thought that indoctrination would:

protect them from all ideas of a contrary character that would only confuse their standardized and mostly harmonious thinking. This philosophy is then to be emotionalized and quickened as a religion, since there is nothing that will prevent contrary thought quite as effectively as in an atmosphere of contrary emotion.\textsuperscript{14}

The Commission, Bobbitt charged, cloaked its views in obscurity concerning the role indoctrination would play in the emerging collectivism. It was the view of the Commission that self-regimentation would be better than coercion. Bobbitt continued his biting criticism:

The central thought of that paragraph, which the Commission seems deliberately to have obscured by its irrelevant opening and closing phrases, is this: We must educationally aim at indoctrination so as to avoid the necessity of coercion.\textsuperscript{15}

Totalitarian nations going through the process of collectivization of their populations had to use coercion. In

\textsuperscript{14} ibid., p. 206.
\textsuperscript{15} ibid.
Bobbitt's view, the Commission sought to avoid this through education. Students had to be prepared to enter the society which was then emerging. This was to be accomplished — Bobbitt felt: "by achieving full self-regimentation, actuated by enlightened self-interest. The function of the school is to attach the needed enlightenment to the self-interest."\(^{16}\)

If educators and the enlightened public failed to understand this, Bobbitt stated, it was because they were unable to decipher the hidden meanings of the final Report. The members of the Commission had no one one to blame for this state of affairs but themselves.

In his conclusion, Bobbitt continued his unrelenting criticism of the final Report. The American was sophisticated enough, Bobbitt felt, to know that American society was in real trouble. He stated it in this fashion:

The nation is like a very sick man. Only the best doctors are qualified to diagnose, to prescribe and direct the treatment. Hence the nation, in its representatives, the governments, turns to its custodians of school science as the expert physicians. The rightness of the method of turning to the best available science for guidance can not today be questioned.\(^{17}\)

The country had to accept the views of the experts. If the experts did not possess the wisdom to solve the problems, then

\(^{16}\)Ibid., p. 206.  
\(^{17}\)Ibid., p. 207.
the country would fail. In Bobbitt's opinion, the Commission failed to do what was expected of it. He stressed this failure emphatically:

The tone of the commission as it presents its basic - shall we call it thought or emotion? - is that of the revolutionary hysteria that grips all of the collectivizing nations. They laud scientific method; but it seems to be rationalizing after-thought. They show evidence, in spite of their claims, of having used it in arriving at their conclusions.18

He continued to downgrade the work of the Commission: "The report of the Commission is an ominous symptom of unpreparedness on the part of the custodians of the social sciences to lead the thought required for guiding aright the onward progress of the nation."19 Bobbitt also berated the American Historical Association, and he pointed out that the organization would not be deserving of the support of the public if it did not deal properly with the final report. The public would support it if a good job was done but would reject it if it had failed.

Bobbitt's criticisms stirred up a vast amount of comment among sympathizers and critics alike. Krey called Beard's attention to Bobbitt's remarks in their regular exchange of correspondence. Krey was especially concerned about the intensity of Bobbitt's attack. He felt that it was up to Counts to answer Bobbitt. In the letter, he remarked:

13 Ibid., p. 203.
19 Ibid.
Bobbitt's blast in *School and Society*, to which you called my attention, impressed me at first glance as something that George might best answer as someone most nearly in the field of Bobbitt's approach. Since then it has again been called to my attention by President Coffman, who is convinced that the article must be answered. I therefore read the thing a little bit more carefully than I had the first time. It seemed to me clear then that this article had probably been submitted to others at the university of Chicago and that it then probably represented concentrated venom. It seems a bit strange that Bobbitt should have been selected as the fang for the discharge of any of this venom.20

In an earlier exchange of correspondence Beard had cautioned Counts against replying to Bobbitt's charges.21 Counts followed Beard's advice and refrained from answering Bobbitt. In the absence of replies by Beard or Counts the principal defense of the Commission's position fell to Krey and Newlon.

Krey replied to Bobbitt and other critics of the Commission's work in two papers. One paper was published in *The American Scholar*; the other in *School and Society*. In defense of the Commission's activities, Krey stressed the overall nature of the Commission's work. He chided critics such as Bobbitt for concentrating their criticism on narrow aspects

20 Krey to Beard, Minneapolis, Minnesota, to New Milford, Connecticut, September 13, 1934, Krey Papers, University of Minnesota Library, Archives.

21 Beard to Counts, Counts-Beard Correspondence, Southern Illinois University Library, Carbondale, Illinois, August 31, 1934.
of the report, for example, the treatment of the "frame of reference." This concept was intended, Krey explained, as a heuristic tool to introduce the various sections of the report. The Commission was merely describing the social changes which had taken place in American society. Every student of social science was aware of the existence of the process known as cultural lag. They would realize that the Commission was not advocating any radical change but merely pointing out what had already occurred.

Newlon was in the best position to offer the rebuttal of the Commission to Bobbitt's criticisms. In a paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Newlon answered Bobbitt and other critics. This forum would allow the Commission maximum exposure to a group influenced by Bobbitt. Newlon lashed out at the critics who accused the Commission of being too radical and leaning towards Communism. The Commission, Newlon stated, had been accused of all sorts of radical activities and had been giving "lip service to democracy" while knifing it in the back.22

Newlon dealt at great length with Bobbitt's criticisms. First he considered Bobbitt's criticism of the Social Analysis of the Commission. Bobbitt criticized the Commission for not indicating whether it advocated Communism or Fascism, but Newlon indicated that these were not the only forms of collectivism. Bobbitt also criticized the Commission for referring to the change from individualism to collectivism. Could it be, Newlon reasoned, that Bobbitt was unaware of the changes sweeping American society? These events had been capably documented by various specialists in several fields. Newlon felt that this fact should be common knowledge. Concerning Bobbitt's view that the Commission favored paternalism, Newlon remarked:

All the trust legislation that we have been able to put upon our statute books has not stopped this process of integration. Government regulation, begun more than fifty years ago, has been gradually extended until every business of any consequence has been brought under some form of government control.\(^{23}\)

The Commission did not advocate a paternalistic approach but was merely reporting on a trend that had already developed.

Concerning Bobbitt's criticism that the Commission gave lip service to democracy, Newlon replied: "Taking its stand squarely on the principle of democracy the commission answers, for the people, by the people. Human beings are placed above

---

\(^{23}\)Ibid., p. 410.
private property rights". What better defense of democracy and democratic rights could be expected than the Commission's concern for the individual Newlon reasoned.

Newlon alluded to the dire economic situation in the country where the paralysis of the depression was still pronounced:

Who would not prefer a wide extension of collective control of the instruments of production and distribution, and of credit, to the continuance of the maldistribution of work and national income to which laissez-faire capitalism has brought the country — with forty six incomes above a million, and twelve million workers unemployed, in the year of our lord, 1935. The report recognized the fact of the trend towards collectivism. It accepts the principle of the trend towards collectivism. It believes that collectivism and democracy are not irreconcilable.

If democracy and collectivism were incompatible, judging from events in some European states, then democracy is doomed in the United States. The only answers, according to Newlon, would be through some form of collective control.

Continuing his criticism of Bobbitt, Newlon pointed out that the trend towards collectivism was a conditioning factor in American society, not a choice. The country could not return to an earlier stage of its development Newlon stated. In order to be realistic, educators had to accept the recent trends in American development. Numerous studies,

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid.
including the Hoover Commission Report, had pointed this out. With these factors in mind, they should be entered into the "frame of reference." Unless the educator accepted a guiding philosophy and social outlook, educators would always be confused and ineffective. 26

In conclusion, Newlon stressed that Bobbitt and other critics brought their own "frame of reference" to bear in criticizing the Report. This undoubtedly colored their views. Newlon implied that every educator used some "frame of reference" in developing his approach to education and its application.

N. J. Weiss of Albion College criticized Bobbitt's paper in a later issue of School and Society. Weiss was as outspoken in his criticism of Bobbitt as Bobbitt had been regarding the final Report. Weiss felt that the scholarly authority of Counts, Beard, Hayes, et al., was evenly matched with that of Bobbitt. The debate came down to the following: "It is reduced, then, to a matter of choosing between the respected opinions of scholars of equally high rank. If, as Wilson once said, 'truth matches truth,' some one must be mistaken." 27

26 Ibid., p. 411.

27 N. J. Weiss, "Concerning Professor Bobbitt's Criticism," School and Society 40 (October 6, 1934): 446.
Weiss felt that Bobbitt developed his "frame of reference" during the last years of the frontier experience in our country. It was also a period of individualism in economic advancement. Hence he (Bobbitt) could not comprehend the difficult economic conditions which faced the country. It was to these changed conditions that the final report was addressed. As Weiss indicated:

In the light of the foregoing we can understand Professor Bobbitt's tentative rejection of a "frame of reference" which does not conform to his own intuitive credo, acceptable during the era of frontier economy when he evolved his philosophy of education based on enlightened self-interest. It must be disheartening to see one's published works of a lifetime become obsolescent in a dynamically emerging society.²³

Weiss then attacked one-by-one the positions Bobbitt took in his paper. He accused Bobbitt of reducing the terms, such as collectivism, to his own stereotyped images.

Therefore, before the professor undertakes to answer the commission, he takes the liberty to reduce all terms to his own mental stereotype, presumably so that his carefully annotated files of ready-made rebuttals might be used without too much adaptation to the real points. Resting heavily upon the special lexicon of the professional patrioteer he employs his whole repertoire of negative sanctions in pummeling his man of straw.²⁹

Weiss believed the Commission did not use the stereotyped terminology which Bobbitt accused it of doing. Carefully

²³ibid., p. 447.
²⁹ibid.
avoiding the highly charged stereotypes, the Commission had sought to deal with the political realities of the day. Weiss stressed this: "In short, Professor Bobbitt objects because the Commission chose to be specific and scientific rather than general and unscientific." The Commission used terms that more adequately described the realities of society than Bobbitt did in describing the Commission's views of that society.

Bobbitt's criticism of the Commission's views on democracy drew Weiss's fire. In Weiss's view, the Commission did not give lip service to democracy but wholeheartedly endorsed it and suggested that it should not be ignored but fulfilled in American society. Weiss quoted from the report to illustrate this point. He could not figure out how Bobbitt could ignore the Commission's views espousing democracy. The Commission did not in any way reject democracy but sought to extend and integrate it with all levels of American society Weiss reasoned; a task which would be fulfilling the true spirit of the American democratic ideal.

Regarding Bobbitt's criticism of the Commission's views on indoctrination, Weiss felt that it was also exaggerated. The Commission did not stress regimented indoctrination but an "enlightened knowledge of realities" and a capacity

30 Ibid.
to cooperate in shaping "the form of that society in accordance with American ideals of popular democracy and personal liberty and dignity." The report stressed that individualism in its non-acquisitive expression should be substituted for self-interest. The Commission put the welfare of the group above one individual. Was this not true democracy, Weiss asked?

According to Weiss, the new, emerging society advocated by the Commission would be for all citizens—not just the wealthy. A new social motive was to be substituted for the competitive one in the economic realm. All citizens would cooperate with the aid of technology to gain for every individual freedom from economic stringencies so that all would have time and energy to become culturally what they aspired to be. The Commission desired that the American educational system would produce rich—many-sided personalities. Whether this meant that individuals would become automatons under the control of a repressive state depended upon the democratic techniques employed in determining American destiny.

The fact that Bobbitt resorted to polemics in denouncing the work of the Commission should not deter American educators from reading the report. Educators would have

31 Ibid.
32 Ibid., p. 448.
to determine for themselves the value of the report and should not be swayed by Bobbitt's hysterical pleading. According to Weiss, Bobbitt resorted to the same hysterical, polemical approach that he accused the Commission of using. In conclusion, Weiss felt that Bobbitt had lost sight of the original aims in criticizing the report and had resorted to polemics and hysterical denunciations of the work of the Commission.

Boyd H. Bode, Professor of History of Education at Ohio State University, delivered a more favorable critique of the report — eschewing the polemics used by Bobbitt. Bode pointed out that there was much to condemn in the report; but he also said there were areas of concern for the thoughtful educator. His remarks appeared in *Social Studies* and were directed primarily to secondary educators. Like Bobbitt, he zeroed in on certain parts of the Report rather than dealing with it as a whole. Most of Bode's criticisms were directed at the "frame of reference" developed by the Commission.

Bode felt that it was necessary for the Commission to state a "frame of reference", as the formation of a social philosophy was one of its major reasons for existing. The Commission erred, in Bode's view, by insisting that the schools be used to promote this point of view. Bode pointed out:
Agreement with the social philosophy expressed in the 'frame of reference' does not necessarily commit us to any such conclusion. If this philosophy is presented for the purpose of securing sanctions for an educational program of indoctrination, it is necessary to remind ourselves that even the devil can quote Scriptures for his purposes.\textsuperscript{33}

The Commission, according to Bode, espoused democratic ideals and sought to develop a "reasoned scepticism" in students. Furthermore, students were to be protected against "coercing regimentation and indoctrination." These views seemed to resist criticism but closer scrutiny would lead to doubt. The Commission advocated the aforementioned points but only if they were to be carried out within the limits imposed by the "frame of reference." As Bode remarked: "Independent knowledge, reasoned scepticism, are all to be prized, but 'within the general frame of reference adopted.' Did any despot or church council ever ask for more?"\textsuperscript{34}

Bode reasoned that the Commission asked educators to develop "in the child habits of independent study, inquiring thought and action and thus free him as quickly and completely as possible from reliance upon the formal and authoritarian tutelage of teacher, school and elders."\textsuperscript{35}


\textsuperscript{34}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid.
of liberation had to be kept within the bounds of the "frame of reference." In other words, Bode remarked, the student could think what he wanted to as long as he did not disagree with his teacher. The Commission was wrong in thinking that freedom of thought could be taught in this fashion. If students were taught in this manner, the results could not be reconciled with the conclusion desired by the Commission. In Bode's eyes, the Commission was resorting to faculty psychology and imparting a "pure and holy nature" to the "frame of reference."

Bode remarked that the student did not come to school without some previous training. The student was not an empty receptacle waiting to be filled but an active organism attempting to develop its own "frame of reference." The teacher was faced with the choice of trying to impose the "frame of reference" or to allow the student to develop his own synthesis. If the latter situation occurred, the "frame of reference" lost its sacred character. The teacher's role then shifted to shedding light on the conflicts the student faced as he reconstructed his experiences. As Bode asserted:


It is not the function of the teacher to predetermine the conclusions. From the nature of the case, the new synthesis which is achieved by the student will vary according to the elements that enter into it. The synthesis cannot be predetermined by any antecedent frame of reference; it necessarily becomes a process in which the student builds his own frame of reference.38

It was necessary to have a "frame of reference" or a basic philosophy but the Commission wanted it both ways. The Commission wanted the "frame of reference" to cover both method and conclusions. This, to Bode, was hopelessly self-contradictory. As Bode stated:

The insistence on independence of thinking becomes an empty pretense if the conclusions to be drawn are determined in advance. The appropriate frame of reference for a democratic theory of education, it would seem, would be the thesis, in the language of the Commission, that 'the Supreme goal of education is the growth of an independent yet socially sensitive personality.'39

A democratic philosophy of education related to method, to reliance on intelligence and not to conclusions, Bode felt.40

The Commission would have to take the risks involved in espousing a democratic philosophy of education. It would have to have faith in the intelligence of the common man. A democratic system of education had to restructure its conclusions in light of the conflicts and tensions which were

38 Ibid.
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inherent in that particular society. If faith in the intelligence of the common man was upheld, the effect of such an educational system would be the promotion of democracy. If not, then democracy should be discarded as an idle dream.

The Commission, by dictating conclusions, was showing its distrust of the common man. It was done in the following manner: "The proper function of the 'frame of reference' set up by the Commission is not to set limits to thinking, but to justify the conclusion that a genuinely democratic system of education cannot be to establish any such limits". 41

In conclusion, Bode felt that it was a lack of faith in the common man which rendered the recommendations of the Commission innocuous. The Commission attempted to combine an authoritarian "frame of reference" with the cultivation of effective and independent thinking. He concluded:

The moral is that we cannot eat our cake and have it. If we are bound to predetermine the character or direction of social change, we cannot at the same time make the maximum intellectual and spiritual development of the common man our major consideration. 42

Krey replied to Bode's criticism by attacking his assertion that the Commission lacked faith in the common man.

41 Ibid., p. 346.
42 Ibid.
Krey asked if Bode would urge that the common man be allowed to choose his own rules with reference to the English language or the system of arithmetic? Was it not just as conceivable that the "average man" would be as well qualified to select his own language, his own system of society? Certainly, Krey reasoned, there were other systems of language and arithmetic, but they did not carry the benefits of commonly derived systems. If a common language and a common arithmetic were not desirable, why not a common understanding of contemporary, complex social movements which were more important? This was the aim of the Commission — to give the student as accurate a description of our society as it was possible to draw up.

The Commission, according to Krey, had no ulterior motives nor did it make any attempt to prophesize. It merely intended to present and describe as clearly as possible the social changes which had taken place in American society.

Krey pointed out that social change was a continuing process and every serious student of Sociology knew that a cultural lag existed. Cultural lag could be a source of social friction because it accentuated sharp differences of opinion. The members of the Commission attempted to describe American society as they perceived it in the "frame of reference". While there were disagreements among Commission members,
there was apparent agreement on the social correctness of the "frame of reference" as a description of American society.

Newlon dismissed Bode's criticism by charging that Bode developed a "frame of reference" in criticizing the Commission and hence was guilty of what he accused the Commission of doing. Newlon remarked:

Professors Haggerty, Bode and Bobbitt make their criticism of the Commission's frame of reference from their own 'frames of reference' which color everything they do, the methods of teaching they employ, the problems they choose to investigate and their writing. 43

Bode restricted his condemnation of the Report to the "frame of reference," while heartily approving the rest of the Report. As Bode stated:

Even if this criticism be granted, however, the Report is a significant document. The insistence that careful attention must be given to whatever general point of view or 'frame of reference' may be involved in the teaching of the social sciences is of basic importance. So is the emphasis placed on the transitional character of the present, and the recognition that the supreme issue in this period of stress and strain is the issue of democracy. We cannot go on indefinitely on the basis of custom and tradition; this Report will do much to stimulate our thinking with respect to responsibility of education for the quality or direction of social change. 44


Merle E. Haggerty was Dean of the School of Education at the University of Minnesota. A widely respected educator in the Midwest his views would reach a large audience. His remarks concerning the Conclusions and Recommendations appeared in School and Society. Intended primarily for professional educators in the schools of education, his views were, like Bobbitt's, highly critical of the Commission. Educators who were looking to the Report for enlightenment were, according to Haggerty, in for a disappointment. The Report neglected, Haggerty stated, or slid over the areas it was supposed to deal authoritatively with. These problems remained for educators to grapple with as they had in the past.

Haggerty could find little to agree with in the Report. He felt that the overall tone of the Report was unrealistic and not attuned to the realities of American secondary education. The Conclusions of the Commission ignored years of solid educational research and were largely denunciatory of secondary educators. He devoted an entire paragraph to a catalogue of deprecatory terms used in the Report. The Commission, Haggerty noted, espoused an emotional rhetoric while eschewing scholarly detachment which should have been characteristic of this type of endeavor. As Haggerty pointed out:
"The temper of the report is reminiscent of the religious movement that invaded American colleges in the 'nineties' determined upon 'the evangelization of the world in this generation'. The Commission was bent on action rather than knowledge.\textsuperscript{45}

Having voiced his general displeasure with the document, Haggerty proceeded to criticize it in depth. The following sections of the Report were criticized: (1) the "frame of reference"; (2) the curriculum; (3) the teacher; (4) tests and measurements and (5) educational and social objectives. The Report tended to ignore the results of educational research in various subject-matter areas in reaching its conclusions.

The "frame of reference" came in for some of Haggerty's most harsh remarks. He was not in disagreement with the content of the "frame of reference" but with the idea that it would become an all embracing philosophy for American educators. This view carried with it restrictive implications with regard to the independence of each teacher. The Commission stressed the idea that the teacher should be free and independent, but it then erected the barrier of the "frame of reference" as a protective wall, as Haggerty illustrated:

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., p. 277.
it erects about him the protective all beyond which he can not stray in search of his own solutions of social problems. With pontifical care it would save him all the hard intellectual labor and social risks of independent thought. The teacher's world is not to be made safe for intellectual adventure and liberty of mind; it is to be made safe for the particular social creed approved by the commission.46

The Commission had developed a creed rather than a philosophy. Philosophies were not constructed in committee rooms, Haggerty asserted, but in the wide ranging, creative work of active minds. Ideas that were addressed to the needs of the day did not have to be adopted by a committee. The procedure used by the Commission did not serve as an aid to American teachers but as ritualistic support for the ideas of the members of the Commission.

In trying to set up a social curriculum, the Commission was unrealistic. The realities of the American educational scene were ignored by the Commission. For example, Haggerty pointed out, the Commission completely overlooked the fact that only about thirty percent of rural children of the ages fourteen to seventeen were enrolled in secondary schools. The social studies curriculum recommended by the Commission was inadequate in terms of the realities facing American educators.

Haggerty stated the reason as follows:

The report stresses to boredom the importance of understanding the integrated society and the significance of all the social disciplines in such an understanding, but it still declares that instruction in history, political science, economics and sociology shall each be given according to the traditional method as a separate body of knowledge, utterly indifferent to the fact that this procedure in the vast majority of schools can result in only a partial offering, thus leaving the student without much of the material upon which integration depends.47

The report pointed out that instruction in the social sciences depends on the nature of the child, but nowhere in the report does the Commission show that these "generalizations" are within the scope of the child's mentality. Similarly, the report stressed the need for adjusting instruction to the varying abilities of the students, but it then rejected the use of tests and measurements which had been developed for that purpose. Concluding his remarks on this section, Haggerty stated: "In short, the report avoids practically every real problem that will arrive in the experience of a teacher once launched upon a teaching task."48

Haggerty felt that the section on the teacher was so unrealistic that it added almost nothing to knowledge about teaching. Haggerty compared the author Ernest Horn of this section to an author writing a novel or a composer composing a piece of music. The profile sketched of the ideal teacher

47 Ibid.
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was an exercise in imaginative literature - not in the science of education. This section had little use, Haggerty concluded, for the deans and instructors in teacher institutions.

Since Haggerty spent a great deal of his career working in the area of tests and measurements, he was particularly distressed with the views of the Commission on these subjects. He felt that the Commission's view was one of rejection. The Commission saw tests as some evil, nefarious force stalking American education. Page after page of the report condemned the use of the new-type test. The sweeping condemnation of tests was not backed up by factual evidence. Statements made by the Commission were not backed up by the Commission's research or by studies available in the general literature.

The Commission did not try to understand the conditions which brought about the development of the test movement. The Commission attributed the growth of the test movement to casual, superficial factors dealing with the growth of public education rather than the overarching problem of man's attempt to deal with measurement since the birth of modern science. This, Haggerty pointed out, is an enterprise not restricted to education but an activity carried on in all fields of endeavor as man attempts to understand the world around him. The Commission chose to ignore this aspect of the use of tests. The Commission's failure to understand the value of tests in the
educational enterprise detracted immensely from its findings and conclusions.

The Commission failed to clearly define the objectives of education. This was due, Haggerty felt, to the fact that the Commission stressed the role of the schools in the solution of social problems. These objectives were alien to the tradition of American public education. Many of the social objectives stressed by the Commission were not capable of being solved by the public schools. Haggerty thought the Commission was dumping social problems on the doorsteps of the schools. American schools were not equipped to deal with the solution of these problems. Schools could attain other useful objectives for which they were equipped while eschewing the objectives stressed by the Commission. The inclusion of these issues were not realistic objectives. As Haggerty stressed:

until it comes to grips with this question of possibilities and distinguishes those particular ends which may be achieved through education from those which must be sought through other means, as pronouncements can not be taken seriously as educational objectives. 49

Had the Commission used statistical procedures, it could have identified the major objectives and developed a program which would lead to their achievement.

49 I bid., p. 233.
Haggerty concluded his remarks in a biting, sarcastic manner:

If scholarship in the social sciences has no offering to the schools but this, nothing beyond the unsupported and sinaitic 'affirmations' contained in this volume, then our educational program must continue to limp along under its own power, with only teachers, educational administrators and the much-disdained 'educational specialists' to give it direction and strength.\(^50\)

Krey and Newlon answered Haggerty's criticism for the Commission. Krey attempted to soften the blow of Haggerty's incisive remarks. In a letter to Haggerty he commended the Dean for his thoughtful and searching critique. Krey stated it as follows:

Let me say at the outset that of the many criticisms of our report in detail or whole which I have seen, yours is by many lengths the most searching, the most thoughtful and the most pointed. In addition it is beautifully written. Unlike some of the critics, you have chosen to deal with those matters on which you are best informed, and on the whole you have refrained from attacking conclusions on matters which lie outside the field of your special study.\(^51\)

Krey then criticized several points which Haggerty made in his critique. First, Krey felt that Haggerty, like other critics, dealt with the Conclusions and neglected the other fifteen volumes of the Report. Haggerty thus failed to

---
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take into account the whole Report. To Krey, the Conclusions represented the final chapter of the Commission's work—not the main body. By ignoring the other volumes of the Report, Haggerty did not have the facts available to support his conclusions.

Haggerty misunderstood the Commission's intentions regarding the sections on tests and testing. The Commission had hoped to include a favorable reaction on tests in the Final Report. Research dealing with this area pointed out the inadequacies of the test movement. Surely Haggerty did not want the Commission to "doctor the facts" in order to issue a favorable report? The Commission did not criticize the capable professionals such as Haggerty in the testing field. The Commission wanted to point out the inadequacies which existed and had no intention of slighting the good work that had been accomplished. If Haggerty, Krey reasoned, viewed his criticisms in this light, he probably would be in agreement with the Commission.

Having criticized Haggerty's views, Krey then urged him not to publish the dissenting opinion but to couch it in the cooperative terms which characterized the work of the Commission: "I hope that in your published criticism of the Commission's report you will be able to take this very real intent of its members into account, whatever may be your opin-
Krey failed in his attempt to get Haggerty to soften his criticism. The critique was published with little or no mention of Krey's objections. At the urging of President Coffman (Coffman was President of the University of Minnesota at the time) Krey answered Haggerty's criticism at a special faculty meeting. The reply was never published, but the views expressed by Krey went beyond the confines of the auditorium in which it was presented.

In his reply to Haggerty, Krey attacked the principal criticisms which Haggerty directed against the report: (1) the "frame of reference"; (2) tests and measurements; (3) the teacher; and (4) the question of school attendance.

Krey felt that Haggerty misunderstood the purpose of the "frame of reference." Haggerty complained, Krey observed, that the Commission intended to impose a narrow set of views on social studies students. They did not have this view in mind, as the purpose of the "frame of reference" was to prepare students for the obligations and duties of citizenship in a democratic society. The average person could not keep up with the rapid changes in American society. As expressed by the Commission, the "frame of reference" would give students an accurate picture of American society. The

---
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outmoded picture of American society dating back to the 1890's would be replaced by a contemporary "frame of reference."

Haggerty failed to understand the underlying idealism in the "frame of reference." The "frame of reference" stressed an idealistic vision of the American past without removing the democratic framework. These views were stressed in the volumes prepared by Counts and Merriam. Haggerty's concentration on the final Report did not permit him to take these important views into consideration.

Haggerty was too critical of the Commission's views concerning tests and measurements. The Commission did not intend to criticize the sincere workers in the field such as Haggerty. Criticism was directed by the Commission at those testers who had hastily constructed tests without fully developing them or developing an awareness of their possible impact. Criticism by the Commission was also directed at the extravagant claims proponents of the testing movement put forth. The Commission sought to portray the test movement as it related to social studies education, however pessimistic that appraisal might turn out. It was not the intention of the Commission to embarrass any worker in the field but to describe realistically the testing procedures in the social studies. Krey did concede that the Commission's criticisms were a bit severe, but he felt that they were essentially
accurate. Krey urged Haggerty to view the Commission's views on tests in the foregoing light. Krey reasoned that if Haggerty would do this, he would be in agreement with the Commission's views on testing.

In criticizing the Commission's view of the teacher, Haggerty made the same mistake he accused the Commission of making. He exuded flowery prose in the critique of the training of teachers. Krey felt that this did little to accurately portray the average American teacher. The fact that many teachers did not measure up to the high ideals stressed by the Commission did not in any way diminish these ideals. The Commission sought to impress those in charge of teacher training selection by stressing high standards and professionalism. In a calmer mood, Krey reasoned, Haggerty would probably concur with the Commission's views.

Haggerty's criticism of school attendance was based on emotionalism and a less than critical interpretation of the facts. While it was true, Krey agreed, that many students were not finishing high school, a closer scrutiny of the facts would show that this was not entirely true. In large states such as California, 39 percent of the children up to sixteen years of age were attending school. One school district in the survey revealed that 66 percent of the students were still enrolled in school at the age of eighteen.
In view of these facts, the Commission was justified in its curricular recommendations. Krey concluded that if Haggerty had viewed the Commission's work in its entirety, and had he not become emotionally involved, his critique would have had greater significance.

Newlon, like Krey, commended Haggerty for his forthright remarks concerning the Final Report. He deplored the fact that Haggerty found little to approve of in the Report. In a manner similar to other critics of the Report, Haggerty chose to confine his criticism to narrow aspects of the Report. Newlon remarked that the Commission dealt with broad, general issues. For example, the Commission criticized the work of scientific educators but endorsed the use of the scientific method. Haggerty accused the Commission of trying to impose a "frame of reference" on American education while ignoring this fact when it permeated his views.

The "frame of reference" stressed by the Commission was not meant to be a strait jacket into which American social education was to be placed. Haggerty chose to take a narrow interpretation of its meaning. Throughout the Report, the Commission emphasized the importance of "reasoned skepticism". The critics of the Report, including Haggerty, failed to take this into account. Social studies education had to include techniques for social criticism, along with techniques emphasi-
ing social enlightenment in its programs. These factors were to be complementary - not competitive. The Report broke new ground with its analysis of social conditions; and if this analysis proved to be correct, American social education would be directed along the proper paths.

The Social Studies published a series of articles during 1934 to try to bring together criticism and praise of the Commission's final volume. Articles were reprinted from other journals. These articles were written by educators and professionals from other subject matter disciplines.

Eduard C. Lindemann, a sociologist who taught at the New York School of Social Work, authored one of these articles. The article was conciliatory to the views of the Commission. Lindemann pointed out that the Commission realized that social studies education was muddling its way through the educational thicket. The purpose of the Commission's report was to find a clear path through this thicket. The Commission in a bold, courageous manner sought to advance American education for the important task ahead. Lindemann felt that the "frame of reference" correctly diagnosed the social ills facing the country. The American student did not have to go to the radical press or attend a radical lecture to become aware of the ills in American society. This information could be gathered from a reading of the Commission's Final Report.
The critique of American society presented in the Report was essentially correct. Lindemann pointed out that corporate leaders had been attempting to manage the American economic system with ideas based on the nineteenth century. It was felt that a system of laissez-faire and individualism could produce a form of rough social justice. This was not the case, as the gap between technological advance and culture led to the economic crisis which gripped the country.

Lindemann agreed with the Commission's views on collectivism. The Commission wanted to combine economic collectivism with cultural freedom. As Lindemann pointed out:

Members of the Commission wanted a collective society without regimentation; they wish to preserve and build upon the precious heritage of liberty which they believe to be indigenous to American life. They foresee a planned society which may be thought of as a fulfillment of the historic principles and ideals of American democracy.53

There were two major criticisms which Lindemann had of the Commission's work. While the critique of the scientific movement in education was necessary and timely, it was only a partial view. In order for the American educational system to progress, there must be a system of evaluation of the means employed to reach the goals. Horn had presented a similar view in his article on tests and testing.

---

Secondly, the Commission had a naive view of the role of the school in social change. A large portion of the Commission's view of social studies could not be implemented. The only way that the views of the Commission could have been put into practice was through coercion. In the American system of education, the best that could be hoped for was a change in attitude of the wielders of economic power. In conclusion, Lindemann hoped that those who were in power would see the light before it was too late.

Erling H. Hunt of Teachers College, Columbia University, took a middle position in his article. Feeling that it was easy to criticize a report of this magnitude, he sought to deal with the report as the authors did—not as a program but as a basis for a program. Hunt's views fell into three categories. First, he hoped that the Commission would set a precedent. The leaders of educational and social thought would have to cooperate and develop solutions to the problems which faced American education. The Commission's work was an example of this cooperative endeavor and this type of activity would have to be continued in the future.

Second, the Commission called attention to needs and pointed out weaknesses in American education, but it did not provide a program. This was a glaring weakness of the report,
a failure to provide a program for American education. This was a common criticism voiced by many critics. American educators had been looking forward to a program of social studies education which would be devised by the Commission.

Third, the Commission placed an enormous burden on the teacher. The task of implementing its recommendations fell primarily on the teacher. Could the teacher, Hunt asked, assume primary responsibility for character molding, the cure of civic ills and the remolding of the social order? These burdens would have to be borne by education as a whole. The best that the teacher could do would be to contribute first a clear narrative and descriptive account of the development of our society and its present functioning — followed by training in location and the use of facts — then our major responsibility would be met. If this was done, we could proceed to take on further obligations — important and not to be shirked if they were practicable — which the Commission recommended.64 Hunt's critique was reasonable and sympathetic to the views expressed by members of the Commission.

R. O. Hughes, Assistant Director of Curriculum Study in the Pittsburgh Public Schools, wrote a paper that was essentially critical of the report. His criticisms were similar to those expressed by others who were disenchanted with the Report. Hughes felt that the Report was a disappointment, as secondary educators had been looking for more than it offered. The paper was written in a straightforward style omitting the hysterics and emotionalism of other critics. Hughes criticized the language used in the Report, claiming that it was written over the heads of the readers. Hughes asked: "Why can't cultured people, when they have a big proposition to put before the public, say what they have to say in clear, terse, everyday English?" He felt that this defect would detract from the general acceptance of the Report.

Hughes felt that the Commission's views on impending social change were ambiguous. The use of the term collectivism would likely be misinterpreted by some to mean Communism. The Commission should have stated clearly what type of collectivism the country was moving towards. As he stated: "If all

---

the Commission means is that these fundamental principles of cooperation and social justice should be stressed, we are all with it. But if it means more—well, what do you think?" 56

Hughes agreed with the Commission's view on the role of the teacher in planning school programs. Administrators, he said, have had too much authority in determining programs and assignments which should have been handled by social studies teachers. The Commission felt that social studies teachers were best qualified to determine the place of social studies in the curriculum. Having stressed this point, the Commission then pulled out the rug by refusing to develop a definite program. Because of this, no serious progressive superintendent could use the report in preparing a social science program.

Hughes also disagreed vehemently with the Commission's views on tests. He felt that the Commission performed a useful service by criticizing the quacks in the test field, but he could not agree with their sweeping condemnation of the test movement. The Commission should have pointed out the types of tests which had been proved to be useful in the evaluation process. Teachers could then make their own choice as to which types of tests to use.

56 Ibid., 236.
Lastly, the Commission placed too much of a burden on the individual teacher. The duties which the Commission would impose on the teacher— to assume primary major responsibility for character molding, the cure of civic ills and the remolding of the social order— would more properly be solved by the field of education as a whole. The best that the social studies teacher could do was to contribute to the students understanding of our present society. Once this was done, education had to proceed to the more idealistic goals which the Commission recommended.

Kenneth Edward Gell represented the views of the secondary teacher. His remarks were first made at a meeting of the NEA. The paper was later published in The Social Studies. Gell was both complimentary and critical of the Commission's work as shown in his remarks. He felt that the Commission understood the importance of the social studies. As Gell pointed out:

In these regards, the Commission has emphasized the importance to society of the social sciences and of the social-science teacher; it has pronounced for better teaching standards, training and rewards; it has definitely espoused and justified a liberal interpretation of our society and its future.

_57_ Ibid.

On the other hand, Gell felt that the Report could be criticized for the following reasons. It placed a heavy burden of social and political responsibility on the teacher. The Commission failed to develop a specific program for the crying needs of the profession. It neglected the science of education for the art of education. The Final Report failed to show the complexity of the educational process.

Gell's most harsh criticism was reserved for the chapter on tests and testing. He wrote:

The chapters on 'Tests and Testing', I feel should be repudiated by high-school teachers as being against the best judgment and experience on the subject, and also because the findings have been presented in a manner which is both unscholarly and such as to belittle the scholarship and integrity of the professors.59

Gell did urge secondary teachers to heed the values stressed in the Report and to try to follow its positive precepts. He also called upon high school teachers to work together to correct its shortcomings. His remarks were similar to other critics who had expected the Commission to do the impossible.

Edgar Bruce Wesley, Associate Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, presented one of the most balanced critiques of the Conclusions. His views were contained in an article which was written in The Social Studies and entitled:
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"A Guide to the Commission's Report". It was intended to prepare teachers and other concerned individuals to use the Report for professional purposes. Unlike other critics, he dealt with the overall report. He devised a plan whereby the Report might be effectively studied. Dividing the Report into eighteen sections, Wesley considered the good and bad points of each section.

Lack of space does not permit a discussion of each section - only the most significant points will be considered. They were: (1) analysis of contemporary culture; (2) social institutions and groups; (3) ideals and attitudes of the American people; (4) the function of the school; (5) the teacher; (6) objectives of the social studies; (7) nature of the social sciences; (8) selecting curricular content; (9) methods of teaching; and (10) evaluating the results of instruction.

Wesley answered critics of the final Report in an indirect fashion. While not paying specific attention to the major critics of the final Report, he proceeded to defend the work of the Commission and to point out the inaccuracy of their criticisms. The various aspects of the final Report accurately described the conditions existing in American society. The use of a "frame of reference" portrayed these realities and their effect on the educational process. The final Report was not meant to be an exhaustive analysis of
American society. The Commission probably did as much as was possible in this area.

The best way to study a society was through an examination of the institutions and agencies which constituted the society. Several volumes in the Commission's Report illustrated this procedure. Counts, Newlon and Pierce carefully examined the role of social institutions in our country.

As to the charge that the country was moving towards a totalitarian state or the misuse of the term denoted as Collectivism, Wesley countered with an affirmation of the idealistic and democratic stance of the Commission. The Commission realized the important role which ideals and attitudes have had on American views towards their educational system. Several volumes of the Report were directed to these topics. In the Conclusions, the Commission dealt with the "choices deemed possible and desirable in American life." Works by Counts, Curti, Beard, Newlon and Pierce dealt liberally with the ideas and ideals which had grown up in American society. Throughout the Report, great emphasis was placed on the democratic ideal.

The function of the school had to change as society changed. American schools had expanded from relatively simple

---

agencies for training pupils in the basic skills to become a vast arm of a bureaucratic complex and an agency for social control. The expanded nature of the schools called for a continuing process of reevaluating the schools' role in American society. This was Wesley's answer to those who claimed that the Commission was putting the burden of change on the schools and the classroom teacher.

Unlike other committees, the Commission was concerned with the importance of the teacher. Special emphasis was placed upon the role of the teacher in the educational process throughout the Report. Newlon, Merriam and Bagley dealt with this important topic in the volumes they authored. The Commission clearly stated the training and working conditions which would help the teacher to perform to the best of his or her ability. Training in specific social study disciplines was stressed as opposed to training in methods and the science of education.

Contrary to the views of critics such as Dobbitt and Haggerty, the Commission placed a great deal of attention on the objectives of social studies education. Beard devoted a section of his *The Nature of the Social Studies* to this important topic. The final Report included a vigorous and challenging statement on social objectives.

The Commission failed in its effort to provide a suitable curriculum for social studies education. Marshall
and Goetz in their volume merely reiterated well-known ideas concerning curriculum development. Beard discussed suggested course content in his volumes, but he did not include techniques or methods of selecting a curriculum. Counts included some interesting suggestions concerning course content, but he did not outline a specific social studies curriculum. The nearest the Commission came to programming a social studies curriculum was in the Conclusions:

In the selection and organization of social science materials the teaching staff of the country, cooperating with the social scientists and representatives of the public, should assume complete professional responsibility and resisting the pressure of every narrow group or class, make choices in terms of the most general and enduring interest of the masses of people.  

This suggestion was impracticable and could not be used by any school system in the country. The Commission thus failed to furnish specific guidance for the selection of curriculum materials.

The Commission left the problem of devising a curriculum up to the individual school districts. It was felt that a recommended program might lead to a stereotyped uniformity. Due to the widespread differences in the American educational system it would be unwise to attempt such a program.

---

Public displeasure of such a program might sabotage the positive effects of the Commission's work.

The Commission clearly opposed the views of educators who were interested in the scientific approach to methods of teaching. In the Conclusions, these views were summed up as follows: "When all is said that can be said concerning method, the great teacher defies analysis. He neither can be defined, nor his method dissected or described; but whoever comes into his presence feels the power of a human spirit."62

Rather than follow a set of principles set up by educational methodologists, the Commission recommended that the competent teacher should try to emulate the great thinkers and teachers of the past.

The Commission's views on tests and testing were an attempt to deal with the complex issue of evaluation. Numerous tests were studied and constructed, these by the Commission's Committee on Tests. Four tests were published and made available to the schools. At the conclusion of the study of tests, the Commission was dissatisfied. Most new-type tests were not useful for evaluation and it was felt that the intelligence test had a very limited usefulness and offered little or no social guidance. Wesley felt that the
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Commission's views on tests should be viewed as a cautionary measure rather than as a wholesale condemnation of the testing movement.

Wesley dealt with favorable and unfavorable criticisms of the Report. He pointed out that while there were many educators who condemned the Report, there were those who viewed it in a favorable light. Despite the shortcomings of the Report the useful parts were not to be overlooked. American educators were urged by Wesley to avoid letting their disappointment and annoyance over the Report obscure their views concerning its positive aspects.

He concluded the article by remarking:

The value of the Report is not to be found in its ease of application but in its possible effects in stimulating teachers to view their task in a broad way, to appreciate tendencies and trends; and to adapt their work to the changed and changing situation. The final effect and evaluation of the Report still rests with the social studies teachers of the united States. 63

An analysis of the criticisms leveled at the Report have revealed the following: (1) the reactions of secondary educators tended to be unfavorable; (2) the controversies which highlighted the signing and acceptance of the Report carried over into the public arena; (3) much of the criticism was on an emotional and highly partisan level; (4) most of the criticism dealt with specific parts of the Report rather

than dealing with the overall Report; (5) subject matter specialists tended to view the Report in a favorable light while educationists tended to view it in an unfavorable light; (6) the major participants did not answer their critics; (7) most of the criticism centered around the "frame of reference", collectivism, tests and testing, the failure to develop a social studies curriculum and it was considered to be idealistic and impractical; and (8) there were favorable criticisms, but they did not gain the attention accorded unfavorable criticisms.

More space has been devoted to unfavorable criticism than to criticism which favored the Commission's work. This was not an oversight but an attempt to deal with the factors which propelled the Commission and its work into national prominence. There were many individuals who praised the work of the Commission, but their views did not gain the spotlight. Another reason for devoting more space to unfavorable criticism was the fact that much of this criticism was charged with emotion and partisanship. Critics of the Report, such as Bobbitt, Bode and Haggerty, seemed to be more interested in advancing their own views and gripes than in considering the solid merits of the Commission's work.

The criticism directed at the Report contained some valuable insights into the nature of the Report, as well as its shortcomings. Unfortunately, too much attention was paid to
its shortcomings. The controversy over the signing of the Report carried over into the public arena. While the major participants: Beard, Counts, Day, Merriam, Horn and Ballou remained silent, their supporters engaged in a battle which colored perceptions of the Commission's work. The unbalanced nature of the criticism had an unsettling effect on the Report's reception by secondary teachers and administrators.

In conclusion - the critics we have discussed, with the exception of Wesley, did not attempt to deal with the report in its entirety. Critics such as Bobbitt and Bode confined their remarks to narrow interpretations of the Report's value and meaning. Haggerty attempted a broader approach, but his biases seemed to preclude a balanced critique. Lindemann presented a balanced account which portrayed the shortcomings, as well as the positive achievements attained by the Report. Hughes, Hunt and Gell tended to overemphasize the idealistic nature of the Report and the burden that it placed on the secondary teacher. Wesley presented a reasoned account which provided a good introduction to the use of the Report by interested teachers and administrators.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

By the mid-1920's, the field of Social Studies Education was faced with a major crisis. American society was undergoing profound changes. They were: (1) the attempt to return to normalcy after the unsettling effects of World War I; (2) the continuing effects of industrialization which were changing a rural, individualistic society to a collectivized, urban society; and (3) the effects of the influx of immigrants from Southeastern and Eastern Europe as they attempted to adapt to the American system. Social Studies educators were concerned with ways in which the profession might best deal with these problems. Several professional committees, beginning in 1894, had attempted to deal with these problems. The work of these committees was unsuccessful, and they failed to arrive at a workable solution.

The American Historical Association, which had played a major role in the work of these committees, responded to the crisis by creating the Commission on the Social Studies. It was a standing committee of the American Historical Association, charged with dealing with the current crisis in Social Studies Education. Generous funding for the project was secured from the Carnegie Foundation.
August C. Krey, a noted historian, was chosen to direct the work of the Commission. Other members of the Commission included subject matter specialists and educationists such as: Charles A. Beard, George S. Counts, Isaiah Bowman, Charles E. Merriam, Edmund Day, Frank Ballou and Ernest Horn.

The work of the Commission was divided into five areas: (1) philosophy, purpose and objectives; (2) materials of instruction and methods of teaching; (3) tests and measurements; (4) the teacher; and (5) public relations.

Meetings were held as was thought necessary in the form of two or three day conferences. The work of the Commission consisted of special reports, such as a bibliographical study and specialized studies conducted by each of the five committees - results of which were published in book form. The bibliography, while useful, contained much extraneous material and was not published. The Report of the Commission consisted of fifteen volumes dealing with the investigations of the committee and a summary volume published under the title: Conclusions and Recommendations.

The task attempted by the Commission reached monumental proportions. This study was limited to a consideration of six aspects of the Commission's work: (1) the methodological and philosophical views of the major participants; (2) a consideration and analysis of the social theories advanced by
the members of the Commission; (3) views of the Commission concerning Social Studies Education; (4) an analysis of the views of the dissidents on the Commission who refused to sign the final Report; (5) the relationship which developed between the American Historical Association and the Commission; and (6) the reception of the final Report by secondary educators and an analysis of their criticisms.

The membership of the Commission was drawn primarily from large Midwestern and Eastern institutions. Three schools: Columbia University, the University of Chicago, and the University of Minnesota provided a large proportion of the membership. Facilities at these institutions were used to help the various staffs prepare the reports and papers of the Commission.

It was found to be impossible to neatly categorize and label the philosophic positions held by the members of the Commission. Some generalizations were possible, and they proved useful in identifying the positions taken by Commission members during various stages of the investigation. Several distinctive polarities emerged: (1) the liberal-humanistic position held by the subject matter specialists as opposed to the traditionalist approach by those who represented the schools of education; (2) those who held a relativistic view of the educational process as opposed to those who held
the view that education should be scientific; (3) those who favored a child-centered curriculum as opposed to those who emphasized a modified, traditional curriculum; (4) those who favored a close interaction between the school and society, a reconstructionist position as opposed to those who favored detachment - the school should follow the dictates of society; and (5) those who felt that diagnostic tests were of little value in the educational process as opposed to those who wanted to develop a rigorous, objective science of education.

The social theories advanced by Charles A. Beard, George S. Counts, Merle Curti and Charles E. Merriam were presented and analyzed. The Commission proposed a "frame of reference" which would embrace the entire field of Social Studies Education. According to the Commission, the social realities which confronted and influenced Social Studies Education were: (1) the interrelationship of society and education - the educational process could not be separated from society; (2) the role of education in the historical development of a country; (3) the impact of industrialization on the educational process; (4) the yielding of individualism to planning as American society moved towards a collectivistic society; (5) the transitory nature of social problems when considered against the historical backdrop; (6) the judgement that a progressive view was best in dealing with current educational problems; (7) education could not solve all social
problems as it was but one social agency; (8) education had to deal realistically with the problems it faced; (9) progress could occur only when preceded by the necessary planning and foresight; (10) a new form of democracy was replacing that of an earlier era as our society moved from economic individualism to a democratic collectivism; (11) education was a product of a particular time and place; and (12) education would lag behind the cutting edge of a society as it moved through history.

The views expressed by members of the Commission agreed on the importance of social education. They extolled the benefits which would accrue to American society if these courses were diligently pursued by the nation's educators. They did not outline specific programs but tended to expound broad goals and calls to action. This stance was to lead critics to label their views as idealistic and impractical.

Aside from Count's views on imposition and his insistence that the school become directly involved in social change, the views expressed were moderate. All agreed that one of the major goals of social education was the development of good, patriotic citizens. Society's role in shaping the school's environment was also stressed, as well as the role of competing institutions. Emphasis was placed on the relativistic approach in teaching and the value attached to the teaching of
social awareness. Allowances had to be made for the changing nature of American society. The day of individualism had passed and social education had to prepare students for the changed realities. Lastly, they pointed out that the schools should make opportunities available to all students and not concentrate on the middle and upper classes.

The dissenters presented their views concerning their reasons for not signing the final Report. Isaiah Bowman's reasons related primarily to geographic education and were not concerned with the Report as a whole. Edmund Day and Charles Merriam did not divulge their reasons for not signing. It can be inferred that philosophic and personal reasons were at the root of their actions. Merriam and Day were opposed to ideas concerning the role of imposition and the approaching collectivism. A careful reading of the correspondence between Merriam and Day revealed personality clashes with members of the Commission which played a big part in their refusal to accept the Report. Frank Ballou made his views known in an article published in School and Society. He was disappointed in the Commission's views on tests and its failure to develop a social studies curriculum. Ernest Horn refused to sign for two reasons: (1) the views taken in the final Report on tests; and (2) the denigration of teacher training institutions by the members of the Commission. The work of the
Commission would have been easier if all the dissidents had stated the reasons for their actions in a public forum.

The Commission was allowed a great deal of freedom in its work and in the preparation of the volumes of the Report. The American Historical Association did not interfere directly in the affairs of the Commission. It did play a role through the actions of the Executive Council in terminating the work of the Commission. The question which was difficult to answer was whether the Council's action represented a consensus of the Association's membership? Judging from the lack of criticism to the Council's actions, the views expressed must have been acceptable to the membership.

When viewed in the perspective of the passage of time, it seems that the action of Beard and the American Historical Association was too precipitous. Members of the Commission directly involved in secondary education were probably closer to the heart of the problem, hence their views should have carried more weight. Many of the criticisms leveled at the Report concerned the parts raised by Ballou and Horn (lack of specific curricula and a biased view on tests and testing). Certainly, Beard and Counts did a masterful job in preparing the final Report, but should not they have deferred to others with greater expertise in the field of tests and testing? The Commission wanted to issue a bold statement, but were not Counts'
ideas on the emerging collectivism a bit strong for a country that still harbored a naive view concerning the political realities of the day?

The reactions of the secondary educators to the Report tended to be unfavorable. Most of the criticism centered around the "frame of reference", collectivism, tests and testing, the failure to develop a social studies curriculum and the fact that the language of the Report tended to be too idealistic and impractical.

The amount of criticism reached epic proportions as professional journals such as School and Society and The Social Studies carried a running account of the controversy. Accounts of the controversy were also carried in the popular press giving it nationwide acclaim. There was also sound, complimentary criticism of the Report but it did not generate controversy.

We have attempted to portray and analyze selected aspects of a major undertaking in American educational history. What did the Commission accomplish? Was it, as its critics suggested, a magnificent failure somewhat akin to Plato's Republic? Most of the impact of the Commission's work was subtle and indirect but positive. Several volumes of the Report became classics in their respective fields. Other volumes were used as textbooks in History, Education and
Methods courses. The Commission showed that it was impossible to develop a unified curriculum on a national scale for the Social Sciences. No group has attempted such a large scale undertaking since that time.

With the passage of time some of the views of the Commission have taken on greater meaning. The country has moved closer towards a corporate society as evidenced by the growth of conglomerates, large trade unions and government involvement in the private sector. Today American public education is in disarray, the object of frequent and bitter criticism from educators and the public it serves. A major criticism directed to the schools is the apparent lack of a sound basic education that relates to all students. This was one of the Commission's major goals as evidenced by the volumes authored by Beard, Counts and Curti.

Finally, there were significant changes which occurred in Social Studies Education as a result of the Commission's work. It was the last time a professional organization attempted to devise a curriculum for the field. Teachers began to play a greater role in curriculum development and determination of school policy. The movement was slow at first but accelerated after World War II. It reached its peak with the rise of teacher militancy and unionization in the 1960's.
It marked the end of the period of collaboration between the subject matter specialists and educationists. Following the conclusion of the Commission's work, each group went its own way. Education departments and teacher training institutions achieved phenomenal growth in the 1950's and 1960's. Lastly, feeling that its advice was not heeded, the American Historical Association remained aloof from the secondary educator—helping in part to cause the crisis confronting the profession today.

There are numerous topics concerning the Commission on the Social Studies which remain to be studied by educational historians. Charles A. Beard and Charles E. Merriam are the only major figures of the Commission to be the subjects of full length biographies. Bibliographical studies could point out the location of sources relating to the work of the Commission. Members of the Commission left archival materials behind which could form the nucleus of other bibliographical studies. Sociological studies dealing with the problems of group conflict, consensus and decision making could be undertaken. Studies using the comparative process could compare American approaches to curricular change with that used in other countries. What was the relationship between members of the Commission and the faculty at their institutions? Bobbitt's criticism seems to point to a connection with members of the
Commission. Was he expressing his views or acting as a spokesman for members of the Commission? The work of the Commission will remain an important part of the history of American education.
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A list of the membership of the Commission on the Social Studies. It was taken from:


COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Frank W. Ballou, Superintendent of Schools, Washington, D.C.
Charles A. Beard, formerly Professor of Government, Columbia Univ.
Isaiah Bowman, Director of the American Geographical Society, New York.
Ada Comstock, President of Radcliffe College.
George S. Counts, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia.
Avery O. Craven, Professor of History, University of Chicago.
Edmund E. Day, Director of Social Science, Rockefeller Foundation.
Guy Stanton Ford, Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of History, University of Minnesota.
Evarts B. Greene, Professor of History, Columbia University.
Carlton J. H. Hayes, Professor of History, Columbia University.
Ernest Horn, Professor of Education, University of Iowa.
Henry Johnson, Professor of History, Teachers College, Columbia University.
A. C. Krey, Professor of History and Professor of the History of Education, University of Minnesota.
William E. Lingelbach, Professor of History, University of Pennsylvania.
L. C. Marshall, formerly Dean of the School of Commerce and Administration, University of Chicago.
Charles E. Merriam, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago.
Jesse H. Newlon, Director of Lincoln School of Teachers College, Columbia University.
Jesse F. Steiner, Professor of Sociology, University of Washington.

345
APPENDIX II
APPENDIX II

A list of the committee assignments. It was taken from:


COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Philosophy and purpose in education.

George S. Counts
Merle E. Curti
Jesse H. Newlon

Materials of instruction

Charles A. Beard
Isaiah Bowman
George S. Counts
Henry Johnson
A.C. Krey
T.L. Kelley
L.C. Marshall
C.E. Merriam
R.M. Tryon

Method of teaching.

Ernest Horn
Henry Johnson
T.L. Kelley
A.C. Krey
L.C. Marshall
C.E. Merriam

Tests and testing.

C.A. Beard
Ernest Horn
T.L. Kelley
A.C. Krey
The teacher.

W.C. Bagley
H.K. Beale
J.H. Newlon
Bessie L. Pierce

Public relations and administration.

W.C. Bagley
H.K. Beale
Merle E. Curti
C.E. Merriam
J.H. Newlon
Bessie L. Pierce
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A list of the volumes published by the Commission on the Social Studies. It was taken from:


VOLUMES PUBLISHED


5. Geography in Relation to the Social Sciences, by Isaiah Bowman.


7. The Social Studies as School Subjects, by Rolla M. Tryon.

8. Methods of Instruction in the Social Sciences, by Ernest Horn.


11. The Teacher of the Social Sciences, by William C. Bagley.


APPENDIX III (Continued)

15. The Nature of the Social Sciences, by Charles A. Beard.
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