The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of Education

CONTESTED IDENTITIES AND COMMON NARRATIVES: A STUDY

OF RACIAL REPRESENTATION IN STATE SOCIAL STUDIES

CONTENT STANDARDS

A Dissertation in

Curriculum and Instruction

by

Carl B. Anderson

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2011

The dissertation of Carl B. Anderson was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Scott Alan Metzger
Assistant Professor of Education
Dissertation Advisor
Chair of Committee

David A. Gamson
Associate Professor of Education

Stephanie C. Serriere
Assistant Professor of Education

Jeanine M. Staples
Assistant Professor of Education

Glendon W. Blume
Professor of Education
Graduate Program Coordinator for Curriculum and Instruction

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

This study is a thematic textual analysis of United States History standards in light of how they represent the historical experiences of people of color within broader national narratives, as well as how they integrate controversial or contested elements of race relations in America into their overall national narratives. This mixed methods collective case study uses a multi-perspective critical theoretical framework to investigate how nine polities represent the experiences of people of color during three distinct time periods: the Civil Rights Movement; the revolutionary era, the early U.S. republic, the Civil War, and Reconstruction; and westward expansion of the early republic and post-Civil War United States. The standards were evaluated on both the quality of treatment and the style of use of how racialized identities were deployed during the relevant time periods.

The analysis revealed that the standards generally construct simplistic narratives about race relations in U.S. history and emphasize rote cognitive skills over critical historical thinking. The standards also typically avoid politics and controversy by using omniscient and vague language and generate a safe multicultural narrative that accentuates the cultural contributions of people of color within a framework of linear progress on race relations. The standards ultimately perpetuate a contributory model of racial inclusion and a normative narrative of American progress and exceptionalism within U.S. History curricula. The resultant compromise curriculum seeks to advance a consensus notion of how race has shaped American history, but its overemphasis on superficial content coverage limits the potential for teachers and students to think more critically about historical and present-day issues of social identity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude both on a professional and personal level to all those who helped shape this dissertation and afforded me the patience and space for me to see it through to the end. On a professional level I am grateful to my doctoral committee for the constructive criticism and encouragement that pushed me to improve my writing at every stage of the process, and I want to thank David Gamson, Stephanie Serriere, and Jeanine Staples for lending me their expertise and helping me to find my own voice. I am especially indebted to my dissertation advisor, Scott Metzger, for taking me on and expertly guiding me through the dissertation process from start to finish. No single person has ever devoted as much time and concern to my professional development as a scholar, and for that I will be forever appreciative.

I want to express personal thanks to all of my family members that saw potential in me and stuck with me through this long and winding road. I thank my maternal grandmother, Dr. Elizabeth Bohning, for passing down the academic gene to me, and my other grandparents for their many gifts. I also want to thank my parents and my sister for their intellectual and emotional gifts, as well as their generous support and encouragement in my lengthy educational journey. Finally, none of this would have been possible without the enduring patience and encouragement of my wife Melissa, who saw the potential in me when it was hard to see it in myself, and my beautiful sons for keeping me grounded every day.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Much educational research suffers from a crisis of bipolarity. There are theoretical studies, which ostensibly interest university-based academics, and practice-based studies, which are supposedly of greater interest to classroom teachers. In the current age of standards-based school reform, a good deal of research geared toward educational policymakers assumes a more technocratic, functional character. Relatively few studies, however, have attempted to bridge these divides and speak to multiple audiences beyond a superficial level. This study of state-level U.S. History curricula attempts to do just that, but it does not endeavor to provide quick-and-easy "answers" that these various constituencies may be looking for to theoretical or practical problems. This dissertation may in fact frustrate some educational stakeholders because it does not advocate any one way of structuring U.S. History curricula, nor does it deploy a specific ideology to argue for the inclusion of certain people or events in these curricula. Policymakers looking for a blueprint for "national" U.S. History standards will not find such a proposal here, and this study problematizes the very notion of such a template.

Rather, this dissertation is designed to help scholars, teachers, students, and policymakers ask critical questions about issues of social identity in relation to U.S. History curricula, and to use this reflective capacity to guide discussions about the role of historical study in educating children to be responsible and active citizens within the American democratic system. This study is a thematic textual analysis of state-level U.S. History standards in light of how they represent the historical experiences of people of color within broader national narratives, as well as how they integrate controversial or contested elements

of race relations in America into their overall national narratives. This study advances the scholarly literature on U.S. History curricula in at least two ways. First, I deploy a multi-perspective critical theoretical framework to interrogate the reviewed standards not only on the basis of inclusion of people of color in the curriculum content but also on the extent to which this inclusion challenges or disrupts archetypal curricular orientations in the social studies. Second, I offer a three-tiered analytical approach that assesses the level of historical thinking in the reviewed standards using both quantitative and qualitative strategies. These two features should provide curriculum researchers with more sophisticated tools to investigate how schoolchildren think historically about contested social constructs like race, class, and gender.

This introductory chapter contextualizes the study within ongoing debates about how social identities, particularly around race, are mobilized in social studies curricula. The chapter also situates the study's units of analysis – state-level curriculum standards – within the larger policy environment of increased emphasis on standards-based assessment and accountability over the past several decades. I focus particularly on politically charged debates over social studies content standards in several states. I then delineate the study's research questions and define the key terms that I employ throughout the dissertation. Finally, I provide a brief sketch of each of the dissertation's six other chapters.

Race and the Social Studies

In 1903 African American sociologist W.E.B. DuBois predicted that the fundamental problem of the twentieth century would be the color line between Blacks and Whites. In 1944 Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal identified race relations as the "American Dilemma" and

predicted that the United States would soon need to confront the paradoxes inherent in its avowed commitment to liberty and justice and its deplorable treatment of Blacks. In 1993 African American scholar Cornel West opined on the pathologizing effects of race in America, particularly in the aftermath of the Rodney King verdict and the subsequent Los Angeles riots. Even more recently educational scholar Henry Giroux (2006) chronicled the racial overtones of the federal government's response to Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans. Omi and Winant (1994) claim that "today, as in the past, concepts of race structure both state and civil society. Race continues to shape both identities and institutions in significant ways" (p. vii). Moreover, note Omi and Winant, "Race will *always* be at the center of the American experience" (p. 5). At the same time, Anderson (1994) contends,

> We tend to acquire meanings about race not out of conscious reflection based on scholarship, but through conventional wisdom that is deeply entrenched in our culture. We believe that we know race when we see it; white people, black people, yellow people, brown people, and even "red people" are held to be various subspecies of a multiracial society. We arrive at nothing short of confusion, however, when we are pressed to define race. (p. 87)

McCarthy and Crichlow (1993) point out that even many scholars rely on essentialized and reified constructions of race in America when writing about educational and social issues, and thus the abstraction of *race* holds little substantive meaning as a unit of analysis. The authors also criticize "the tendency in current mainstream and radical writing on race to treat social groups as stable or homogeneous entities" (p. xviii). The abstraction of race, however, remains a powerful social construct. Nelson and Pang (2006) argue that "there is social reality

to the definition of race, despite its lack of scientific clarity, precision, or exclusivity. That reality is the use of race as a sociopolitical marker for granting or limiting rights and privileges" (p. 119). If racial identity is a compelling social issue, then it is important to ask where citizens might expect to learn about how race operates in American society. One possible answer to this question is in America's public schools, particularly within social studies curricula. Nelson and Pang maintain,

> Of all the school subjects, social studies is the one that should be most directed to the matters of racism and prejudice. It is the subject most concerned with human ideas, ideals, and practices. It is also the field most concerned with controversy and the critical examination of divergent views. (p. 125)

The social studies field, however, is itself a highly politicized entity. Ross (2006) argues that "disagreements over curricular issues in social studies has characterized the field since its birth" (p. 19), while Evans (2004) notes, "To be sure, social studies is an enigma. The history of social studies is a story of turf wars among competing camps, each with its own leaders, philosophy, beliefs, and pedagogical practices" (p. 1). More broadly, curriculum theorists have described the contested nature of the school curriculum, particularly around issues of social identity, such as race, class, and gender. Taubman (1993) maintains that "the curriculum has always been ethnocentric, particularist, and politicized" (p. 301), while Castenell and Pinar (1993) argue,

> Curriculum is racial text, that is, that debates over what we teach the young are also- in addition to being debates over what knowledge is of most worth- debates over who we

perceive ourselves to be, and how we will represent that identity, including what

remains as 'left over', as 'difference'. (p. 2)

The social studies curriculum, therefore, is an important venue for academic and popular

debates about the construction of social identities.

<center>Standards, Testing, and the Social Studies</center>

Although the 2002 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

(ESEA), commonly known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), placed greater emphasis on high-

stakes testing as a measure of educational accountability, the absence of social studies from

the NCLB testing regimen means that social studies may be relegated to second-class status in

the curricular hierarchy (Grant & Salinas, 2008). As of January 2010 all fifty states and the

District of Columbia had state assessments aligned to state standards in English/language arts

for the elementary, middle, and high school grades. Additionally, forty-nine states and the

District of Columbia had assessments aligned to standards for both mathematics and science

across all grade levels. For history/social studies, however, while twenty-three states had

assessments aligned to state standards for at least one grade level, only eleven states had

assessments tied to standards across all levels ("Standards, Assessment, and Accountability,"

2010).

Although NCLB has pushed many states to attempt to develop more rigorous social

studies content standards, the social studies disciplines have largely been excluded from efforts

to streamline core content across states. The Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI),

spearheaded by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and

the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), has enlisted forty-eight states, two territories

and the District of Columbia to develop common core state standards in English-language arts

and mathematics for grades K-12. The CCSSI does include a set of standards for *Literacy in*

History/Social Science, but these standards encompass only reading and writing skills and do

not include any content knowledge (National Governors Association, 2010). The social studies

disciplines were also excluded from a study that investigated the question of whether there

exists a "de facto national curriculum" as measured by state content standards (Porter, Polikoff,

& Smithson, 2009).

One reason for the exclusion of the social studies from the core content initiative and

from large-scale curricular reform generally is the highly idiosyncratic nature of individual

states' approaches to social studies curriculum design. Grant and Horn (2006) note,

> The standards landscape for history/social studies is a complicated one. Some state-
>
> level standards bear strong resemblance to one or another set of national standards,
>
> other state standards draw on a range of standards documents, and still others
>
> represent a unique array of ideas. (pp. 10-11)

This discontinuity in social studies curricular policy also complicates efforts to measure student

learning outcomes in the social studies disciplines:

> Considered carefully, it becomes clear that what the term "social studies" or "history"
>
> means and what is measured in the exams administered can differ sometimes
>
> substantially from state to state. Although a set of concepts – history, economics, civics,
>
> and sometimes geography – frequently appears among the content standards assessed,
>
> the variation across states is sometimes striking and raises the question of how, if at all,
>
> such results might be compared. (Grant & Horn, 2006, pp. 20-21)

The potential value of curriculum standardization itself is also a normative and contested issue. The rationale for defining core content knowledge across disciplines is that identifying a baseline of what makes a person educated in America will help to reduce the achievement gap and lead to higher overall achievement among American students because students are ensured of learning similar information regardless of where they reside (Mathison, Ross, & Vinson, 2006; Journell, 2008). As "core knowledge" developer E.D. Hirsch (1996) argues, "It is the duty of schools to provide each child with the knowledge and skills requisite for academic progress – regardless of home background" (p. 24). On the other hand, Cornbleth (2000) highlights the danger inherent in any attempt to prescribe a national curriculum, noting that "when the student body becomes more diverse, as it has with the increased immigration of the past three decades, curricular efforts to constrain that diversity appear to increase as well, suggesting an inverse relationship between social and curricular diversity" (p. 215).

Social justice-oriented researchers have argued that the narrowing of the curriculum has particularly adverse consequences for the possibility of addressing historical and contemporary racial conflict in American society. Epstein (2009) claims that "teachers who avoid race talk in history or humanities classrooms mis-educate all American youth not just about their nation's historical legacy, but about their ability to change contemporary society" (p. 5). Ladson-Billings (1999) argues that the dominant social studies curriculum's normative Eurocentric standard distorts contributions from and stereotypes people of color, while Roithmayr (1999) maintains that the normative curriculum teaches students of color that their cultural traditions are primitive and backward, while the knowledge they learn in school is objective and historically accurate. Gay (2003) contends that the social studies professional community is essentially

"deracialized," or devoid of any meaningful debate about the contested nature of racialized

identities both historically and today, and that prospective social studies teachers are not being

taught to engage with race and racism in the classroom and challenge the normative

standardized curriculum. Loewen (1995) advances the notion of "ethnocentric cheerleading" to

explain how Americans have neglected and ignored issues of race and racism both historically

and today. According to Loewen American ethnocentric cheerleaders are eternally sanguine

about the role of the United States as a unique beacon of liberty and progress:

> When textbooks make racism invisible in American history, they obstruct our already
>
> poor ability to see it in the present . . . . The notion of progress suffuses textbook
>
> treatments of black-white relations, implying that race relations have somehow steadily
>
> improved on their own. This cheery optimism only compounds the problem, because
>
> whites can infer that racism is over. (p. 169)

As the above analysis indicates, the degree to which the social studies curriculum is equipped to

engage meaningfully with contested issues of social identity is a major philosophical dilemma

for the academic and professional social studies communities.

Policy Context

The perennial debates over whose knowledge and historical contributions should be

given precedence in social studies curricula demonstrate that issues of inclusion and

representation are inherently political (Evans, 2004; Ross, 2006; Zimmerman, 2002). As Barton

and Levstik (1998) point out, public schooling is "a site where contending forces in the culture

try to influence what history will be publicly commemorated" (p. 479). Commenting on

ongoing social studies standards revisions across several states in March, 2010 a writer for

Education Week noted:

> History, in fact, appears to be repeating itself. Many of the issues are throwbacks to the
>
> squabbles that enmeshed the voluntary national standards in that subject a decade and
>
> a half ago, when critics complained about an ideological bias and contended that the
>
> standards omitted key historical symbols and figures. (Robelen, 2010a)

The politicization of social studies curricula has been especially salient in Texas. In May

2010 the Texas State Board of Education approved a series of social studies standards revisions

along strict party-line votes after months of partisan debate over hundreds of amendments,

many of which dealt directly with the representation of people of color and the place of racial

discrimination in U.S. history. The actions of the State Board are particularly significant in this

case because of Texas's status as a statewide textbook adoption state and as the second largest

textbook market in the nation after California, which means that the Texas standards could

determine the social studies content that students will be expected to learn not only statewide

but nationally (Robelen, 2010b). In her study of mathematics curricular reform in California

Wilson (2003) revealed how the politicization of curriculum debates in one consequential state

can have a significant nationwide impact.

Many other states have also fought ideologically charged battles over issues of

representation and identity in social studies curricula. One particularly intriguing subplot of the

2010 Arizona immigration reform debates was the place of ethnic studies courses in social

studies curricula. Arizona State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Horne pushed for,

and in May 2010 won, a ban on courses that are designed primarily for students of a particular

ethnicity. Horne focused his criticism on the Tucson Unified School District's (TUSD) ethnic studies courses that teach the state's English and social studies standards through the lenses of Mexican American, African American, or Native American culture, alleging that the courses promote a "'destructive ethnic chauvinism'" and advocate resentment toward a particular race or class of people (Zehr, 2010). In October, 2010 eleven TUSD teachers brought suit against Horne to prevent the enforcement of his ban on Mexican American studies and his prohibition against teachers using Mexican American historian Rodolfo Acuña's seminal textook, "Occupied America: A History of Chicanos," in their classes. The bill took effect in January, 2011 just as Horne assumed his new office of state Attorney General, and he immediately found the Mexican American studies courses in violation of the law and ordered them shut down. The courses, however, will continue until the issue is resolved in the courts (McGreal, 2011).

In Michigan the most recent social studies standards revision process became a forum for protracted battles over identity politics. In 2006 the Michigan Department of Education was forced to revise its original social studies standards draft after facing intense criticism from both political liberals and conservatives. Michigan state legislators reprimanded the lead developer of the draft standards for recommending that teachers avoid using the term "America" to refer to the United States and subsequently drafted a law ensuring that students could freely use "America" as a synonym for the United States. According to one observer writing in the *Detroit News*, "Department of Education staffers inexplicably handed a gift to culture warriors by publicly explaining why words like 'America' or 'American' were inaccurate designations for even a U.S. history course" (Mucher, 2006). Furthermore, Oakland County Circuit Judge Michael Warren wrote a letter to the State Board of Education protesting the omission of key

individuals from the U.S. History standards, arguing that "a blatant anti-American bias permeated the standards" (Warren, 2007). Even the revised version, editorialized the *Detroit News*, though "one of the nation's most innovative K-12 social studies curriculums," was "still weighted down by the unnecessary baggage of identity politics" ("Drop Political Games," 2007).

Virginia was a pioneer in standards-based reform under Governor George Allen in the 1990s, and from the beginning the social studies revision process was "contentious, divisive, and politically charged" (van Hover, Hicks, & Stoddard, 2010, p. 1). As in other states much of the debate in Virginia focused on the inclusion or exclusion of historical beings from the U.S. History standards. Educational scholars David Saxe and Diane Ravitch lauded the 1995 Standards of Learning (SOL) for History and the Social Sciences for their emphasis on historical detail, while critics panned the standards for engaging students in "trivial pursuit" (van Hover et al., 2010, p. 3). Due to low test scores the SOL for History and the Social Sciences was revised again in 2001, but the historical "name game" again generated ideological polarization. Saxe criticized the Virginia Board of Education for eliminating 62% of the historical people from the 1995 SOL (van Hover et al., 2010, p. 4). Though there was less public debate over the most recent revisions in 2008, van Hover et al. (2010) assert,

> The initial furor and criticism highlights the fundamental difficulty in codifying and representing historical knowledge because the decision-making process about what knowledge is of most worth—what our children need to learn—is a value-laden, complex, political process that rarely pleases everybody. (p. 4)

Washington State has also experienced ideological battles over its social studies standards, particularly around the place of tribal history in the curriculum. In 2004 the

Washington State House Education Committee passed a bill requiring that the State

Superintendent of Public Instruction collaborate with social studies teachers and tribal

specialists to develop a model curriculum for Washington State tribal history, and that school

districts electing to implement a tribal history curriculum would be compelled to work with the

federally recognized tribe or tribes closest to the district ("Students Should Study," 2004). The

tribal history requirement, originally conceived by Rep. John McCoy, Washington's only Native

lawmaker, was surprisingly opposed by many Native peoples, especially "landless" Native tribes

who resented the fact that only recognized tribes would receive coverage in the curriculum

(Kamb, 2005). Consequently, an amended and watered-down bill passed in spring 2005 that

altered the language of the tribal history initiative from "require" to "encourage" to "shall

consider including information on the culture, history, and government of the American Indian

peoples who were the first inhabitants of the state" (SHB 1495). As these diverse examples

illustrate, the notion of a common and agreed-upon American history that can be pre-packaged

and transmitted to students is problematic both in theory and in practice.

Research Questions

In light of these concerns about the purposes, goals, and contested nature of social

studies curricula, this study will address the following research questions:

- How do state-level U.S. History content standards represent the historical

  experiences of people of color within broader national narratives?

- How do state-level polities integrate controversial or contested elements of race

  relations in America into their overall national narratives?

Any study that addresses the history of "race" in the United States must necessarily involve definitional questions. I aim to avoid advancing essentialized and reductionist conceptions of "race" in this study, especially since sociological scholars over the course of the twentieth century have increasingly formed a consensus understanding of "race" as a socially constructed phenomenon (Omi & Winant, 1994). As Omi and Winant (1994) point out, in the U.S. "everyone 'knows' what race is, though everyone has a different opinion as to how many racial groups there are, what they are called, and who belongs in what specific racial categories" (p. 3). David Hursh (1997) complicates the matter even further by maintaining that "we all are racialized, gendered, and classed subjects who, because of who we are and our previous experiences, have come to see the world in particular ways" (pp. 107-108).

Bearing in mind these constraints I consistently use several key terms in this study to talk about how "race" operates as both a historical and contemporary construct. I draw on the theory of "racial formation" developed by Omi and Winant (1994) to operationalize *race*, *racism*, *race relations*, *racial representations*, and *racialized identities*. Omi and Winant define "race" as "*a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies*" (p. 55), while they define "racism" as "a fundamental characteristic of social projects which create or reproduce structures of domination based on essentialist categories" (p. 162). I conceptualize "race relations" as the historical and contemporary manifestations of these social conflicts (and instances of cooperation) between essentialized identity groups, and I ground my work in Omi and Winant's admonition that "the processes of racial formation we encounter today, the racial projects large and small which structure U.S. society in so many ways, are merely the present-day outcomes of a complex

historical evolution" (p. 61). I also draw on "racial formation theory" to define "racial

representations" as "historically situated *projects* in which human bodies and social structures

are represented and organized" (pp. 55-56), and to define "racialized identities" as the product

of "our ongoing interpretation of our experience in racial terms" (p. 60), whereby "skin color

'differences' continue to rationalize distinct treatment of racially identified individuals and

groups" (p. 60).

One of this study's primary assumptions is that racialized identity formation has been a

ubiquitous factor in American development and that it transcends the experience of so-called

"racial minorities" to include all Americans. In this sense historical beings that we normally

consider "White" are also racialized peoples, especially since many European Americans have

historically defined their own social identities in opposition to those groups we typically assume

to be race-bound, such as Africans American slaves and Mexican Americans. (Roediger, 1999).

One could also justifiably argue that at some point in U.S. history most ethnic groups, including

many of European extraction, have been discriminated against or victimized by prejudice or

group violence. In this study, however, I focus on the experiences of historical beings without

European origins, or *people of color*, in U.S. history. Buras and Apple (2006) describe people of

color in the United States as "subaltern," oppressed and marginalized in some way by the

dominant society. I do not wish to weigh the relative subalternity of various racial and ethnic

groups in this study but rather to investigate how the experiences of people of color during

specific time periods in U.S. history are represented within larger national narratives. For the

sake of consistency I use "European American" throughout this study to refer to those peoples

claiming European origins, "African American" to refer to those peoples claiming African origin, and "Native peoples" to refer to descendants of indigenous populations of North America.

Despite my concern with subaltern or oppositional perspectives in American history, I reject a positivistic epistemological stance that says there is one "true" historical narrative and that the job of social studies educators is to combat ostensibly racially biased narratives by packaging and selling ideologically different counter-narratives in their place. Such positivistic conceptions of history, argues Novick (1988), convey a belief that "truth is one, not perspectival. Whatever patterns exist in history are 'found,' not made" (2). I espouse a more nuanced conception of the goals of historical study and history education that privileges the centrality of the interpretive act. As Wills (2001) contends, "Historical narratives always involve interpretation, and always necessitate decisions regarding how to represent historical figures and events, including judgments concerning the significance of specific historical figures and events" (pp. 44-45). This study's purpose is to interrogate and unpack the extent to which U.S. History content standards frame issues of social identity, particularly around race, in an intellectually nuanced manner. This nuance should be reflected in the extent to which the standards engage students in interpretation and analysis of historical phenomena, including the consideration of multiple perspectives and contingencies. Put another way, to what extent do educational stakeholders endorse Segall's (1999) assertion that "meanings given to the past are never objective or neutral; they are always positioned and positioning" (p. 364)?

Outline of the Study

This study is a *thematic textual analysis* of state-level U.S. History standards in light of how they represent the historical experiences of people of color within broader national

narratives, as well as how state-level polities integrate controversial or contested elements of race relations in America into their overall national narratives.

In chapter two I review the literature on racial representation in the U.S. History curriculum and I describe the reigning archetypes of racial inclusion in the curriculum: the *contributory model* and the *normative narrative of American progress and exceptionalism*. I then describe my alternative model of racial inclusion: the *multi-perspective critical theoretical framework*.

In chapter three I describe the study's sample and the methodology that I used to analyze the data. This research is a *mixed methods collective case study* that investigates state standards as organic and socio-politically relevant windows into educational policy and curriculum development.

In chapters four, five, and six I present the findings and analysis for my three cases. In chapter four I investigate the representation of people of color within K-12 U.S. History content standards treating the Civil Rights Movement for Arizona, Florida, Michigan, New Jersey, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington State, and Washington, D.C. In this chapter I consider the perspectives of all non-European American peoples.

In chapter five I examine the representation specifically of African Americans within K-12 U.S. History content standards treating the revolutionary era, the early U.S. republic, the Civil War, and Reconstruction for Michigan, New Jersey, South Carolina, and Virginia.

In chapter six I explore the representation specifically of Native peoples within K-12 U.S. History content standards treating westward expansion of the early republic and post-Civil War United States for Arizona, Florida, South Dakota, and Washington State.

Finally, in chapter seven I discuss overall themes of racial representation across the three cases, and I conclude by addressing the epistemological and political tensions over how history is taught in schools.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The representation and mobilization of social identities in the school curriculum is a perennially controversial and contested issue, particularly around issues of race and ethnicity. United States History curricula have long been cultural signifiers of the dynamic interplay between the past, present, and future of American race relations , as ideologically diverse camps have fought for control over curriculum content (Evans, 2004; Ross, 2006; Zimmerman, 2002). At the same time, educational and political debates about race and history curricula have too often lacked substance and depth, focusing largely on the nominal inclusion of historical beings rather than on how historical social identities are deployed and assigned significance (Rains, 2006), and race talk in American society writ large is becoming increasingly superficial (Grant-Thomas, 2009). In this chapter I examine two fundamental impediments to the possibility of history curricula that address issues of racialized identity with depth and sophistication: the contributory model of racial representation and the normative narrative of American progress and exceptionalism. I then introduce the multi-perspective critical theoretical framework that I employ to analyze the various state U.S. History standards.

The Contributory Model: Bean Counting and Racial Representation

The contributory model of racial representation in social studies curricula is simple but deceptively powerful. At its heart this model relies on simple quantitative measures of how many times people of color appear in curriculum documents as opposed to European Americans. This model framed the 1994 debate over the first voluntary national history standards (Nash, Crabtree, & Dunn, 1997; Symcox, 2002) and, as seen in chapter one, has pervaded curriculum debates in Texas, Virginia, and Washington State. This form of cultural

bean-counting, wherein each politically influential racial and ethnic group is allotted a certain

number of cultural signifiers (names, dates, and events) within the tapestry of a progressive

narrative of American development, has been largely responsible for the vapid political

posturing over what content should be included in U.S. History curricula. The contributory

model, according to Rains (2006),

> Name-drops and lightly colorizes without managing to provide substance, context, or
>
> the ways in which racial issues have arisen in this country. This curriculum may "feel
>
> good" and may even be "politically correct", yet it fails to provide the tools necessary to
>
> address race matters in intelligent ways. (p. 138)

The most insidious manifestations of the contributory approach can be seen in the

ideological battles over the place of multiculturalism in school curricula. Hursh (1997) argues

that the notion of "multicultural social studies" actually lacks any substantive meaning when it

is deployed within a celebratory framework, while Wills (2001) maintains that much of the

blame for the superficial treatment of race in social education rests with curricular and

pedagogical decisions to focus on "cultural differences" between European Americans and

people of color, rather than focusing on the social and institutional conditions that often frame

social interactions between races. Wills offers the treatment of Native peoples in social studies

classrooms as a representative example:

> The essentialized cultural differences constructed in class discussions represent the
>
> conflict between whites and Native Americans in US history as a clash of two opposing
>
> and incompatible structures (because culture is represented as fixed and static, not a
>
> process but an object that groups possess). That is, the conflict between whites and

Native Americans is represented as a cultural conflict, rather than differences in the

power of whites and Native Americans to realize their interests during the colonial

period and beyond. (pp. 53-54)

Wills and Mehan (1996) advance the notion of "cultural tourism" to account for the

prevalence of intellectually shallow approaches to multicultural inclusion in U.S. History

curricula. The authors maintain that cultural tourism "results when underrepresented groups

are treated as 'cultural representatives' and not as 'social' or 'historical' actors" (p. 6). This

curricular model is both seductive and widespread because it allows educational policymakers

to make the requisite overtures to multicultural sensitivity without engaging too deeply with

the present-day implications of historical social relations – "Like tourists, students are invited to

travel to 'foreign lands' and learn about exotic people and places, and then return home to a

place in which these people have no relevance in their daily lives" (p. 6). People of color,

though, have long had to fight for any meaningful place at all in U.S. History curricula. The Civil

Rights Movement allowed people of color, especially African Americans, to claim a much

greater share of textbook and curriculum space, but Kincheloe (1993) maintains that "the

nature of the coverage is so superficial, so acontextual, so devoid of conflict that the essence of

the American black experience is concealed even as uncritical curricularists boast of 'progress'

in the area" (p. 250). Furthermore, according to Kincheloe,

Black history has often been represented in the curriculum as a set of isolated events-

slaves as bit players in the larger portrayal of the Civil War, brief "personality profiles" of

Sojourner Truth, Booker T. Washington as "a credit to his race", George Washington

Carver and the peanut, Martin Luther King, Jr., as the one-dimensional leader of a

decontextualized civil rights movement now relegated to the past, c. 1955–c. 1970. (pp.

250-251)

Several other researchers have identified the prevalence of additive approaches to

multicultural inclusion in U.S. History curricula. Fitzgerald (1979) maintains that U.S. History

textbooks "made many discoveries about Americans during the nineteen-sixties. The country

they had conceived as male and Anglo-Saxon turned out to be filled with blacks, 'ethnics,'

Indians, Asians, and women" (p. 93). However, according to Fitzgerald, "In the main, this

rewriting of history involved no profound alteration: it was merely a matter of adding, of

putting in what was not there before" (p. 85). Zimmerman (2002) notes that "each racial and

ethnic group could enter the story, provided that none of them questioned the story's larger

themes of freedom, equality, and opportunity" (p. 4). Furthermore, argues Zimmerman,

> Despite shrill warnings by a wide range of polemicists, the inclusion of racial and ethnic
>
> minorities in textbooks did not dilute America's majestic national narrative. Instead,
>
> these fresh voices were folded into the old story, echoing a century-long pattern of
>
> challenge, resistance, and co-option. (p. 6)

Researchers have also documented contributory approaches to curriculum content

dealing with archetypal people of color, such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Rosa Parks. Alridge

(2006) maintains that high school history textbooks frame King's life through "three master

narratives: King as a messiah, King as the embodiment of the civil rights movement, and King as

a moderate" (p. 664). According to Alridge these master narratives collectively serve to "offer a

sanitized, noncontroversial, oversimplified view of perhaps one of America's most radical and

controversial leaders" (p. 680). Furthermore, Alridge contends that "when students are

exposed to only the typical master narratives of King and other individuals, they are deprived of a conceptual lens that would help them better comprehend the world around them" (p. 680). Carlson (2003) investigated the mythologization of Rosa Parks within multicultural education curricula and in popular culture. Carlson argues that school and popular texts commonly pair Parks with King as "monumentalist heroes" who must "carry the burden of cultural progress and development on their backs" (p. 47). At the same time, maintains Carlson, monumentalist narratives ultimately serve a conserving function and "play into the presumption that change, and thus social progress, occur in America when people make legalistic or juridicial claims" (p. 49). The above examples indicate that the contributory model exerts a powerful and often taken for granted influence on U.S. History curricula.

The Normative Narrative: American Progress and Exceptionalism

The notion of narrative is central to any discussion of how people make sense of the past. I deploy the term "narrative" in a sociocultural sense to denote a particular kind of shorthand or "cultural tool" that a society deploys to make connections between the past and the present (Barton, 2001). For example, Wertsch (1998) identifies the "quest-for-freedom" narrative as a powerful shaper of how Americans view the origins of the United States. The historians Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. (1992) and Michael Kammen (1993) delineate the normative narrative of American progress and exceptionalism. Schlesinger contends,

> For our values are not matters of matters of whim and happenstance. History has given
>
> them to us. They are anchored in our national experience, in our great national
>
> documents, in our national heroes, in our folkways, traditions, and standards . . . . It has

taken time to make the values real for all our citizens, and we still have a good distance

to go, but we have made progress. (p. 137)

Kammen, meanwhile, describes "American exceptionalism" as "the notion that the United

States has had a unique destiny and history, or more modestly, a history with highly distinctive

features or an unusual trajectory" (p. 6). Furthermore, according to Kammen, "American

exceptionalism is as old as the nation itself and, equally important, has played an integral part

in the society's sense of its own identity" (p. 6).

Both scholars' notions of a unique American character is rooted in a vision of the United

States as fundamentally a nation of one people with a common history. Bruce VanSledright

(2008), however, problematizes the notion of a common American history: "What exactly does

an Americanizing narrative or (hi)story contain? How does *a* story become *the* story; that is,

how is that story authorized? How is it then promulgated" (p. 110)? VanSledright maintains

that despite America's status as a nation of immigrants (both voluntary and involuntary) and

persistent social struggles to negotiate vast cultural differences among its citizens, what gets

transmitted to students in social studies classrooms is often an uncomplicated narrative of

national development and progress. Kim (2004) criticizes unifying narratives of U.S. history for

their failure to address the importance of multiple perspectives and interpretations in historical

analysis:

Triumphalist narratives, which involve a creative reimagining of US history, function as

national mythology. They depict America as a uniquely great nation that has a date with

destiny, a nation overcoming all obstacles on a triumphant march towards the perfect

fulfilment of its founding ideals of freedom, equality and justice. (p. 989)

Epstein (2009), meanwhile, challenges what she describes as the typical progressive narrative of U.S. history, where "people successfully and relatively effortlessly challenged inequality, the government created and expanded freedom and rights, and civil rights leaders brought equality to all" (p. 1-2). Many U.S. History students, despite having to confront the thorny historical realities of slavery, segregation, and discrimination, can always point to the accomplishments of the Civil Rights Movement as a signifier that racism has been extinguished once and for all (Barton & Levstik, 1998; Wills, 1996). As Kim (2004) argues, "A hallmark of triumphalist narratives is their transformation of national vices into virtues and their citation of the putative overcoming of these vices as proof of the nation's dynamic progress towards the fulfilment of its creed" (p. 989).

Several researchers have argued that U.S. History textbooks typically convey an "archetype of progress" when tackling race relations, particularly around slavery and Reconstruction (Anderson, 1994; Fitzgerald, 1979; Loewen, 1995; Zimmerman, 2002). Washburn (1997) claims that textbook authors tend to craft their historical narratives to suit contemporary needs, and so "the discussion of slavery in United States history texts is framed by ideologies dominant at the time of their writing" (p. 486). The liberalization of American historiography to include more bottom-up, social history approaches in the 1960s, coupled with the Civil Rights Movement, forced textbook authors to adopt more critical stances toward slavery. As Anderson (1994) points out,

> Attention to race in standard histories usually emerges when it is virtually impossible to ignore the question, such as in discussions of the constitutional convention, the defense of slavery, Civil War and Reconstruction, or, more recently, the civil rights movement of

the 1960s and 1970s. It is conceived in these instances as the tragic flaw that

temporarily derailed the American pageant's procession toward democracy and justice

for all. (pp. 88-89)

Loewen (1995) maintains that U.S. History textbook authors have typically perpetuated

a "progress as usual" master narrative about slavery, wherein "the United States is always

intrinsically and increasingly democratic, and slaveholding is merely a temporary aberration,

not part of the big picture" (p. 142), while Gordy and Pritchard (1995) argue that many U.S.

History textbooks offer students a window into the injustices of slavery, but at the same time,

students "will not be given a full understanding of the racial and gender discrimination inherent

in the slave system and the consequences of this discrimination on generations of Americans,

both African American and White" (p. 213). Holt (1995) contends that U.S. History survey

textbooks tend to shoehorn their analyses of Reconstruction into a conception of national

development that deemphasizes conflict in favor of social consensus:

> Students will probably emerge with an image of the diverse and competing classes and
>
> interest groups of the United States, who all gyrated around a moral compass that was
>
> homing toward the same ideas, ideals, and institutional commitments. That compass
>
> needle moves ever toward the center of the political universe, and always toward
>
> compromise. (p. 1649)

Other researchers have focused more generally on problematic treatments of race in

history texts. In their study of present-day representations of racial violence toward African

Americans in U.S. History textbooks, Brown and Brown (2010) argue that although acts of

violence that have historically been excluded are now increasingly included in textbooks, the

texts attribute causation for the acts to the immorality of individual actors or groups rather than to the social conditions that supported the acts, and thus the violent acts became "aberrational, or temporary exceptions, in the narrative of American democracy" (p. 57). Good (2009) uses a critical multicultural lens to contend that many high school U.S. History textbooks portray Native peoples as the "first Americans" while simultaneously denying them historical agency and voice, thereby perpetuating a master narrative of American history:

> This simplistic, untroubled portrayal of the first people to inhabit North America (as well as later groups) shifts them into a conceptual box, more specifically, into the conceptual box of the mythical and normative American story. Framing American Indians as the "first Americans" or the "first immigrants" goes further than just reflecting our ideas about national identity; it is active in the process of constructing, constraining and essentializing both American identity and portrayals of American Indian identity. (p. 49)

Lintner (2004) employs critical race theory (CRT) to argue that history textbooks often portray African Americans and Native peoples through a European American lens that perpetuates damaging racial stereotypes of these groups as mentally inferior and historically insignificant. As Lintner argues, "To understand racism and racial stereotyping in America, one needs only to examine the African American and American Indian historical experience" (p. 27).

Researchers have also argued that teachers often unwittingly propagate negative racial stereotypes by deferring to the "omniscience" of the textbook (Bain, 2006; Crismore, 1984; Paxton, 1999). Lintner (2004) maintains that the ideologies of textbooks "can either validate or challenge student beliefs. White students may feel empowered through repeated reminders of triumph and progress, while African American and American Indian students may feel

marginalized through historical representations of subjugation and hardship" (p. 30). Journell (2008) contends that social studies curricula patronize students of color by focusing heavily on instances of racial oppression and liberation rather than on the historical contributions of people of color:

> The lack of inclusion of prominent African Americans often sends a simplistic message to students regarding the nature of African American history. When states only focus on Frederick Douglass and Martin Luther King Jr., they portray monumental events such as the abolition of slavery and the Civil Rights Movement as being the sole work of dynamic individuals. Students need to know that such movements were the result of actions of ordinary Americans, White and Black, and that they sought leadership from multiple sources. (p. 46)

While Journell's commitment to the contributory model of multicultural inclusion is troubling, he rightly condemns social studies curricula for treating American race relations superficially, and his call for greater depth and nuance in the representation of complex social phenomena such as the Civil Rights Movement is encouraging.

An Alternative Model: The Multi-Perspective Critical Theoretical Framework and Racial Representation in U.S. History Standards

The contributory model of racial representation and the normative narrative of American progress and exceptionalism are superficial constructs that inherently inhibit students from deploying critical lenses to investigate the contested nature of race relations and political power throughout U.S. history. In this study I widen my analytic lens to interrogate standards documents not only on the basis of the inclusion of content on people of color, but on patterns of representation across that content. I employ a multi-perspective critical theoretical

framework to investigate how U.S. History standards construct the historical experiences of

people of color within broader national narratives, as well as how they integrate controversial

or contested elements of American race relations into larger national narratives. I am

ultimately interested in the extent to which U.S. History standards frame the historical

experiences of people of color as congruent with or anomalous from dominant narratives of

America as a land of perpetually expanding freedom and opportunity.

The multi-perspective critical theoretical framework is designed to interrogate and

challenge dominant hegemonic narratives and structures in schooling and society. At the same

time, I reject a Marxian structuralist approach to historical and social criticism that seeks to

correct ostensibly distorted Eurocentric "truths" by eliminating bias and restoring an "objective

truth." Since the postmodern literary turn many scholars have problematized the notion that

there is one objective truth about any social group's historical experience. Appleby, Hunt, and

Jacob (1994) delineate this skeptical position:

Once there was a single narrative of national history that most Americans accepted as

part of their heritage. Now there is an increasing emphasis on the diversity of ethnic,

racial, and gender experience and a deep skepticism about whether the narrative of

America's achievements comprises anything more than a self-congratulatory story

masking the power of elites. History has been shaken right down to its scientific and

cultural foundations at the very time that those foundations themselves are being

contested. (pp. 3-4)

Segall (1999) argues that critical scholars have attempted to recast the discipline of history as a

socially constructed enterprise:

Scrutinizing the idealized version of history as a picture-perfect presentation of an

unmediated, authorless past, [critical scholars] have advocated a heightened awareness

of history's literary and creative functions thus, returning the modernist historian from

the objective side-lines to the very centre of what could, at best, be defined as partial,

subjective, and partisan history making. Exploring history as a socially constructed set of

conventions designed to discipline knowledge and knowing in particular ways, these

scholars have subverted history against itself in order to question (and highlight) the

politics and ideologies embedded in the production, circulation, and legitimation of

history, of historical texts. (pp. 358-359)

The historical profession, however, remains divided about the place of objectivity in the

discipline. Evans (1999) argues,

It is right and proper that postmodernist theorists and critics should force historians to

rethink the categories and assumptions with which they work and to justify the manner

in which they practice their discipline. But postmodernism is itself one theory, one

approach among many, and as contestable as all the rest. For my own part, I remain

optimistic that objective historical knowledge is both desirable and attainable. (p. 220)

Despite Evans's (1999) tempering comments the postmodern turn has polarized historians

along ideological and epistemological lines. I reject both a total relativist stance that positions

as merely rhetorical all historical truth claims and an essentialist objectivist stance that

conceptualizes history as a pre-existing external reality waiting to be discovered. While history

is a socially constructed enterprise and responsible historians, postmodern or otherwise, should

be compelled to confront their own subjectivity as scholars, the persuasiveness of any historical

interpretation still lies very much in how well the researcher marshals factual and verifiable supporting evidence to buttress an argument. I support a balanced model of historical rigor that recognizes the importance of factual accuracy while simultaneously rejecting mono-causal narratives that discount the importance of nuance and contingency to the interpretive act. I base my analysis of the quality and depth of U.S. History content standards in large measure on the degree to which the standards ask students to use evidence and consider multiple perspectives and causation in developing an interpretation or argument about how race has shaped American history.

Unfortunately, much theorizing on race in social studies curricula has too often taken the form of hyper-structuralist approaches to social justice advocacy rather than nuanced analyses of curriculum and instruction. Many critically-oriented scholars have persuasively argued that normative Eurocentric epistemologies in the social studies tend to marginalize and delegitimize the experiences of people of color, but these scholars have also failed at times to articulate what their alternative vision of emancipatory pedagogy would look like in practice (May & Sleeter, 2010). Writing from a teacher education perspective Ladson-Billings (2000) argues,

> However seductive notions of critical theory may seem, they have had minimal impact on the schooling of most students . . . . Critical theory's dilemma lies in how to get teachers – who have been educated in and inducted into patterns of tradition and hierarchy that reproduce inequality – to teach in critical, emancipatory ways. (p. 151)

Structuralist social justice approaches also tend to rely just as much on epistemological certainintes as do so-called traditional Eurocentric approaches. Malott and Pruyn's (2006)

notion of "Critical Multicultural Social Studies" (CMSS), for example, is a radical curricular and pedagogical approach to social education. The authors describe CMSS as a tool to,

> Analyze and deconstruct dominant hegemonic forms within a framework of social justice and equity, then to collectively construct a counter-hegemony that creates a critical/revolutionary space where students, teachers, and communities can continue to work and challenge hegemony and oppressive forms and relations. (p. 164)

The notion of "counter-hegemony" as presented here is problematic because it presumes that there is an objective truth about race relations in America that has been badly distorted and needs to be corrected. Neither the "dominant hegemonic forms" nor the counter-hegemony within this framework are necessarily helpful in illuminating how race has shaped American history, and this type of binary analytical structure does not allow much room for multiple perspectives and meaningful debate about controversial or contested social issues, especially around race.

The ideological battles in Texas and other states over social representation in school curricula reveal that educational policymakers have often been quick to latch onto simplistic identity-based binaries to advance their personal agendas. According to this prevailing worldview Christopher Columbus was either a genocidal imperialist or a magnanimous missionary, America's Founding Fathers were either deeply devout Christians or Atheists, and the Declaration of Independence was either a pro-slavery or an anti-slavery document. These false dichotomies convey the notion that there are only two legitimate perspectives on historical questions and, equally as problematic, that one of the sides is "correct." From a broader anthropological perspective Subedi (2010) maintains that "binary oppositions create

superior/inferior or civilized/uncivilized ways of looking at cultural practices and do not reveal

the complexities of experiences that are connected to issues of power and privilege" (p. 3).

These binaries are so seductive and thereby ubiquitous because they preclude the need for

educational policymakers, teachers, and students to challenge their preconceived certainties

about social identities in U.S. history.

A more balanced and responsible approach to social education would be to draw on

documented history to open up, rather than close off, debate about historical and

contemporary social problems. This type of inquiry-based approach, however, runs counter to

the pervasiveness of what VanSledright (2011) calls "persistent instruction" approaches to

history education in the United States:

> The learning-as-acquisition metaphor is pronounced. There are many plot twists, much
>
> detail, many events to address – and more accumulate each day. The ticking classroom
>
> clock becomes the enemy and the race to get through it all becomes both *de rigueur*
>
> and *raison d'etre*. In history education, such practices become embedded into the
>
> teaching culture and are passed from one generation to the other largely through years
>
> of apprenticeship in observation. Hence, persistent instruction. (p. 21)

VanSledright argues that much of this persistent instruction is devoted to perpetuating a

"collective memory project" in which U.S. History teachers "play an important role in

socializing and Americanizing the young, habituating them to celebrating and revering national

heroes who sacrificed much to fuel the development of the most powerful (some might also

say exceptional) nation on Earth" (p. 12).

A critical inquiry-based approach to history education, on the other hand, would necessarily entail problematizing taken-for-granted assumptions about social constructs like race, class, and gender. Wineburg (2001) poses a probing question:

What would it take before we begin to think historically about such concepts as "prejudice," "racism," "tolerance," "fairness," and "equity." At what point do we come to see these abstractions not as transcendent truths soaring above time and place, but as patterns of thought that take root in particular historical moments, develop, grow, and emerge in new forms in successive generations while still bearing traces of their former selves? (p. 17)

A critical epistemological approach would emphasize engaging with and evaluating sources, including the textbook, "as evidence (rather than as what really happened), to identify and attribute them, assess their perspective, and judge their reliability and value in making historical claims" (VanSledright, 2011, p. 13). Though a critical approach to history education is inherently risky because it "threatens to collide directly with the socializing Americanization mission persistent instruction in American history is designed in good measure to accomplish" (VanSledright, 2011, p. 22), such an approach also allows for many potential benefits.

The greatest benefit of what Seixas (2000) terms a "disciplinary" approach to history education is the potential for students to become critical consumers of truth claims within an increasingly polarized American culture seemingly governed by the explosion of electronic media and the dictates of the 24-hour news cycle. A multi-perspectival epistemological orientation would theoretically allow students to avoid the twin pitfalls of either accepting at

face value any given historical account as "what happened," or discarding all history as obsolete and irrelevant to immediate needs:

> While the single authoritative interpretation of the past, conveyed as what really happened, is consistent with an authoritarian political culture, the epistemology that underlies [disciplinary history] is suited to the education of critical citizens in a liberal democracy: It should help them to develop the ability and disposition to arrive independently at reasonable, informed opinions. (Seixas, 2000, pp. 24-25)

By learning to think historically about how social identities have been deployed in the past, students may also be able to think more critically about how social identities and citizenship are linked in the twenty-first century. Hess (2009) argues, however, that most public schools do not actively encourage historically contextualized critical thinking about "current events" related to constructs of race, class, and gender because "such issues are 'taboo' and therefore dangerous for young people to encounter" (p. 6).

The social studies field has also long been mired in an existential crisis about its purposes and goals. Scholars have been unable to resolve the problem of what subject matter constitutes the core of the social studies, and researchers have created and perpetuated a false dichotomy between history-centered social studies and issues-centered social studies (Evans, 2001; Whelan, 2001). We are left, ultimately, with intellectually unsatisfying curricula that lack clarity and vision and seek to be all things to all people (Zimmerman, 2002), rather than curricula that engage students in nuanced study of historical and contemporary social phenomena. A multi-perspective critical theoretical framework offers no certainties or easy solutions to the dilemma of how best to construct and mobilize social identities in U.S. History

curricula. I do not advocate any one type of history curriculum, but any curricular arrangement that addresses contested issues of social identity in history by adopting a superficial coverage orientation and perpetuating the normative narrative of American progress and exceptionalism is bound to achieve mediocrity at best and debilitating triviality at worst. By analyzing racial representation in U.S. History content standards using a multi-perspective critical theoretical framework I aim to disrupt reified conceptions of how racialized identities have been deployed in U.S. history and how race operates today as a cultural signifier.

Chapter 3: Methods

This mixed methods textual analysis is a collective case study of state-level standards for

social studies in the United States with regards to how they represent the historical experiences

of people of color and integrate controversial or contested elements of American race relations

within historical master narratives. After situating my understanding of mixed methods

research, textual analysis, and the collective case study within the methodological literature, I

briefly contextualize the study within the research on educational standards. Next, I introduce

the study's sample and data and describe the analytical methods that I employ in the study.

After that, I provide a rationale for the selection of the three cases that comprise this collective

case study and I discuss the study's conceptual and methodological limitations. Finally, I

conclude by justifying why the study's methodological approach fits the multi-perspective

critical theoretical framework.

Mixed Methods Research

This study employs both quantitative and qualitative analytical strategies to investigate

the social studies standards as sociopolitical signifiers of educational policy and politics. My

analytical focus draws from Clifford Geertz's (1973, 1983) conception of "interpretive

anthropology." Geertz (1973) defines analysis as "sorting out the structures of signification . . .

and determining their social ground and import" (p. 9). In this study I interpret and analyze

how history standards convey meaning about both the culture that produced the standards

documents and the culture of the historical beings that the standards address. Consequently,

the study requires deep and sustained analysis of how a text uses words and symbols to

represent social life. This study satisfies several of Creswell and Clark's (2011) criteria for mixed

methods educational research, in that I collect and analyze both quantitative and qualitative

data, I use each type of data to inform my analysis of the other type, and I prioritize each form

of data at different times depending on the context (p. 16).   I use a mixed methods analytical

approach because neither quantitative nor qualitative analysis alone tells the whole story about

the social meaning behind the standards. I am interested both in the degree to which the

standards purport to engage students in historical thinking, which I assess quantitatively, and

the ideology of the standards that is conveyed by linguistic choices, which I assess qualitatively.

<div align="center">Textual Analysis</div>

Peräkylä (2005) stresses that "much of social life in modern society is mediated by

written texts of different kinds" (p. 870). Bazerman (2006) argues that textual analysis is

especially applicable to research on educational politics and policy, as "written texts pervade

the educational process, the educational system, and the policy and political processes that

shape education" (p. 77). Furthermore, Bazerman holds that "within the situation and moment,

each text also has a rhetorical purpose- an underlying aim that it is attempting to carry out"

(p.89). In this sense texts are also sociopolitical mediators:

> The key to understanding the variety of methods of text analysis is to see that texts are
>
> parts of actual social relations- written in specific circumstances at specific times and
>
> read in specific circumstances at specific times, thereby realizing concrete social
>
> transactions. Through inscriptions that travel between places and between time, texts
>
> mediate meanings and actions between people. In their social and psychological lives
>
> texts are part of complex events. (Bazerman, 2006, pp. 77-78)

Following Bazerman's conceptualization I define textual analysis in this study as an inductive process whereby the researcher engages in a dialogical process with a text in order to better understand its rhetorical functions.

Collective Case Study

Creswell (2007) classifies case study research as "a methodology, a type of design in qualitative research, or an object of study, as well as a product of the inquiry" (p. 73). Stake (2005) delineates the major conceptual responsibilities of the case researcher: bounding the case; selecting themes or issues; seeking patterns of data; triangulation of the data; seeking alternative interpretations; and developing assertions or generalizations about the case (pp. 459-460). Stake further maintains that "the case researcher digs into meanings, working to relate them to contexts and experience. In each instance, the work is reflective" (p. 450). In some instances it is methodologically more appropriate in a study to build what Stake terms a collective case study. Stake notes that "when there is even less interest in one particular case, a number of cases may be studied jointly in order to investigate a phenomenon, population, or general condition" (p. 445). Furthermore, Stake claims that the cases are "chosen because it is believed that understanding them will lead to better understanding, and perhaps better theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases" (p. 446). I identify this research as a collective case study because the three cases that I describe below each offer rich possibilities for a more nuanced picture of how U.S. History curriculum documents typically deploy historical social identities.

The Context of Educational Standards

The increasing fixation with educational content standards can be traced to the seminal

1983 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education: *A Nation at Risk: The*

Imperative for Educational Reform. The authors of this scathing indictment of the American

public education system argued that the United States was in danger of losing its competitive

global edge and called for improved instruction and assessment primarily in mathematics and

science but also in the humanities and social sciences. In 1989 President George H.W. Bush

convened the nation's governors in Charlottesville, Virginia for a summit to formulate strategies

for improving the nation's educational performance, and Bush outlined his Goals 2000 agenda

during his 1990 State of the Union Address. Part of the Goals 2000 agenda was a call to create

national history standards for the nation's high schools, and in 1996 the National History

Standards Project (NHSP) produced the first voluntary national history standards (Nash,

Crabtree, & Dunn, 1997; Symcox, 2002). Social studies content may one day be part of the

national common core curriculum discussion, but over a decade later national standards in

History, Civics, Geography, and the other social studies disciplines are still only voluntary and to

be used at the discretion of state departments of education and school districts.

Despite the uncertain impact of national content standards on social studies teaching,

various reviews of state-level history and social studies content standards conducted by the

Thomas B. Fordham Foundation have been less than encouraging. Finn, Petrilli, and Julian

(2006) graded state-level content standards across five subjects, and found significant

variability in quality between states. For example, in U.S. History six states earned an *A* rating,

while twenty-three states earned an *F* rating. The study assigned an overall grade of *C-* to the

aggregated state standards, and the authors noted that two-thirds of America's schoolchildren were being educated in states with standards rated *C-* or below. Furthermore, the study's authors maintained that not much had changed since the Fordham Foundation conducted a similar study prior to the passage of NCLB (Finn & Petrilli, 2000). The study revealed that while thirty-seven states either updated or revised their standards in at least one academic subject since 2000, "On the whole they are just as mediocre as ever" (Finn et al. 2006, p. 6).

The Fordham Foundation has also published two reviews of state history standards specifically. Saxe (1998) reviewed the history standards for thirty-seven states and the District of Columbia and concluded that "most states do not have quality history standards. Only 13 of 38 standards received a grade of C or better" (p. 11). Saxe argued that part of the blame for the poor quality of history standards could be found in the common strategy by states to adopt a social studies framework based on the 1994 National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) standards, which resulted in standards that were "incoherent and lack direction when it comes to history" (p. 11). Five years later Stern (2003) reviewed U.S. History content embedded within state social studies standards for forty-eight states and the District of Columbia. Stern concluded that "with far too few bright spots, state standards for U.S. history are a parade of mediocrity" (p. 89). Stern assigned grades of *outstanding* to six states and *very good* to five more, but he noted that the standards for the vast majority of states were either *weak* or *ineffective* (p. 89). According to Stern "the dereliction of most states when it comes to framing solid standards for teaching their children about their nation's past poses a major challenge to education reformers, education professionals, and elected officials alike" (p. 89).

Sample

I selected the nine state-level polities in my sample based on several criteria. First, I only include polities that have comprehensive K-12 social studies standards documents with benchmarks and/or grade level expectations and content standards that use a consistent format to provide a holistic picture of what they deem to be the most important social studies content for all public school students to learn. Second, I only include polities that have completed a revision of their social studies standards since 2005 because I hypothesize that more recent iterations of standards documents will manifest a greater concern for identifying comprehensive core content in light of NCLB. Third, I wanted to maintain geographic balance between polities, as this allows for a more diverse and representative pool of historical experiences from which to draw. For example, I hypothesize that South Carolina and Virginia would have a much different perspective on slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction than would New Jersey and Michigan.   Lastly, I wanted to include at least a few polities that both meet the above criteria and also test students annually on the U.S. History standards content ("Standards, Assessment, and Accountability," 2010). This approach bears in mind the caveat that "understanding the growth of state-level history tests is problematic as the number of exams has proven to be a moving target" (Grant & Horn, 2006, p. 16). Furthermore, according to Grant and Horn (2006):

> For the majority of states that implement a history exam, student-level accountability is inconsequential. That is not to say, however, that the test results carry no effect. Increasingly, schools and districts are being held responsible for the performance of their students on such exams. (p. 21)

Based on the above criteria Table 3.1 indicates the state-level polities I include in the analysis. I treat Washington, D.C. as a state-level polity because its educational bureaucracy acts like a state department of education in overseeing public instruction and publishing curricular benchmarks and content standards.

Data

The data for this study come solely from the U.S. History portion of the social studies standards documents made publicly available through each polity's Department of Education website.[1] Although it is outside of the scope of this study to determine the degree of correspondence between what is included in curriculum content standards and what actually gets taught in classrooms, state-level standards likely represent the closest approximation of what Thornton (2008) calls the "*official* curriculum - that is, the curriculum devised in advance by authorities beyond the classroom, which is intended to guide curricular-instructional gatekeepers . . . normally teachers, in planning and implementing instructional programs" (p. 16). Each polity in my sample takes a unique approach to dividing social studies content into disciplinary domains such as U.S. History, World History, Geography, Economics, and Civics/Government, and the states also differ by the degree to which they integrate multiple disciplines into common standards.

Arizona and Florida weave an "American History" content strand throughout their comprehensive K-12 standards documents, while New Jersey and South Dakota take the same structural approach but call their strand "U.S. History." Washington State's document includes a "History" strand that integrates state, national, and global history throughout the K-12

---

[1] See references for full citations

Table 3.1

Characteristics of Sample Polities

_____

Polity	Location	Revised	Testing
Arizona	Southwest	2005	None
Florida	Southeast	2008	None
Michigan	Midwest	2007	7-12
New Jersey	Northeast	2009	None
South Carolina	Southeast	2005	K-12
South Dakota	Midwest	2006	None
Virginia	Southeast	2008	K-12
Washington State	Northwest	2008	None
Washington, D.C.	Mid-Atlantic	2006	None

_____

standards. Michigan has two separate documents for the K-8 and the high school social studies

standards. The K-8 standards include a "History" strand that resembles Washington State's

pattern of integration, while the high school standards include a "United States History and

Geography" strand. For all of these states I exclude from my dataset content standards that do

not fall under the strands delineated above.

South Carolina's standards are "history-driven" and are not organized by strand but by

chronology. The K-2 standards follow an "expanding environments" approach, South Carolina

history is studied both in third and eighth grade, grades four and five emphasize U.S. History,

and grades six and seven focus on World History. At the high school level "United States

History and the Constitution" is a core subject area, although no grade level is specified. I

include all of these standards in my dataset with the exception of grades six and seven.

Washington, D.C. also has a history-driven chronological framework that integrates the major social studies disciplines without breaking them into separate strands. Washington, D.C.'s pre-K-2 standards also follow the expanding environments model, third grade students study the Geography and History of the District of Columbia, fourth, fifth, eighth, and eleventh grades emphasize U.S. History and Geography, grades six, seven, nine, and ten focus on World History and Geography, and twelfth grade students study District of Columbia History and Government. I exclude grades six, seven, nine, and ten from my dataset.

Finally, Virginia adopts a unique approach to structuring social studies content. Virginia's K-3 standards document includes a "History" strand, but after third grade the state does not assign areas of study to a particular grade level. Rather, Virginia identifies several thematic content blocks that are to be integrated into the curriculum for grades 4-12 at the discretion of each school district: "Virginia Studies," "United States History to 1865," "United States History: 1865 to the Present," Civics and Economics," "World History and Geography to 1500 A.D. (C.E.)," "World History and Geography: 1500 A.D. (C.E.) to the Present," "World Geography," "Virginia and United States History," and "Virginia and United States Government." I include in my dataset the K-3 History strand, as well as "Virginia Studies," "United States History to 1865," "United States History: 1865 to the Present," and "Virginia and United States History."

Within the overall dataset I only coded and analyzed standards that included people of color as historical beings. This approach encompasses specific individuals of color, but it also incorporates groups or movements typically associated with people of color, as well as legislation and judicial decisions that particularly affected people of color. The relevant topical

content in a given standard differs depending on the "case," but every standard must meet the above minimum requirements to be included in the analysis. Michigan's high school content standards provide an example of how I determined the standards that "counted" for analysis: "Compare and contrast the ideas in Martin Luther King's March on Washington speech to the ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Seneca Falls Resolution, and the Gettysburg Address" (Michigan 8.3.2), and

> Analyze the causes and course of the women's rights movement in the 1960s and 1970s (including role of population shifts, birth control, increasing number of women in the work force, National Organization for Women (NOW), and the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). (Michigan 8.3.3)

Both of these standards address the Civil Rights Movement and the role of women in pushing for social equality, but only the first standard explicitly deals with "race" by including Martin Luther King, Jr.'s March on Washington speech, and so the second standard, although certainly relevant to a discussion of the Civil Rights Movement, does not "count" in my analysis. That said, classifying a standard as containing content on "race" is only the first step in my analytical strategy, and as I will explain below, the quality and rhetorical style of how this "race" content is deployed is of much more interest.

Analysis

In each chapter I use a three-tiered analytical approach that encompasses the *topical content*, the *quality of treatment*, and the *style of use* of each relevant standard. The topical content axis concerns the historical feature that is represented within the standard statement. Meanwhile, the quality of treatment axis pertains to the depth and sophistication of the

statement, as well as the degree to which the statement engages students in historical thinking.

According to Wineburg (1991) historical thinking means the ability and/or inclination to adopt a

historiographic stance:

> We are all called on to engage in historical thinking- called on to see human motive in
>
> the texts we read; called on to mine truth from the quicksand of innuendo, half-truth,
>
> and falsehood that seeks to engulf us each day; called on to brave the fact that certainty,
>
> at least in understanding the social world, remains elusive and beyond our grasp. (p. 518)

Wineburg also maintains that historical thinking is largely absent from "school history":

> When historical texts make the journey from the discipline to the school curriculum, we
>
> force them to check their distinctiveness at the door. The historical text becomes the
>
> school text, and soon bears a greater resemblance to other school texts- those in
>
> biology, language arts, and other subjects- than to its rightful disciplinary referent. So,
>
> for example, perhaps the defining feature of historical discourse- its constant reference
>
> to the documentary record through footnotes- is the very aspect that drops out when
>
> historical texts become history textbooks. (pp. 513-514)

The primary purpose of the quality of treatment axis is to assess the degree to which the

standards engage students in the central elements of historiography. The quality of treatment

axis includes four dimensions: *evidence-based*, *multiple perspectives*, *evaluative/interpretive*,

and *higher-order thinking*.

I assigned a simple dichotomous rating for each dimension ("yes" = 1, "no" = 0) and then

totaled the score for each relevant standard out of four possible points. I coded a standard as

evidence-based if the statement asked students to read and interpret specific documents,

either historical or contemporary, and then develop a conclusion or defend a position using the document(s) for support. An example of an evidence-based standard is the following from Washington, D.C:

> Trace the development of slavery; its effects on black Americans and on the region's political, social, religious, economic, and cultural development; and the strategies that were tried to both overturn and preserve it (e.g., through the writings of David Walker, Henry Highland Garnet, Martin Delany and Frederick Douglass, as well as the historical documents on Nat Turner and Denmark Vesey). (Washington, D.C. 8.8.4)

In contrast, the following Washington, D.C. standard is not evidence-based: "Explain the characteristics of white Southern society and how the physical environment influenced events and conditions prior to the Civil War" (Washington, D.C. 8.8.3).

I coded a standard as including multiple perspectives if it asked students to consider competing sides of a historical or contemporary issue or the viewpoints of various social identity groups in U.S. history. For example, the following Virginia standard includes multiple perspectives:

> The student will demonstrate knowledge of the role of Virginia in the American Revolution by: identifying the various roles played by whites, enslaved African Americans, free African Americans, and American Indians in the Revolutionary War era, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and James Lafayette. (Virginia VS.5)

On the other hand, the following Virginia standard does not include multiple perspectives: "The student will demonstrate knowledge of life in the Virginia colony by: explaining the importance of agriculture and its influence on the institution of slavery" (Virginia VS.4).

I coded a standard as evaluative/interpretive if the statement asked students to form and defend an opinion about a historical or contemporary issue. Washington State provides the following example of an evaluative/interpretive standard: "Presents a position on the causes and outcomes of the Civil War demonstrating understanding of varying viewpoints of the conflict" (Washington 4.3.2). Washington State, however, also supplies an example of a standard that does not require evaluation or interpretation: "Explains how African cultural and religious customs influenced the culture of the U.S." (Washington 4.2.2).

I coded a standard as higher-order if the verbs used in the statement transcended the "knowledge" and "comprehension" levels of Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1956) and instead required "application," "analysis," "synthesis," "evaluation," or equivalent socially situated processes. The following Michigan standard encourages higher-order thinking: "Construct generalizations about how the war affected combatants, civilians (including the role of women), the physical environment, and the future of warfare, including technological developments" (Michigan 8-U5.2.5). Here, the notions of both "constructing" and "generalizing" are higher-order concepts. On the other hand, the following Michigan standard does not require higher-order thinking: "Describe the different positions concerning the reconstruction of Southern society and the nation, including the positions of President Abraham Lincoln, President Andrew Johnson, Republicans, and African Americans" (Michigan 8-U5.3.1). Here, "describe" indicates that the standard is coverage-oriented rather than analytical.

The style of use axis relates to the ideology of the standard, or to how the subject matter is deployed for a specific purpose. This axis includes three categories: *contributory*, *progressive/exceptional*, and *discordant/conflict*. I coded a standard as contributory if it focused primarily on the historical cultural contributions of people of color. For example, South Carolina provides an example of a contributory standard by asking students to "illustrate the significant actions of important American figures, including George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Martin Luther King Jr." (South Carolina K-3.2). This standard is contributory because the primary emphasis is on individual accomplishments rather than on social relations and institutions.

Meanwhile, I coded a standard as progressive/exceptional if the statement primarily focused on establishing the U.S. as either a nation of perpetual progress or exceptionality on race relations. The following example from Florida represents the progressive/exceptional archetype: "Assess the building of coalitions between African Americans, whites, and other groups in achieving integration and equal rights: examples are Freedom Summer, Freedom Rides, Montgomery Bus Boycott, Tallahassee Bus Boycott of 1956, March on Washington" (Florida SS.912.A.7.7). This example is progressive/exceptional because it emphasizes coalition building and consensus rather than conflict between social identify groups.

I coded a standard as discordant/conflict if the statement significantly challenged or disrupted the notion of America as a land of expanding freedom over time for people of color. Arizona supplies the following example of a discordant/conflict orientation: "Discuss the effects (e.g., loss of land, depletion of the buffalo, establishment of reservations, government boarding schools) of Westward Expansion on Native Americans" (Arizona Concept 5: PO 5). This

standard fits the discordant/conflict archetype because it emphasizes the adverse

consequences that many Native peoples suffered as a result of westward expansion by

primarily European American settlers, and thus it suggests a conflict-based rather than a

consensus-based historical perspective. An example from New Jersey provides a complete

picture of how I coded the standards data:

_____

Compare and contrast the leadership and ideology of Martin Luther King, Jr., and
Malcolm X during the Civil Rights Movement, and evaluate their legacies. (New Jersey
6.1.12.D.13.b)

X: MLK and Malcolm X
Y: 0, 1, 1, 1, **(3)**
Z: contributory

_____

Figure 1: **Example of Coding Scheme.**

The topical content in this standard is the contributions of Martin Luther King, Jr. and

Malcolm X to the Civil Rights Movement. I assigned to the standard an overall score of "3"

because it is not evidence-based, but it does include multiple perspectives, is

evaluative/interpretive, and does promote higher-order thinking. The standard does not ask

students to read or interpret any documents, but it does ask students to compare and contrast

different styles of leadership during the Civil Rights Movement, and then to "evaluate" the

legacies of the two given individuals. Finally, the standard deploys the content in a contributory

way because it focuses primarily on the contributions of prominent individuals to a larger social

movement.

Three Cases

Although in chapter seven I synthesize the overall themes of racial representation across the standards, the bulk of this study is comprised of three separate thematic textual analyses, or "cases," that treat the experiences of people of color during widely recognized historical eras. In chapter four I focus on the perspectives of all non-European American peoples during the twentieth-century Civil Rights Movement. In chapter five I focus specifically on how the standards frame the historical experiences of African Americans during the revolutionary era, the early U.S. republic, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. Finally, in chapter six I focus specifically on how the standards represent the historical experiences of Native peoples during westward expansion of the early republic and post-Civil War United States.

In chapter four I include all nine state-level polities as well as all non-European American peoples in the analysis because during my initial impressionistic reading of the various standards documents I noticed that the Civil Rights Movement does not get as much treatment as slavery, the Civil War, Reconstruction, and westward expansion, so I thought it more important here to include a broader range of perspectives in order to strengthen my analysis. On the other hand, in chapters five and six I limit my sample to four polities and one social group each due to the substantial amount of standards content that addresses slavery, the Civil War, Reconstruction, and westward expansion. In these cases I decided that it was more important to limit my sample so that I could conduct a more in-depth analysis.

I include Michigan, New Jersey, South Carolina, and Virginia in my analysis of African American representation during the revolutionary era, the early U.S. republic, the Civil War, and Reconstruction because I hypothesize that the presence of two Northern and two Southern

polities will provide a compelling contrast in how historical race relations are framed in content standards. I include Arizona, Florida, South Dakota, and Washington State in my analysis of Native representation during westward expansion of the early republic and post-Civil War United States because these polities have historically had a sizable Native presence, and I hypothesize that these polities' varying experiences with Native relations both historically and today will provide a rich contrast.

<center>Limitations</center>

Two important limitations of this study are what I would term the "front end" and "back end," or the "conception" and "implementation" questions. I formally investigate neither the standards-making process nor the classroom implementation of the standards in the nine state-level polities that I include in my analysis. I examine the standards as finished, self-contained documents, though I realize both that many minor and major changes were likely made to the documents on the front end during the revision process and that the degree to which individual teachers adhere to the standards in practice is likely quite variable. This dissertation, however, is not a policy study of how specific standards came to be or a classroom study of history teacher effectiveness but a sustained analysis of "official curriculum" (Thornton, 2008) texts as they are manifested to teachers and students. I conceptualize the standards documents as "texts" in a poststructural sense, in that they do not have a fixed, inherent meaning apart from the meaning that teachers and students ascribe to them. Rather, I approach the curriculum texts from a critical epistemological perspective, wherein "textual themes invoke cultural codes, valued categories, and ideological orientations. Criticism develops extratextual concerns by

evaluating, discussing, examining, and questioning these codes, categories, and orientations" (Cherryholmes, 1988, p. 159).

My critical interpretive approach also recognizes the impossibility of ever fully capturing or reproducing the "reality" of the particular research subject or subjects. As Denzin and Lincoln (2005) note, "No single method can grasp all the subtle variations in ongoing human experience" (p. 21). It is also impossible for any researcher to achieve complete objectivity and separation from the object of study. In particular, any research that investigates how race operates as a social construction in American society is bound to encounter head-on the problem of ideology. Though this study is fundamentally an analytical investigation rather than an advocacy piece, I acknowledge and claim a salient relationship between my desire to see a greater emphasis on multiple perspectives in history education and a commitment to social justice-oriented pedagogy.

This tension between analysis and advocacy is a perennial point of contention in social education. Radical scholars like Henry Giroux (2004) often promote a vision of pedagogy as liberatory politics:

> Pedagogy is a moral and political practice that is always implicated in power relations and must be understood as a cultural politics that offers both a particular version and vision of civic life, the future, and how we might construct representations of ourselves, others, and our physical and social environment. (p. 33)

As Evans (2008) points out, however, the possibility of using social studies curricula as vehicles for promoting social justice through critical pedagogy invariably runs into roadblocks:

Advocates of critical pedagogy are often quite strident in their rhetoric, sometimes

implying that critical pedagogy means the imposition of a rather dogmatic view, critical

of capitalism, militarism, sexism, racism, etc. Unfortunately, such dogmatic posturing,

while understandable and linked to a sense of moral outrage, tends to be quite

alienating for some students, colleagues, and administrators. (p. 22)

Although I am sympathetic to calls by researchers from the "critical/social reconstructionist"

tradition (Evans, 2008) to develop and implement more democratic and emancipatory social

studies curricula, I am skeptical of any curricular or pedagogical project that seeks to impose

dogmatic views of how U.S. society operates, whether the stance is Neo-Marxian, Neo-

conservative, or any iteration in between. In contrast, I approach this analysis of U.S. History

standards with an open mind rather than with a prefabricated vested interest in either lauding

or condemning the standards *prima facie* in a reductionist and essentialist fashion.

Conclusion

This mixed methods textual analysis uses a collective case study methodological

approach to investigate the social and political implications of how state-level content

standards for social studies frame the historical experiences of people of color in the United

States. Educational standards are socially constructed documents that do not have an inherent

or fixed meaning, and thus I employ interpretive methods to engage in a dialogical process with

the standards rather than seeking to deduce the suitability of a set of *a priori* suppositions. I

use a three-tiered analytical approach that encompasses the topical content, quality of

treatment, and style of use of each relevant standard with special emphasis on the degree of

historical thinking and nuanced analysis that the standards promote. Finally, this analytical

approach supports a multi-perspective critical theoretical framework because it values poly-

vocal, substantive, and nuanced analysis of how historical social identities, particularly around

race, are mobilized within social studies curricula.

Chapter 4: The Civil Rights Movement and Racial Representation in U.S. History Standards

This chapter investigates the representation of people of color within K-12 U.S. History content standards treating the Civil Rights Movement. The polities included in the analysis are Arizona, Florida, Michigan, New Jersey, South Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, Washington State, and Washington, D.C. The analysis revealed three themes of racial representation: celebratory heroification, progressive catharsis, and trivial pursuit. I conclude that the standards inadequately frame the historical experiences of people of color during the Civil Rights Movement by emphasizing content coverage over in-depth analysis and by perpetuating a simplistic dominant narrative of American race relations as an uninterrupted linear progression from slavery to segregation to equality.

The Contributory Model and Celebratory Heroification

One of the primary goals of the contributory model of racial inclusion is to promote *celebratory heroification* of a limited number of representative people of color. These "monumentalist heroes" are archetypal crusaders for equal rights and social justice (Carlson, 2003), but the "heroification" process also typically necessitates artificially simplifying these individuals' social identities for narrative convenience (Loewen, 1995). Ngo (2010) argues that this narrative simplification is tied to shallow constructions of multicultural education, as "cultural difference is paraded out and highlighted through isolated 'tolerance units,' 'multicultural weeks,' or 'history months.'" (pp. 475-476). In the name of enlightened multiculturalism social studies educators, particularly at the elementary level, commonly "turn flesh-and-blood individuals into pious, perfect creatures without conflicts, pain, credibility, or

human interest" (Loewen, 1995, p. 19).   In this vein most of the reviewed elementary-level social studies standards adhere to a holidays-heroes-history" model that has typically defined the elementary social studies scope and sequence (Armento, 1993).

The reviewed early elementary grade standards almost universally include Martin Luther King, Jr. in the pantheon of archetypal American heroes. South Carolina expects kindergarten students to be able to "illustrate the significant actions of important American figures, including George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Martin Luther King Jr." (South Carolina K-3.2**:** 0, C)[2], as well as to "identify the reasons for celebrating the national holidays, including Independence Day, Thanksgiving, President's Day, and Martin Luther King Jr. Day" (South Carolina K-3.3**:** 0, C). Michigan expects first grade students to be able to "identify the events or people celebrated during United States national holidays and why we celebrate them (e.g., Independence Day, Constitution Day, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day; Presidents' Day)" (Michigan 1-H2.0.7**:** 0, C), while South Dakota asks students to "listen to literature about Native American Day, Veterans' Day, Thanksgiving, Independence Day, Martin Luther King Day, and Presidents' Day" (South Dakota K.US.2.1**:** 0, C). Florida adopts an especially celebratory stance toward King, as the state includes King in a list of examples that also includes Pocahontas, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Harriet Tubman, and astronauts, asking kindergarten students to "listen to and retell stories about people in the past who have shown character ideals and principles including honesty, courage, and responsibility" (Florida SS.K.A.2.4: 0, C). Florida also includes Martin Luther King, Jr. Day among a list of examples that asks first grade

---

[2] Hereafter for each standard I cite I parenthetically provide the standard number, overall historical thinking score, and style of use code respectively.

students to "identify celebrations and national holidays as a way of remembering and honoring the heroism and achievements of the people, events, and our nation's ethnic heritage" (Florida SS.1.A.2.3: 0, C).

These examples of heroification are not surprising given the pervasiveness of the holidays-heroes-history model. Wills (2005) maintains that "the significance of commemoration in constituting and maintaining collective memories of the past suggests the importance of schools and classrooms as public spaces for producing collective representations and interpretations of history" (p. 111). Though the reviewed standards suggest that King's place among immortal American historical figures is sacred and uncontested, the history of the King holiday tells a different story. Although President Ronald Reagan approved national legislation establishing Martin Luther King, Jr. Day in 1983, the questions of whether and how to recognize the King holiday were controversial in every state and ultimately decided mainly through executive orders, court decisions, and closed legislation. Arizona did not approve state legislation recognizing such a day until 1992, after Arizonans had voted it down in a 1990 statewide popular referendum and earned national rebuke and charges of racism. (Alozie, 1995). Not until 2000 was Martin Luther King, Jr. day officially observed in all fifty states, after South Carolina became the last state to make the day an official paid holiday the same year that it removed the Confederate battle flag from atop the Statehouse (Severson & Brown, 2011). The notion of states being coerced into celebrating the King holiday supports Wills's (2005) contention that "the King holiday, like Black History Month, can be criticized as a token attempt to include African-Americans in the nation's past, a mere 'add-on' that does little to revise or challenge exclusionary narratives of US history" (p. 110).

In the upper elementary and secondary grades the reviewed standards even more explicitly construct a contributory narrative to frame the Civil Rights Movement. While more names get added to the list of significant contributors to the Civil Rights Movement as the grade level increases, the standards typically portray the movement as fundamentally mono-causal and uni-polar. South Carolina asks fifth grade students to "explain the advancement of the civil rights movement in the United States, including key events and people: desegregation of the armed forces, *Brown v. Board of Education*, Martin Luther King Jr., Rosa Parks, and Malcolm X" (South Carolina 5-5.3: 0, C). Arizona compels its students to "recognize that individuals (e.g., Susan B. Anthony, Jackie Robinson, Rosa Parks, Martin Luther King Jr., César Chavez) worked for and supported the rights and freedoms of others" (Arizona Concept 9: PO 1: 0, C), while Washington, D.C. expects fifth grade students to,

> Identify key leaders in the struggle to extend equal rights to all Americans through the decades (e.g., Mary McLeod Bethune, Ella Jo Baker, César Chávez, Frederick Douglass, Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales, Charles Houston, Martin Luther King Jr., Thurgood Marshall, Carlos Montes, Baker Motley, Rosa Parks, Malcolm X, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Reies López Tijerina). (Washington D.C. 5.14.3: 0, C)

In perhaps the most obvious example of the contributory model at work, Florida asks high school students to assess the roles of groups and organizations in shaping the Civil Rights Movement and Black Power Movement:

> Examples are the NAACP, National Urban League, SNCC, CORE, Charles Houston, Thurgood Marshall, Rosa Parks, Constance Baker Motley, the Little Rock Nine, Roy Wilkins, Whitney M. Young, A. Philip Randolph, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Robert F.

Williams, Fannie Lou Hamer, Malcolm X [El-Hajj Malik El-Shabazz], Stokely Carmichael [Kwame Ture], H. Rap Brown [Jamil Abdullah Al-Amin], the Black Panther Party [e.g., Huey P. Newton, Bobby Seale]. (Florida SS.912.A.7.6**:** 3, C)

The preceding standards provide little evidence that these people and groups were working toward very different goals and advocated very different strategies for securing civil rights. These standards collectively convey a simplified and racialized narrative of the Civil Rights Movement that reduces the movement to a short-lived form of self-help for people of color. All of the listed people in the above standards, with the exception of Susan B. Anthony and Eleanor Roosevelt, are non-European American, and most are African American. While there is nothing inherently wrong with requiring students to be familiar with the work of a broad range of civil rights workers and activists, the disproportionate inclusion of African Americans in these standards inadvertently risks framing the Civil Rights Movement as a "Black" movement undertaken primarily by African Americans to improve their own condition in the United States, but with no other manifest benefits to society. This form of racialized discourse also sends an implicit message to European American students that they have little personal stake in the democratization of American society, for as Lewis (2001) argues, "it is often Whites' lack of understanding of their own roles as racial actors that stands as a roadblock to further progress toward racial justice" (p. 782).

One especially prominent example of the oversimplification of the Civil Rights Movement is the lack of historical context that the reviewed standards provide on the militant Black separatist movements of the 1960s, such as Malcolm X and the Nation of Islam and the Black Panthers. While New Jersey requires sixth graders to "compare and contrast the

leadership and ideology of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Malcolm X during the Civil Rights Movement, and evaluate their legacies" (New Jersey 6.1.12.D.13.b**:** 3, C), the standard implies that the major disagreements between the two leaders were stylistic and tactical rather than philosophical. More specifically, the standard does not address the fundamental differences between King's integrationist stance and Malcolm X's separatist Black nationalist stance. This lack of context, though seemingly trivial and benign, serves an ideological function that potentially undercuts critical thinking by teachers and students. The standard creates an artificial categorical binary with King and Malcolm X representing the two poles of African American civil rights protest, but the standard does not ask students to consider the notion that these two leaders did not exist in a social vacuum and that they framed their messages and actions within established religious and political traditions of dissent.

Florida also perpetuates a simplistic conception of social change by constructing a superficial violent/nonviolent tactical binary: "Compare nonviolent and violent approaches utilized by groups (African Americans, women, Native Americans, Hispanics) to achieve civil rights" (Florida SS.912.A.7.5: 2, DC). Florida declines to elucidate these violent strategies, although the state does compel its students to learn about specific non-violent integrationist approaches: "Assess the building of coalitions between African Americans, whites, and other groups in achieving integration and equal rights: Examples are Freedom Summer, Freedom Rides, Montgomery Bus Boycott, Tallahassee Bus Boycott of 1956, March on Washington" (Florida SS.912.A.7.7: 3, PE). This standard also perpetuates an uncritical stance toward history by framing "nonviolence" as the triumphant strategy even though the Civil Rights Movement in many ways became more radicalized and violent after the watershed civil rights legislation of

mid-1960s. King himself adopted an increasingly strident and radical critique of U.S. capitalism,

which he believed created disproportionate poverty and social injustice among people of color:

> By 1965, King's radical voice rang more clearly when he confessed that his dream had
>
> turned into a "nightmare." The dream shattered when whites murdered voting rights
>
> workers in Alabama, when police battled blacks in Los Angeles, when he met jobless and
>
> "hopeless" blacks on desperate Chicago streets, and when he saw hunger and poverty in
>
> rural Mississippi and Appalachia. (Jackson, 2007, p. 2)

Despite popular notions of King today as a consummate coalition builder who successfully

bridged racial divides in the pursuit of equality and justice, in his final years King adopted

unpopular stances by publicly criticizing U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War and championing

workers' rights, as seen in his fateful participation in the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers'

strike.

> The above examples typify what Wills (2005) describes as American society's collective

preference for unifying historical narratives that canonize individual exemplars of non-violence

and deemphasize social conflict:

> It is also evident in the privileged images and public discourse we see and hear every
>
> year as we commemorate King's life: King's 'I Have a Dream' speech, Rosa Parks's
>
> refusal to give up her seat on the bus, and the celebration of King's method of achieving
>
> social change through non-violent protest. This collective memory is by no means
>
> monolithic, but in the hierarchy of culturally available representations of the past this is
>
> the favored commemorative narrative in mainstream US society. (p. 126)

Kohl (1991) claims that "the story of 'Rosa Parks the Tired' exists on the level of a national cultural icon in the U.S." (p. 37). According to this narrative Parks was a poor lady who one day spontaneously got tired of legalized segregation and refused to move to the back of the bus. Kohl argues that the traditional narrative ignores the fact that Parks was actively involved with the Montgomery chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and that Parks's actions were a staged protest designed to initiate the citywide bus boycott organized and implemented wholly by Montgomery's African American community.

Traditional narratives of King's speech also exclude the scripted portion of the text, which dealt with persistent racial economic equality:

Few Americans recall the discordant notes with which King began his legendary speech at the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom. One hundred years after Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, Negroes still wore shackles of segregation, discrimination, and impoverishment. They existed "on a lonely island of poverty," banished to "the corners of American society." The nation's founders had issued a "promissory note" guaranteeing life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to all Americans. But the check bounced when black Americans tried to collect. (Jackson, 2007, p. 1)

Despite these narrative incongruities, the trope of linear progress on race relations in American history remains a seductive framework because it allows Americans both to avoid acknowledging persistent social inequalities and to sit in self-congratulatory judgment of previous generations for failing to recognize the evils of racism.

The Normative Narrative of Progress and Progressive Catharsis

Through the process of celebratory heroification America society has designated Martin

Luther King, Jr. and Rosa Parks as the patron saints of the Civil Rights Movement. King and

Parks represent the physical manifestation of America's "quest-for-freedom" narrative

(Wertsch, 1998). Equally important, though, is the role the Civil Rights Movement plays as a

sociocultural marker, or "cultural tool" (Barton, 2001), within the quest-for-freedom trope.

Although the "Civil Rights Movement" is an abstract concept, the movement has become a

reified cultural shorthand that signifies a short-lived and cathartic "classical" period of

widespread social change:

> The dominant narrative chronicles a short civil rights movement that begins with the
>
> 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, proceeds through public protests, and
>
> culminates with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of
>
> 1965. (Hall, 2005, p. 1234)

During this period most Americans ostensibly acknowledged their past racial sins and accepted

the constitutional rights of people of color, finally allowing the nation to reconcile its egalitarian

ideals with its previous discriminatory practices. Hall (2005) argues, however, that the

dominant narrative trivializes and de-contextualizes the historical impact of the Civil Rights

Movement, precluding the possibility of discussing the movement with any amount of depth

and nuance, or to "make civil rights harder. Harder to celebrate as a natural progression of

American values. Harder to cast as a satisfying morality tale. Most of all, harder to simplify,

appropriate, and contain" (p. 1235).

The reviewed standards include many instances of what I call a *progressive catharsis* approach to history in their treatment of the Civil Rights Movement. Michigan expects eighth grade students to be able to,

> Analyze the key events, ideals, documents, and organizations in the struggle for civil rights by African Americans including: the impact of WWII and the Cold War (e.g., racial and gender integration of the military), Supreme Court decisions and governmental actions (e.g., *Brown* v. *Board* (1954), Civil Rights Act (1957), Little Rock schools desegregation, Civil Rights Act (1964), Voting Rights Act (1965), protest movements, organizations, and civil actions (e.g., integration of baseball, Montgomery Bus Boycott (1955–1956), March on Washington (1963), freedom rides, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Nation of Islam, Black Panthers), resistance to Civil Rights. (Michigan 8.3.1**:** 3, PE)

Among the listed events only the integration of the military and the desegregation of professional baseball occurred, and just barely, outside of the narrow decade-long frame of the classical period that Hall (2005) describes. While this standard asks students to engage in analysis, there is no apparatus provided to weigh the relative significance of the examples, nor is there any indication of the possible connections between the examples. While the standard ostensibly demands that students devote some cognitive power to understanding the origins and outcomes of the Civil Rights Movement, the intellectual focus is really on coverage and recall rather than on interpretation and evaluation.

Virginia frames the Civil Rights Movement within the classical tradition as a short-lived legalistic phenomenon:

> The student will demonstrate knowledge of the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s by: identifying the importance of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, the roles of Thurgood Marshall and Oliver Hill, and how Virginia responded; describing the importance of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the 1963 March on Washington, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. (Virginia VUS.14**: 0, C**)

This standard too emphasizes coverage and recall over analysis and interpretation, but it also epitomizes the tendency among states to designate the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act as the symbolic culmination of the process of progressive catharsis. The standard implies that by finally granting full citizenship rights to historically disenfranchised groups through 1960s civil rights legislation the United States government resolved the race problem that W.E.B. DuBois (1903) had predicted would dominate American consciousness in the twentieth century.

This emphasis on the federal government as the cathartic agent in the Civil Rights Movement is a prominent theme in the standards. New Jersey requires sixth grade students to "determine the impetus for the Civil Rights Movement, and explain why national governmental actions were needed to ensure civil rights for African Americans" (New Jersey 6.1.12.D.13.a**: 2, PE**), while Washington, D.C. compels twelfth grade students to "analyze the development and evolution of civil rights for women and minorities and how these advances were made possible by expanding rights under the U.S. Constitution" (Washington, D.C. 12.10**: 2, PE**). These two

standards convey a top-down approach to history by declaring that the federal government

ultimately drove social change through a spontaneous awakening of moral conscience, rather

than being forced to act by powerful grassroots social movements. The history of the Civil

Rights Movement, however, contains many examples that contradict the notion that political

elites drove social progress. One such example is the 1965 Selma protest, wherein "the

mobilization of black resistance and insurgency begins the sequence, which then provokes a

reaction of southern whites and both local and national political elites, which in turn activates

mass audiences throughout the land" (Lee, 2002, p. 6). At a more general level, maintains Lee

(2002),

> Elite interpretations either neglect or misconceive the principally bottom-up dynamics
>
> of social movements. Protest politics like the civil rights movement, almost by definition,
>
> are sustained challenges to the political status quo that entail the activation and
>
> mobilization of ordinary individuals, from the bottom up. (pp. 6-7)

The limits of elitist conceptions of history can be seen starkly in John F. Kennedy's

record on civil rights. Historian Robert Dallek (2003) argues that Kennedy "was slow to

recognize the extent of the social revolution fostered by Martin Luther King and African

Americans, and he repeatedly deferred to southern sensibilities on racial matters" (p. 707).

Kennedy, for example, appointed segregationist federal judges in the South and introduced civil

rights legislation in June, 1963 only after desegregation clashes in Mississippi and Alabama

shocked the nation and shamed the federal government (Dallek, 2003). Kennedy's record on

civil rights, however, is only obliquely referenced twice across all nine standards documents.

Washington, D.C. expects eleventh grade students to be able to "describe Kennedy's New

Frontier program to improve education, provide health care for the elderly, end racial

discrimination against African Americans, and create the Peace Corps, and the kind of work

corps members are involved in around the globe" (Washington, D.C. 11.10.5: 0, PE), while

Florida expects high school students to be able to "evaluate the success of 1960s era

presidents' foreign and domestic policies: Examples are civil rights legislation, Space Race,

Great Society" (Florida SS.912.A.7.4: 2, PE). South Carolina also perpetuates a historical

metanarrative of political elite-generated social progress, as the state expects students to be

able to "summarize the key events and effects of the civil rights movement in South Carolina,

including the desegregation of schools (*Briggs v. Elliott*) and other public facilities and the

acceptance of African Americans' right to vote" (South Carolina 3-5.6: 0, PE). This standard, like

the preceding two, suggests a causal relationship between governmental action and changes in

South Carolinians' racial attitudes. Social change, however, is typically a much more

complicated and non-linear process characterized by grassroots activism, proposals for

sweeping reform, significant backlash, and compromise on incremental changes (Hall, 2005).

Only a few standards, though, even acknowledge the backlash against the Civil Rights

Movement, and these standards emphasize superficial coverage over interpretive analysis.

Washington, D.C. expects eleventh grade students to "explain the rise of the Dixiecrats and the

Southern Manifesto, which set the stage for the ultimate exodus of Southern Whites from the

Democratic Party to the Republican Party" (Washington, D.C. 11.10.6: 0, DC), as well as to

"describe the Southern Strategy and the success of Nixon's appeal to the silent majority"

(Washington, D.C. 11.12.3: 0, DC). Virginia asks students to "demonstrate knowledge of

twentieth- and twenty-first-century Virginia by: identifying the social and political events in

Virginia linked to desegregation and Massive Resistance and their relationship to national

history" (Virginia VS.9: 0, DC), while Florida expects high school students to "analyze support for

and resistance to civil rights for women, African Americans, Native Americans, and other

minorities" (Florida SS.912.A.5.10: 2, DC).

In the above example Washington, D.C. frames resistance to the Civil Rights Movement

chiefly in political terms as an electoral strategy. The standard fails to acknowledge the social

conditions that persuaded many European Americans to resist civil rights for people of color,

such as economic fears about increased labor competition. A more nuanced historical analysis

of the backlash against the Civil Rights Movement would recognize race as a persistent fissure

within American society. Today there is widespread rhetorical support for civil rights, as it is

socially unacceptable to debate or even consider the merits of a racially segregated society.

Mississippi Senator Trent Lott, for instance, virtually assured his political demise in 2002 by

paying homage to Senator Strom Thurmond's postwar segregationist political platform (Feagin

& O'Brien, 2003). Racial economic equality has been much more elusive. As Conley (1999)

argues, "In contemporary America, race and property are intimately linked and form the nexus

for the persistence of black-white inequality" (p. 5). Conley contends that this economic

inequality is more a function of wealth disparities than of income differences because wealth is

a heritable condition that perpetuates itself over generations, and consequently, "At all income,

occupational, and education levels, black families on average have drastically lower levels of

wealth than similar white families" (p. 5).

The normative narrative of progress presumes, however, that the legislative and judicial

achievements of the Civil Rights Movement established formal equality between the races, and

that henceforth any residual inequalities could be blamed on cultural deficits among people of

color. According to Massey and Denton (1993),

> By the end of the 1970s, the image of poor minority families mired in an endless cycle of
>
> unemployment, unwed childbearing, illiteracy, and dependency had coalesced into a
>
> compelling and powerful concept: the urban underclass. In the view of many middle-
>
> class whites, inner cities had come to house a large population of poorly educated single
>
> mothers and jobless men – mostly black and Puerto Rican – who were unlikely to exit
>
> poverty and become self-sufficient. (pp. 4-5)

The reviewed standards, however, typically deemphasize or simply ignore the persistent social

inequalities that have confounded linear progress on racial equality.

The Civil Rights Movement as Trivial Pursuit

Another prominent trope in the reviewed standards is the Civil Rights Movement as a

stock example of post-World War II social change. Although this archetype nominally covers

more chronological ground than the aforementioned classical period, the Civil Rights

Movement in this instance is just one among many spontaneous and short-lived experiments in

social protest that germinated in the 1960s, a period that Gitlin (1993) characterizes as a

"decade of movements," in reaction to the staid complacency of the Eisenhower era. The

reviewed standards perpetuate simplistic conceptions of the Civil Rights Movement by

attempting to pigeonhole the movement into tidy chronological and thematic categories that

invariably serve to trivialize the movement's significance, as well as the persistent racial

tensions that emerged from the social changes it produced.

The reviewed standards typically appropriate the Civil Rights Movement as a convenient archetype of social change that represents the postwar renaissance of America's latent progressive spirit. The Civil Rights Movement is thus forever moored to 1960s-era youthful idealism rather than contextualized as a series of links in a centuries-old chain of struggle and protest against European American political dominance, a struggle "that reflected not just the legacy of slavery but also the perpetuation of that legacy during subsequent generations by racialized state policies that wove white privilege into the fabric of American culture and institutions" (Hall, 2005, p. 1261). Arizona contextualizes the Civil Rights Movement within a narrative of post-World War II social change:

> Describe aspects of post-World War II American society: postwar prosperity (e.g., growth of suburbs, baby boom, GI Bill), popular culture (e.g., conformity v. counter-culture, mass-media), protest movements (e.g., anti-war, women's rights, civil rights, farm workers, César Chavez), assassinations (e.g., John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., Robert F. Kennedy, Malcolm X), shift to increased immigration from Latin America and Asia. (Arizona Concept 9: PO 3: 0, PE)

While this standard "covers" a good deal of content, it does not ask students to draw any connections between the listed examples or to evaluate the implications of multiple causes (both social and cultural) on how the postwar era radically changed American society. Instead, the standard's descriptive quality conveys the notion that this chain of events was inevitable rather than subject to multiple contingencies. One such contingency, which the standard mentions but does not treat with any depth, is the complicity of the mass media in the shifting public perception of the legitimacy of civil rights protests:

The mass media, in turn, made the protests "one of the great news stories of the

modern era," but they did so very selectively. Journalists' interest waxed and waned

along with activists' ability to generate charismatic personalities (who were usually men)

and telegenic confrontations, preferably those in which white villains rained down

terror on nonviolent demonstrators dressed in their Sunday best. (Hall, 2005, p. 1236)

A more nuanced standard would ask students to evaluate the interconnections between the

mass media, the increasing radicalization of 1960s protest movements, and the assassinations

of King, Malcolm X., and the Kennedys, for as Hall (2005) notes, "The national press's

overwhelmingly sympathetic, if misleading, coverage changed abruptly in the mid-1960s with

the advent of black power and black uprisings in the urban North" (p. 1236).

A more nuanced standard would also ask students to investigate the Kennedys' fractious

relationship with King. Dallek (2003) argues that John F. Kennedy "saw King as self-serving and

possibly under the influence of communists trying to embarrass the United States" (p. 595).

The Kennedys also had an undetermined degree of complicity in the Federal Bureau of

Investigation's (FBI) domestic spying on King's activities, which eventually reached the point

where by the time King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) began

organizing the 1967 Poor People's Campaign,

King was now no longer viewed as a troublesome "racial agitator" but as the most

dangerous radical in America and a diabolical threat to [FBI Director] Hoover's way of

life, his bureaucracy, and his vision of a white Christian racial state where blacks knew

their place. (McKnight, 1998, p. 3)

Only one standard across all nine polities, however, asks students to confront the documentation of domestic spying against race-based organizations during the Civil Rights Movement (Washington, D.C. 11.12.7**: 0, DC**). This avoidance of potentially uncomfortable material limits the potential of U.S. History curricula to engage students in historical thinking about possible connections between domestic social policy and Cold War geopolitics.

Several other standards also trivialize the impact of the Civil Rights Movement. Washington State expects students to be able to explain "how the United Farm Workers, Civil Rights Movement, and Feminist Movement help to define U.S. history after World War II as a time of social movements" (Washington 4.1.2**: 1, PE**). The standard does not elucidate what distinguishes the United Farm Workers and the Feminist Movement from the umbrella "Civil Rights Movement," reinforcing the trope of a racialized Civil Rights Movement that cannot accommodate confounding issues of class and gender within its narrative scope. A more nuanced narrative of the Civil Rights Movement, on the other hand, would emphasize the "gordian knot that ties race to class and civil rights to workers' rights" (Hall, 2005, p. 1239), as well as the notion that "women's activism and gender dynamics were central both to the freedom movement and to the backlash against it" (Hall, 2005, p. 1239). As it is written however, the standard implies that the independent rise of these social movements in the postwar period was inevitable though seemingly uncaused.

Florida expects students to be able to "identify causes for Post-World War II prosperity and its effects on American society: Examples are G.I. Bill, Baby Boom, growth of suburbs, Beatnik movement, youth culture, conformity of the 1950s and the protest in the 1960s" (Florida SS.912.A.7.1**: 1, PE**). The 1950s conformity/1960s protest binary that the standard

advances is problematic because simplistic periodization schemes tend to construct historical

change as a passive and reactionary process (Gitlin, 1993). According to this model 1960s

protestors simply reacted against the perceived restrictive social norms of the Eisenhower era,

rather than creating change through individual and collective social agency. The standard

suggests that students and teachers can dismiss the social tumult of the late 1960s as simply

the excesses of youth culture rather than as historically significant manifestations of

increasingly widespread public discontent with the status quo on race relations and the conduct

of the Vietnam War.

Even when the reviewed standards address the consequences of 1960s social protest

they construct the events passively and deemphasize individual agency. Michigan asks students

to "analyze the causes and consequences of the civil unrest that occurred in American cities by

comparing the civil unrest in Detroit with at least one other American city (e.g., Los Angeles,

Cleveland, Chicago, Atlanta, Newark)" (Michigan 8.3.5: 3, DC). This standard implicitly suggests

that "civil unrest" is an inevitable byproduct of social change, rather than a contingent social

response to deep frustration over social inequalities and government action or inaction. Sears

(2000) adopts a different stance on urban "civil unrest," arguing that in the case of the 1965

Watts Riots African Americans had specific grievances "against police brutality, racial

discrimination, poverty, and other social conditions that impacted particularly on them" (p. 89).

Sears also links the 1965 riots and the 1992 riots that erupted in the wake of the acquittal of

four Los Angeles police officers in the beating of Rodney King:

> The patent injustice of the treatment of Rodney King himself (first his televised beating,
>
> and then his police assailants' walking free) were viewed as typical of a long line of

outrages committed against African-Americans, whether [by] slaveowners, lynch mobs, or brutal police officers. (p. 89)

The Michigan standard, however, does not ask students to evaluate the urban riots of the 1960s in light of historical antecedents, nor does it ask them to consider more recent manifestations of urban "unrest" that continue to reverberate today.

Another problematic aspect of the reviewed standards is their descriptive coverage orientation, particularly on the legal aspects of the Civil Rights Movement. Many standards reference legal decisions and legislative acts on civil rights in order to convey the importance of the Civil Rights Movement to U.S. history, but this material is frequently included for the purpose of factual recall rather than for critical interpretation and evaluation. The standards rarely ask students to situate the factual material that they are to learn in historical context, or to assess the implications of legal precedents or legislative acts for present-day society. Arizona treats post-World War II domestic policy, including civil rights, in a rather cursory "drive-by" fashion:

Describe aspects of American post-World War II domestic policy: McCarthyism, Civil Rights (e.g., Birmingham, 1964 Civil Rights Act, Voting Rights Act, Constitutional Amendments), Supreme Court Decisions (e.g., the Warren and Burger Courts), Executive Power (e.g., War Powers Act, Watergate), social reforms Great Society and War on Poverty, Space Race and technological developments. (Arizona Concept 9: PO 2: 0, PE)

The standard condenses several of the most tumultuous decades of U.S. history into one pithy descriptive statement, and it does not ask students to assess or even acknowledge the interconnections between these examples. Even the sharp demarcation between

"McCarthyism," "Civil Rights," "Supreme Court Decisions," "Executive Power" and so on is seemingly arbitrary.

Although the above standard does not make it explicit, it would be difficult to teach about the Warren Court without discussing the historical significance of *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). It is less clear, however, which of the Burger Court decisions the standard would consider historically significant. If it is important to connect the *Brown* decision to the Civil Rights Movement, then it is also incumbent upon educators to address the gradual rollback of school desegregation remedies that began in the mid-1970s and that continues today. Chief Justice Warren Burger, after all, presided over arguably the three most consequential post-*Brown* Supreme Court decisions on school desegregation: *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* (1971), which found that busing was an appropriate remedy to redress racial imbalance in schools; *Keyes v. Denver School District No. 1* (1973), which found that school district-wide desegregation could be ordered in school systems that had segregated even a part of their districts; and *Milliken v. Bradley* (1974), which effectively negated these earlier rulings by significantly curtailing the ability of large metropolitan areas to implement inter-district desegregation remedies. In these cases the issue of mandatory busing is a powerful example of the perennial tensions between liberty and equality inherent to American democracy because while equality is one of America's foundational rhetorical principles, in practice Americans are free to pursue their own self-interest and change schools whenever it suits them, which works against court-ordered desegregation mandates.

The long-term implications of the rollback of school desegregation also continue to resound today. Orfield and Lee (2007) note that "American schools, resegregating gradually for

almost two decades, are now experiencing accelerating isolation" (p. 2). This series of events

potentially carries severe consequences for students of color:

> The country risks becoming a nation where most of the new nonwhite majority of young
>
> people will be attending separate and inferior schools, and educators will be forbidden
>
> to take any direct action likely to bring down the color line . . . . Nearly 40 years after the
>
> assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., we have now lost almost all the progress
>
> made in the decades after his death in desegregating our schools. (Orfield & Lee, p. 10).

The Arizona standard, however, situates race-based social policy safely in the past and thereby

perpetuates a cathartic conception of the Civil Rights Movement. This cathartic model

presupposes that just as the bloodshed of the Civil War settled the question of slavery forever,

the social tumult of the 1960s ostensibly provided the symbolic coda to the struggle for racial

equality.

The issue of executive power during the 1960s is also complicated by the exigencies of

foreign policy. If it is important to include Lyndon Johnson's Great Society legislation, such as

the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act, in a discussion of the postwar push for

civil rights, then it is also important to contextualize how Johnson's escalation of the Vietnam

War compromised his ability to fully implement his vision of the Great Society. As Unger (1996)

maintains, "The war in Southeast Asia not only distracted the administration and undermined

its credibility with the public; it also forced a reallocation of revenues that squeezed domestic-

program growth. To increase the guns, the butter had to be stinted" (p. 253). The Vietnam

War, however, falls under "foreign policy," which the standard treats as discrete subject matter.

It would also seem highly unlikely that a history teacher could satisfactorily address the 1973

War Powers Act without referencing the contemporary situation in Vietnam, but again Vietnam

belongs to the domain of "foreign policy" and according to the standard it must be considered

separately. As the above examples illustrate, artificial fragmentation of historical subject

matter effectively precludes or at least significantly limits the possibility of nuanced historical

analysis of critical social issues like race, class, and war.

Discussion

Taken collectively the reviewed standards have problematic implications for how race is

addressed in U.S. History classrooms. Although the standards appear rigorous by the sheer

amount of information that they expect students to learn about the Civil Rights Movement, the

standards less effectively promote nuanced historical thinking about how people of color

shaped and were shaped by the movement. The standards discount the roles of context,

contingency, and significance in historical analysis. The standards routinely ask students to

describe or explain events related to the Civil Rights Movement in a vacuum without providing

sufficient political, social, economic, and cultural context for understanding these phenomena.

How are students, for example, to explain the late 1960s urban "civil unrest" without

connecting it to the persistent economic anxiety caused by the Great Migration of African

Americans to the North in the first half of the twentieth century and the growth of

predominantly European American suburbs in the second half of the century?

The reviewed standards also treat the 1960s as if the need for substantive change was

self-evident to the vast majority of the U.S. population. Although a few standards mention

resistance or backlash to the Civil Rights Movement, the standards do not frame this resistance

as a viable alternative to massive social change but as a desperate attempt by a relatively small

group of European American reactionaries to derail an unstoppable, virtually ordained force. This pattern echoes the findings of Wineburg, Mosborg, Porat, and Duncan (2007) in their study of intergenerational collective memory of the Vietnam War:

> The players in the war's drama were stark and distinct: soldiers fighting in Vietnam and hippies protesting at home. Soldiers were unfairly blamed for executing a mission their government required, but which few citizens really understood or supported. Domestically, Americans who did not converge on Washington marched in quiet protest at home. Young people's narratives seemed to contain no place for prowar rallies, hardhat counterdemonstrations, and silent majorities. Indeed, the whole notion of domestic support seems to have dropped out of these teenagers' narratives. (p. 65)

In a similar vein the reviewed standards deemphasize or ignore the existence of widespread opposition to both the goals and the tactics of the Civil Rights Movement, effectively appropriating the movement to suit present-day conceptions of the protesters as the historical "winners."

The reviewed standards also fail to adequately address or even consider the role of contingency in history. Martin Luther King, Jr. had no way of knowing that his nonviolent approach to securing civil rights would be vindicated and indeed sanctified in perpetuity as the "winning" strategy. Neither could the Black Panthers and other more militant civil rights activists have foreseen that their approach would ultimately be viewed as a "losing" strategy that only increased racial tensions. With the benefit of hindsight it is clear that the more militant civil rights leaders alienated a significant portion of even liberal European Americans with their tactics, and thus it is tempting to castigate these leaders as shortsighted and

foolhardy. Such an approach, however, fails to recognize the highly contingent nature of the

Civil Rights Movement. Furthermore, there never was a single all-encompassing and uni-polar

"Civil Rights Movement." Rather, there were a series of smaller protest movements against the

U.S. racial power hierarchy that each had unique goals and strategies, but for the purposes of

narrative convenience we tend to include them all under one umbrella "Civil Rights

Movement."

The reviewed standards also generally avoid the controversial lasting significance of

historical events and movements. Racial conflict over access to political and economic

resources is a persistent theme throughout U.S. history, yet the standards focus

overwhelmingly on the classical period of the Civil Rights Movement without connecting the

analysis back to the legacy of slavery and the political, economic, and social tensions that its

abolition unleashed. By largely restricting the discussion of civil rights to the classical period,

the standards also evade the question of how the movement's implications connect to racial

tensions today. The Civil Rights Movement did not forever extinguish racial inequality of

outcomes, yet the standards convey the stance that the movement allowed all Americans to

finally compete on an even playing field with cultural factors as the only possible remaining

explanation for individual failures.

In sum, the reviewed standards collectively frame the Civil Rights Movement in several

troublesome ways. First, the standards embrace the contributory model of racial

representation by engaging in celebratory heroification of seminal leaders like Martin Luther

King, Jr. and Rosa Parks rather than critically examining their influence on the broader socio-

political context of the period. Second, the standards perpetuate the normative narrative of

American progress by treating the Civil Rights Movement as a preordained moment of progressive catharsis instead of as a series of historically contingent social protests that enjoyed widespread support but also encountered considerable opposition. Third, the standards trivialize the Civil Rights Movement by either framing it as a one-dimensional social movement or couching its goals and outcomes in overly legalistic and deterministic language rather than as a series of coordinated and intentional responses to economic, political, and social inequality. Although the standards are ultimately only a blueprint for what should be taught in U.S. History courses and they do not necessarily represent the enacted curriculum, they must be taken seriously as sociocultural artifacts or lenses into what American society collectively believes is most important for children to learn about our past. As such it is incumbent upon curriculum leaders and educators to take a hard look at what we convey to schoolchildren about race through our curricular choices, and to consider how we appropriate the "lessons" of history for our own narrow purposes.

Chapter 5: Slavery, the Civil War, Reconstruction, and Racial Representation in U.S. History Standards

This chapter explores the representation of African Americans within K-12 U.S. History content standards treating the revolutionary era, the early U.S. republic, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. The polities included in the analysis are New Jersey, South Carolina, Michigan, and Virginia. The analysis revealed that although the reviewed standards collectively devote considerable attention to the role of African Americans in the formation and development of the United States in the century between the American Revolution and the end of Reconstruction, the standards also generally adopt a superficial coverage orientation to this content that ignores or trivializes the systemic context of how African Americans experienced slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. The standards also typically emphasize factual recall and description rather than interpretation and analysis of historical evidence. While the standards cannot be faulted on the grounds of inclusion of African American perspectives, they fall short in stimulating critical thinking about the construction of racialized identities and their role in the political, economic, social, and cultural contexts of these time periods.

The Legacy of Slavery

One of the great paradoxes of U.S. history to the modern mind is that a country founded on egalitarian ideals in 1776 persisted for almost two centuries, until the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1965 Voting Rights Act, in denying full U.S. citizenship to African Americans because of their racial identity. It is thus not surprising that "in post-Civil Rights America, among media pundits, scholars, and politicians, the tendency to view African Americans as people uniquely damaged by their own group experience and culture has continued well into the present" (Anderson,

2004, p. 362). The question of what to "do" about race invariably invites vitriolic rhetoric from an ideologically polarized public. In present-day society the racially coded public issues are crime, welfare, failing schools, and so on, but the legacy of slavery has been a particularly polarizing cultural touchstone. From battles over slavery reparations to the display of the Confederate Flag on state capitol buildings, slavery continues to captivate the American public's attention.

At the same time, Patterson (1998) argues that academic historians have been derelict in acknowledging the role of the legacy of slavery in contemporary racial problems:

> It is an intellectual disgrace, the single greatest disservice that the American historical profession has ever done to those who turn to it for guidance about the past and the etiology of present problems. Indeed, in many ways this denial of the consequences of slavery is worse than the more than two centuries of racist historiography that preceded it. (p. xiii)

Whatever the degree to which historians wish to engage in contemporary racial politics, however, Berlin (2003) maintains that historians have not dismissed slavery as a salient *historical* phenomenon:

> The coincidence of slavery's destruction with the revolutions that made the American republic in 1776 and then remade it in 1861 reveals the extent to which slavery was woven into the fabric of American life. For most of its history, the American colonies and then the United States was a society of slaves and slaveholders. From the first, slavery shaped the American economy, its politics, its culture, and its most deeply held beliefs. (p. 13)

In light of slavery's relevance both as a historical phenomenon and as a contemporary cultural signifier, it is important to consider how U.S. History content standards frame its legacy.

The Context and Ideology of Slavery

The reviewed standards typically deemphasize the roles of individual and collective agency and historical contingency in shaping slavery, conveying the stance that the people, events, institutions, and laws associated with slavery are all bit players in a historical passion play that is destined to culminate in the grand *denouement* of the Civil War. South Carolina asks eighth grade students to "draw conclusions about how sectionalism arose from events or circumstances of racial tension, internal population shifts, and political conflicts, including the Denmark Vesey plot, slave codes, and the African American population majority" (South Carolina 8-3.3**: 2, DC**). Although the standard implies that students are to weigh historical evidence on racial conflict and sectional politics during the antebellum period in order to support an argument, the standard also reflects a very one-sided view of the origins of sectionalism that both emphasizes the inevitability of large-scale racial strife and absolves slaveholders of any responsibility for the outbreak of sectional conflict. Slaveowners did not create the slave codes in a social vacuum; even the infamous 1831 Nat Turner slave rebellion "was not an isolated, unique phenomenon, but the culmination of a series of slave conspiracies and revolts which had occurred in the immediate past" (Aptheker, 1993, p. 11).

Slave revolts were also not unique to the American South. Genovese (1979) points out that "the slaves of the Old South rose much less frequently, in fewer numbers, and less successfully than those of the Caribbean region and South America" (p. xxii). The 1791 Haitian slave rebellion led by Toussaint L'Ouverture was a particularly pivotal point in the global history

of slavery, as "far from passively accepting the hegemony of the ruling class, Toussaint seized and appropriated that hegemony at a transitional moment. Henceforth, slaves increasingly aimed not at secession from the dominant society but at joining it on equal terms" (Genovese, 1979, pp. xix-xx). If sectional conflict and war were inevitable consequences of the slave system, it was not simply because the slaves became restless and resisted the fact of their bondage, thus forcing the hand of their masters. Rather, slavery as an institution was antithetical to what Foner (1970) terms "Republican ideology," which advanced the notion of "a conspiratorial 'slave power' which had seized control of the federal government and was attempting to pervert the Constitution for its own purposes" (p. 9).

Despite the tenuous ideological foundations of slavery, however, extreme imbalances of power still characterized the system and the precise nature of master-slave relationships was highly contingent upon individual agency by both master and slave (Berlin, 2003; Johnson, 1999). Genovese (1976) argues that the typical master-slave relationship was inherently hegemonic, as slaveholders used their superior power to push up as far as they could against potential slave resistance. While many slaveholders unquestionably treated their slaves inhumanely, it was also in the masters' self-interest to encourage the reproduction of their labor force. The notion of slaveholder paternalism, therefore, grew out of a need to justify an exploitative economic relationship. Despite efforts by Genovese and other social historians to humanize the slavery issue, however, the standards typically perpetuate a historical narrative of slavery completely lacking in agency.

The reviewed standards are also vague about slavery's ideological and political underpinnings. Michigan expects students to "explain the ideology of the institution of slavery,

its policies, and consequences" (Michigan 8-U4.2.2: 0, PE). This standard conveys the notion

that the nuance and complexity of arguably the most enigmatic institution in U.S. history can be

explained in a terse synopsis. Hundreds of volumes have been written about the ideology of

slavery alone, yet the standard implies that there is a preeminent catchall explanation.

Michigan also asks students to "describe the issues over representation and slavery the Framers

faced at the Constitutional Convention and how they were addressed in the Constitution (Great

Compromise, Three-Fifths Compromise)" (Michigan 5-U3.3.4: 0, PE). Neither of the above

standards say anything about how individuals shaped the ideology, policies, and consequences

of slavery. The standards depersonalize the institution of slavery, framing it as a temporary

political inconvenience rather than as a deeply entrenched system that affected every aspect of

American life.

Slavery as an institution was of course both persistent and deeply personal, however, as

the events of 1857 reveal. That year the U.S. Supreme Court, led by Chief Justice Roger B.

Taney, declared in the infamous *Dred Scott v. Sanford* (1857) decision that under the U.S.

Constitution African Americans were not citizens and thus could not legally claim any

citizenship rights, such as the right to sue in court. Taney held furthermore that the

Constitution affirmed the right to property in slaves and that slaveholders could legally bring

them into federal territories. The Dred Scott decision, while bitterly contested at the time by

radical abolitionists, was controversial mainly because of its implications for territorial

settlement. The vast majority of the European American population at the time did not

disagree with Taney's notion that African Americans were an inferior race and thus should not

reap the benefits of political and social equality. Seventy years after the U.S. Constitution was

enacted slavery was still deeply entrenched and the notion of full African American citizenship would still have been considered preposterous to most Americans (Foner, 2010).

Simplistic portrayals of slavery are especially evident in South Carolina's standards. South Carolina expects students to "illustrate how the ideals of equality as described in the Declaration of Independence were slow to take hold as evident in the Three-Fifths Compromise and the Fugitive Slave Acts" (South Carolina 4-4.6: 0, DC). As seen in the Dred Scott case and in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), which upheld the constitutionality of legalized segregation under the "separate but equal" doctrine, the notion of full equality for African Americans was more than "slow to take hold." As late as 1948 South Carolina's own native son, Governor Strom Thurmond, ran for the Dixiecrat presidential nomination on an explicitly segregationist platform. The revolutionary ideals outlined in the Declaration of Independence were also "slow to take hold" precisely because so many propertied and wealthy individuals, North and South, derived tremendous economic and political benefits from subjugating various sub-segments of the population, especially African Americans. As Berlin (2003) maintains, "Slavery was nothing if not resilient. It not only survived the egalitarian forces unleashed in the Age of Revolution but also grew strong on them" (p. 11).

Slavery was never just an academic issue of "representation" or the degree to which slaves should "count" as human beings; if nothing else, slavery fundamentally shaped the early American economy. Staple crops like tobacco, rice, sugar, and cotton "allowed slaveholding planters a large place in the establishment of the new federal government in 1787, as planters were quick to translate their economic power into political power" (Berlin, 2003, p. 13). Slaveholders could place relative values on slaves not as individuals but as commodities, and so

questions about identity were necessarily questions about political economics and exchange

value. Genovese (1969) contends that slaveholding ideology was not monolithic but highly

contingent upon specific circumstances, as "the immediate social and economic context –

residency or absenteeism of the planters, degree of acculturation of the blacks, nature of the

crop, level of technology, type of market mechanism, and locus of political power – provided

special qualities in each case" (p. 4).

Religion and morality were also important factors in slaveholding ideology, though the

reviewed standards generally ignore their influence. Genovese (1976) argues that slaveholders

were not uniformly moral reprobates who took delight in subjugating an entire race of people,

as "for a complex of reasons of self-interest, common humanity, and Christian sensibility,

[slaveholders] could not help contributing to their slaves' creative survival" (p. xvi). Despite

evidence that many slaveholders believed that Christian paternalism was reconcilable with

republican virtue, however, the slave system had many pernicious human consequences,

particularly as manifested through the domestic slave trade:

> In the seven decades between the Constitution and the Civil War, approximately one
>
> million enslaved people were relocated from the upper South to the lower South
>
> according to the dictates of the slaveholders' economy, two thirds of these through a
>
> pattern of commerce that soon became institutionalized as the domestic slave trade.
>
> (Johnson, 1999, p. 5)

Not one standard across all four polities, however, references the domestic slave trade or

acknowledges that internal traders continued to treat slaves as disposable commodities once

they were inside of the United States, and well after the banning of the African Slave Trade in

1808. Whether or not the domestic slave trade was an aberration within the overall system, the consequences of treating human beings "in the quest for profit, as transparently fungible" (Baptist, 2001, p. 1630) were devastating:

> The relations of reproduction enshrined in the slave South's law, custom, and political economy succeeded in selling human beings as goods on a market. Mothers, fathers, children, spouses, siblings, lovers, and friends could cajole, plead, and threaten in efforts to prevent the brutal division of human relationships. The history told by ex-slaves, however, contains many more separations than cases in which such pleading worked. (Baptist, 2001, pp. 1630-1631)

Baptist's (2001) reference to slave narratives points up another tension within the literature on slavery that speaks to issues of voice and authenticity in historical analysis. Johnson (1999) notes,

> In proslavery responses to the narratives, which were taken up by early historians of slavery like Ulrich B. Phillips, the narratives were treated as politically interested fabrications and were dismissed according to one of the most durable paradoxes of white supremacy – the idea that those who are closest to an experience of oppression (in this case, former slaves) are its least credible witnesses. (p. 9)

While one could potentially raise a host of questions about the value of slave narratives as historical sources, the reviewed standards do not even consider them worthy of consideration or debate. This lack of attention to issues of voice and authenticity pervades the standards' treatment of slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction. Only one standard across all four polities specifically asks students to read and interpret a primary source, as Michigan expects

students to "use case studies or stories to describe the ideas and actions of individuals involved

in the Underground Railroad in Michigan and in the Great Lakes region" **(**Michigan 4-H3.0.7**:** 1,

C). Many standards are loosely evidence-based in that they ask students to interpret or

evaluate specific legislation or judicial decisions, but there is no stated expectation that

students will engage with documents aside from what they supposedly are to glean from their

textbooks, which represent at best secondary and more likely tertiary sources.

The reviewed standards' lack of attention to historical evidence denies students the

opportunity to engage in what Wineburg (1991) calls the "sourcing heuristic," in which readers

of primary documents analyze the subtext, or the "hidden and latent meanings" (p. 498) of a

historical source. Wineburg contends that this ability to engage with documents at a deeper

level is one of the hallmarks of historical thinking, but the reviewed standards collectively

devote much greater weight to perfunctory cognitive processes like summary, explanation, and

description than they do to interpretation, analysis, and evaluation. South Carolina asks

students to "summarize the institution of slavery prior to the Civil War, including reference to

conditions in South Carolina, the invention of the cotton gin, subsequent expansion of slavery,

and economic dependence on slavery" (South Carolina 3-4.2**:** 0, PE). This standard suggests

that South Carolina and ostensibly other slave states were geographically and economically

isolated to the point where they were forced to rely on slavery for self-preservation, and thus it

was self-evident that slavery interests would seek to expand the institution. This deterministic

stance, however, undervalues the power that the Deep South wielded in the global economy. If

anything, the standard reverses the relationship of dependency, for Northern manufacturing

interests, and particularly the textile industry, were completely dependent on Southern cotton

production for their viability. The same relationship of dependency also existed between the

Deep South and British manufacturing interests, as seen in the Civil war strategy devised by

Jefferson Davis to hold out long enough to win British recognition of the Confederacy (Foner,

2010). The South Carolina standard, however, portrays the slave South as a victim of

circumstances beyond its control rather than as a powerful economic and political bloc.

Virginia also adopts a content coverage approach to engaging the major events of post-

Revolutionary and antebellum America:

> The student will demonstrate knowledge of the major events from the last decade of
>
> the eighteenth century through the first half of the nineteenth century by: describing
>
> the cultural, economic, and political issues that divided the nation, including tariffs,
>
> slavery, the abolitionist and women's suffrage movements, and the role of the states in
>
> the Union. (Virginia VUS.6**:** 0, PE)

While the standard recognizes the place of multiple causation in history, it asks students

neither to analyze the interconnectedness of these issues nor to evaluate the lasting

significance of these issues for the nation's development. One could make a case, on the other

hand, that slavery was the catalyst for all of the other identified issues. Sinha (2000) argues

that the nullification of federal tariffs and the doctrine of states' rights had everything to do

with slavery:

> Carolinian planter politicians' attempt to nullify federal tariff laws encompassed a
>
> rousing vindication of slavery and the interests of a slaveholding minority in a
>
> democratic republic. The Carolina doctrine of nullification was the political expression
>
> of a self-conscious and assertive slaveholding planter class that deviated significantly

from the republican heritage of the country and the growing democratization of

national politics. (p. 10)

The abolitionist and women's suffrage movements also shared similar emancipatory

goals, whether freedom from the literal bondage that slavery represented or freedom from the

metaphorical domestic bondage that many nineteenth-century women's rights advocates

perceived:

> The rhetorics of the two reforms meet upon the recognition that for both women and
>
> blacks it is their physical difference from the cultural norms of white masculinity that
>
> obstructs their claim to personhood. Thus the social and political goals of both
>
> feminism and abolition depend upon an act of representation, the inscription of black
>
> and female bodies into the discourses of personhood. (Sánchez-Eppler, 1988, p. 29)

The Virginia standard, however, frames "tariffs, slavery, the abolitionist and women's suffrage

movements, and the role of the states in the Union" as discrete entities that can each be

described or explained independent of the other factors. In contrast, slavery was not just a

representative example of a divisive political issue in antebellum America but the primary

shaper of that political (and economic) atmosphere.

<div align="center">The Abolitionist Movement</div>

The reviewed standards that treat the abolitionist movement focus primarily on the

contributions of a few representative African Americans toward fulfilling America's

revolutionary egalitarian promise. The standards endorse "celebratory heroification" (Loewen,

1995) of well-known nineteenth-century African Americans like Frederick Douglass, Harriet

Tubman, and Sojourner Truth, who invariably become stock "monumentalist heroes" (Carlson,

2003) fighting for racial justice and a unified country alongside sympathetic European

Americans. South Carolina expects students to be able to "summarize the roles and

accomplishments of the leaders of the abolitionist movement and the Underground Railroad

before and during the Civil War, including those of Harriet Tubman, John Brown, Frederick

Douglass, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Sojourner Truth, and William Lloyd Garrison" (South Carolina

4-6.2**:** 1, C). This standard suggests a "potluck" approach to the abolitionist movement, in that

each of these leaders ostensibly made their own unique offering to a coherent whole. The

standard also conveys the notion that the abolitionist movement enjoyed widespread public

support and that no reasonable person could have opposed its aims given the endorsement of

these prominent figures.

Fundamental fissures existed, however, within the abolitionist movement over both

goals and tactics. Although Frederick Douglass considered William Lloyd Garrison to be his

mentor in the abolitionist cause, Douglass eventually broke off from the Garrisonian wing of the

movement and started his own abolitionist newspaper. McFeely (1991) notes that while

Douglass desired to unite the abolitionist movement to further a common cause,

> The Garrisonians, despite their official secularism, regarded any deviation from their
>
> leadership as heresy: theirs was the only way; all others were wrong. They left no room
>
> for the view that all who were opposed to slavery were engaged in one united
>
> enterprise. (p. 175)

Douglass's relationship with John Brown was also complex. While "for Douglass, any scheme

for getting rid of slavery was worth hearing about; any foe of slavery was worthy of friendship –

and certainly one as wholly committed to the cause as Brown was" (McFeely, 1991, p. 187), Douglass had deep reservations about Brown's motivations and methods:

> Less appealing was Brown's obsession with being the black bondsmen's savior, their Moses leading his people out of bondage and into a black mountain kingdom that would, somehow, float free of its mooring in the Appalachian Mountains of the slaveholding South. And violence was not then, or ever after, absent from his mind. Brown was consummately a warrior. (McFeely, 1991, p. 187)

Despite the well-documented internal discord within the umbrella abolitionist movement, the reviewed standards convey the message that the only salient differences between abolitionist leaders were over tactical issues. Michigan asks students to,

> Describe the formation and development of the abolitionist movement by considering the roles of key abolitionist leaders (e.g., John Brown and the armed resistance, Harriet Tubman and the Underground Railroad, Sojourner Truth, William Lloyd Garrison, and Frederick Douglass), and the response of southerners and northerners to the abolitionist movement. (Michigan 8-U4.3.2: 1, C)

The standard portrays the abolitionist movement as fundamentally uni-polar. According to this one-dimensional construction John Brown and Harriet Tubman may have had very different notions of resistance, but they each foresaw the same end result of peace and brotherhood between the races.

Abolitionists, however, disagreed profoundly about the movement's ends. Many African American abolitionists believed that the only way to achieve true freedom for slaves was through emigration to Africa, a position which even Abraham Lincoln favored for most of

his political life (Foner, 2010). Stauffer (2008) notes that "many blacks endorsed the idea of emigration and agreed with Lincoln that in America blacks and whites could not live together harmoniously" (p. 266). On the other hand, Frederick Douglass vehemently disagreed with African emigration. Colaiaco (2006) contends that throughout his public life "Douglass remained a committed integrationist, insisting that blacks should not abandon American and its ideals" (p. 3). None of the standards in my sample, however, mention the notion of African emigration. Rather, the reviewed standards generally take for granted that all abolitionists advocated political and social equality between races.

Even Douglass, despite his commitment to racial equality, was not naïve enough to believe that his vision would easily be realized once racist European Americans realized the depths of their depravity. Stauffer (2008) argues that "as Douglass well knew, some conservatives endorsed racist policies but treated blacks with respect when interacting with them. And some abolitionists were haughty and patronizing toward blacks. Political beliefs did not necessarily correlate with personal behavior" (p. 285). Douglass's personal knowledge of European Americans' frequently duplicitous behavior toward African Americans caused him to harshly criticize Lincoln's Reconstruction policies, especially his refusal to endorse African American suffrage, for appeasing Southern interests and consequently enabling further African American subjugation. The above examples indicate that that the abolitionist movement was an incredibly complicated entity, but the reviewed standards' penchant for reducing its meaning and aims into a tidy narrative of consensus potentially limits teachers' and students' ability to conceptualize the abolitionist movement as a multilayered and contested aspect of nineteenth century U.S. society.

The Civil War and Reconstruction

While the reviewed standards acknowledge the unique roles that African Americans played during the Civil War and Reconstruction eras in U.S. history, they frequently deploy African Americans as historical ciphers in order to perpetuate nostalgic images of a nation untroubled by racial conflict. Much of this discourse, especially in the South Carolina standards, reflects the "Lost Cause" narrative of "a glorious, organic civilization destroyed by an avaricious 'industrial society' determined to wipe out its cultural foes" (Blight, 2001, p. 257). Blight (2001) characterizes the Lost Cause as a series of nostalgic rationalizations for slavery and the antebellum Southern way of life, and he highlights the pivotal role that the mythical doctrine played in framing the national memory of the Civil War and Reconstruction periods:

> A reunited America arose pure, guiltless, and assured that the deep conflicts in its past had been imposed upon it by otherworldly forces. The side that lost was especially assured that that its cause was true and good. One of the ideas the reconciliationist Lost Cause instilled deeply into the national culture is that even when Americans lose, they win. (pp. 283-284)

This Lost Cause trope can be seen clearly in South Carolina's standards. South Carolina expects students to be able to "explain the reasons for South Carolina's secession from the Union, including the abolitionist movement, states' rights, and the desire to defend South Carolina's way of life" (South Carolina 3-4.3: 0, PE). The standard employs the euphemistic language of "states' rights" and "South Carolina's way of life" in order to deemphasize South Carolina's deliberate agency in seceding from the Union. Faust (1988) argues, by contrast, that South Carolina's act of secession represented a purposeful initial attempt to propagate an

ideology of Southern nationalism, which would eventually become "Confederate Nationalism"

after the Confederacy was formally established. South Carolina knew that it could not carry out

and sustain a successful rebellion on its own, so it had to appeal to more generalizable notions

of "states' rights" in order to gain support not only from slavery interests throughout the Deep

South, but also from non-slaveholding Southern European Americans. Consequently, maintains

Faust, "The formation of this new national ideology was thus inescapably a political and social

act, incorporating both the powerful and the comparatively powerless into a negotiation of the

terms under which all might work together for the Confederate cause" (p. 7).

Despite the evidence of Southern agency in causing the Civil War, however, South

Carolina constructs a narrative of Northern agitation to account for the aftermath of the Civil

War:

> Summarize the events and the process that led to the ratification of South Carolina's
>
> constitution of 1868, including African American representation in the constitutional
>
> convention; the major provisions of the constitution; and the political and social
>
> changes that allowed African Americans, Northerners, "carpetbaggers," and "scalawags"
>
> to play a part in South Carolina state government. (South Carolina 8-4.3: 0, PE)

This standard suggests that African American enfranchisement was a nuisance that prevented

South Carolinians from maintaining their political traditions, and that northerners were intent

on fomenting radical social changes that would morally bankrupt the South. It is true that the

end of the Civil War brought a sizable federal presence and Northern economic interests to

South Carolina, but it is disingenuous to suggest that South Carolina was merely a passive victim

of circumstances with no control over its own destiny. The standard fails to mention the

calculated and successful resistance to political and social reconstruction by conservative South Carolina planters toward the end of retaining their "way of life," and the standard also avoids treating President Andrew Johnson's complicity in sustaining that resistance and fomenting disorder (Zuczek, 1996).

Along similar lines South Carolina expects students to be able to "summarize the successes and failures that occurred in South Carolina during Reconstruction, including the bribery of legislators, corruption in political parties, the development of public education, and violence during the election of 1876" (South Carolina 8-4.5: 0, DC). Only one of these examples, the development of public education, can conceivably be labeled a success, while the other three examples all suggest depravity of some kind. South Carolina, however, negates even the ostensibly positive development of opportunities for public education by expecting students to,

> Explain how events during Reconstruction improved opportunities for African Americans but created a backlash that, by the end of Reconstruction, negated the gains African Americans had made, including the philanthropy of northern aid societies, the assistance provided by the federal government such as the Freedmen's Bureau, and their advancement in politics and education. (South Carolina 8-4.4: 0, DC)

This standard encapsulates South Carolina's view of Reconstruction as an ill-fated social experiment that had a few laudable but paternalistic intentions and that inevitably became an abject failure due to the imposition of forcible federal involvement in Southern social life.

South Carolina's framing of Reconstruction discounts the influential revisionist scholarship on the subject that began in the 1960s. Writing in the late 1980s historian Eric Foner (1988) remarked that "no part of the American experience has, in the last twenty-five

years, seen a broadly accepted point of view so completely overturned as Reconstruction" (p.

xvii). During this period revisionist historians transformed the traditional view of

Reconstruction as a period dominated by "carpetbaggers," "scalawags," corruption, and

violence by shifting the focus to the economic and political revitalization and unprecedented

democratization that also characterized the period (Foner, 1988). The absence of

historiography from the standards should not come as a surprise though, for Segall (1999)

points out that the tendency to ignore shifts in historiography and to thereby promote

outdated interpretations of historical figures, events, and movements is typical of history

textbooks and curriculum documents.

Despite this neglect of historiography, people of color are still well represented in

content guidelines for the Civil War and Reconstruction eras. At the same time, the nature of

the inclusion is typically superficial or ancillary to the dominant narrative. Virginia expects

students to be able to,

> Demonstrate knowledge of the issues that divided our nation and led to the Civil War by:
>
> identifying the events and differences between northern and southern states that
>
> divided Virginians and led to secession, war, and the creation of West Virginia;
>
> describing Virginia's role in the war, including identifying major battles that took place in
>
> Virginia; describing the roles played by whites, enslaved African Americans, free African
>
> Americans, and American Indians. (Virginia VS.7: 1, C)

This standard deploys passive language to deemphasize Virginia's historical significance as the

capital of the slaveholding South and the Confederacy, as well as the symbolic manifestation of

the nobility of the Lost Cause (Connelly, 1977), and adopts a rather politically correct strategy

of covering all of its demographic bases, with the exception of women. While the standard

recognizes a key distinction between enslaved and free African Americans, the standard depicts

"whites" and "American Indians" as all-encompassing monoliths and thus ignores the

gradations of European American and Native sympathies during the Civil War.

The experience of the Cherokee Nation during the Civil War illustrates why superficial

contributory renderings of multiple perspectives in history curricula are problematic. The

growing sectional crisis in the decades preceding the Civil War also divided slaveholding and

non-slaveholding Cherokee tribal groups.   Although Cherokee Chief John Ross signed an

alliance with the Confederacy in 1861 and most individual Cherokees remained sympathetic to

the Confederacy throughout the war, the Cherokee leadership split between pro-Confederate

and pro-Union blocs. When Ross was subsequently captured by federal forces the pro-Union

bloc successfully pushed through legislation emancipating all slaves within the Cherokee Nation.

Just as in the rebellious South, however, the abolition of slavery as an institution did not erase

extant social and economic inequalities and tribal factionalism within the Cherokee Nation,

though federal officials tended to disregard these divisions during postwar reconstruction

efforts (Sturm, 1998). The Virginia standard suggests that "American Indians" played significant

roles in the Civil War but not does address the notion that many Native peoples were just as

conflicted as their European American and African American contemporaries about which side

to support and about what a Union of exclusively "free" laborers might entail. Indeed, many

Native peoples likely would have been conflicted about preserving a Union that would continue

to dispossess them of their land through legislation like the 1887 Dawes Act, which converted

tribal lands to individual ownership for the purpose of "civilizing" the Indian Territory (Sturm, 1998).

New Jersey advances a similarly superficial rendering of multicultural inclusion by asking students to "examine the roles of women, African Americans, and Native Americans in the Civil War" (New Jersey 6.1.8.D.5.c: 2, C). This standard neither explicates what these roles entailed, nor what historical significance these roles had in influencing the course of the war. The standard also implies an agreed-upon dominant narrative of the Civil War that can accommodate the sensitizing perspectives of these demographic groups without being called into question. This form of inclusion mirrors Zimmerman's (2004) account of the post-Civil Rights Movement revisionism in Southern U.S. History textbooks:

> Textbooks integrated as well, sprinkling their pages with pictures and praise of famous African Americans. As in the North, though, the revised books followed the iron law of American textbook politics – offend no one. Despite new passages about Black freedom fighters, for example, southern texts still exalted Robert E. Lee and the Confederate struggle against "invading" Yankees. Just as Blacks needed celebratory history to heal the wounds of racism, whites argued, so did Dixie's sons and daughters require psychic compensation for their "Lost Cause" in the Civil War. (p. 67)

New Jersey adopts a similar contributory stance when it asks students to "compare and contrast the roles of African Americans who lived in Union and Confederate states during the Civil War" (6.1.12.D.4.a: 2, C). This standard creates a convenient bipolarity between Northern and Southern African Americans, disregarding the status of African Americans in the border states, which carried tremendous weight in determining the course of the war. The notion of a

free state population morally united against slavery is also problematic, as many northerners

and midwesterners too held prejudicial views of African Americans (Ransom, 1989). The

reviewed standards, however, do not mention any Northern racial antagonism in the context of

the Civil War and Reconstruction periods. One potential example would be the 1863 New York

City draft riots, which were "a sweeping assault against the local institutions and personnel of

President Abraham Lincoln's Republican Party, as well as a grotesque and bloody race riot"

(Bernstein, 1990, p. 3). Bernstein (1990) suggests that the draft riots and other manifestations

of Northern racial conflict seem geographically misplaced and anachronistic to present-day

Americans because they do not conform to the simplistic binary of a morally backward South

and a morally enlightened North. As the examples in this chapter reveal, it is tempting for

curriculum developers to perpetuate crude dichotomies in U.S. history that allow for a clear

separation between winners and losers and between heroes and villains.

Discussion

This chapter's analysis suggests that the reviewed U.S. History standards are

intellectually shortchanging students by emphasizing rote cognitive processes of recall and

description rather than critical thinking skills like weighing, interpreting, and evaluating

evidence. While the standards include a considerable amount of factual material that students

are expected to master, they virtually ignore the role of evidence in interpreting the meaning

and significance of historical events. The standards are also sufficiently vague to prevent

charges of bias and to thereby provide political cover. Many standards provide detailed,

seemingly objective details about slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction, and in some cases

they even express a point of view about a particular event or movement during this time period.

South Carolina's perspective on the legitimacy of secession is a good example of a normative curricular stance. At the same time, the standards generally avoid marshaling specific historical evidence to buttress these normative claims, which makes it appear that their assertions are self-evident and uncontested.

It is not surprising that the reviewed standards are typically vague since social studies curriculum debates are frequently politicized. As the 2010 revision of the Texas U.S. History standards demonstrates, any state-level polity that makes its ideological slant on history more explicit risks opening itself up to intense scrutiny. In contrast, vague standards hold the potential to satisfy or at least not offend all sides of an ideological debate. Vague standards also ostensibly allow teachers a certain degree of pedagogical freedom, although with the caveat that there are limits to teachers' and students' interpretive license. Only a single standard among this chapter's four comprehensive standards documents asks students to read and interpret a document relating to African American slavery, the Civil War, and Reconstruction (Michigan 4-H3.0.7**:** 1, C). For the Civil War in particular, the standards collectively convey the sense that there is an agreed -upon interpretation of the war's origins and significance, but they avoid providing substantive evidence that would support a particular interpretation. The standards nonetheless expect teachers and students to deduce the preferred interpretation without consulting historical documents.

The reviewed standards also suggest that the history textbook serves as honorary arbiter of "historical truth." The continued dominance of the textbook coverage approach to history instruction points up the difficulty of implementing curricula that attend more seriously to the value of nuanced historical thinking:

From elementary school through college, many students think of historical sources as providing direct and objective information about the past; they typically do not recognize the necessity of interpreting historical sources, nor do they understand how the use of sources differs from one account to another. (Barton, 2008, p. 242)

In a similar vein the authority of U.S. History standards seems to derive from an authorless, impersonal, and unquestionable source. Lacking an understanding of history as a fundamentally interpretive endeavor, students tend to appropriate the received wisdom of curriculum documents to confirm their preconceived beliefs about the world. Barton (2008) maintains that "students may initially resist entertaining historical perspectives when they conflict with their own ethical or political positions, and they can be highly judgmental of historical actions (or representations) that violate current sensibilities" (p. 244).

In the case of slavery and emancipation, U.S. History curricula that deemphasize the importance of context and contingency in history may lead students to uncritically view the South as innately simple-minded and backward and the North as inherently morally superior because the very idea of slavery is so repugnant to the present-day mind. This simplistic dichotomy precludes teachers and students from considering the possibility that attitudes about slavery existed on a continuum at the time and focuses narrowly on slavery as a moral failing on the part of certain individuals rather than as an entrenched and lucrative institution. Racial exploitation did not simply end when European Americans collectively recognized the evils of racism and changed their ways. Rather, the history of American race relations is characterized by persistent institutional, ideological, political, and economic conflicts.

Epistemological dilemmas over what constitutes historical knowledge are inherent to the discipline of history, especially since the postmodern literary turn that originated in the 1960s. Rather than either rejecting the possibility of historical knowledge outright or uncritically accepting the authority of received historical wisdom, more liberatory and engaging U.S. History curricula would frame historical study as an interpretive process that often produces far more questions than answers.

> Seeing history as a discursive construct invites teachers and students to question symbolic environments. It offers them opportunities to critically examine what tends to be perceived as natural and neutral in the production, circulation, and legitimation of a past into history and, more importantly perhaps, to ask: "Why?". (Segall, 1999, p. 368)

The obstacles to adopting an interpretive stance toward history in social studies classrooms are daunting, but this is no excuse to jettison such a project altogether and thereby deny students the opportunity to deeply engage with the discipline's curricular and pedagogical possibilities. It is imperative that history educators continually strive to transcend the narrow goals of "inclusion" and "coverage" within social studies curricula by promoting analytical thinking about how and why we construct historical social identities and assign significance to historical phenomena.

Chapter 6: Westward Expansion and Native Representation in U.S. History Standards

This chapter examines the representation of Native peoples within K-12 United States History content standards treating U.S. westward expansion during the early republic through the post-Civil War decades. The polities included in the analysis are Arizona, South Dakota, Washington State, and Florida. The analysis revealed that the reviewed standards generally romanticize stock celebratory heroes and construct Native historical social identities according to a simplistic noble/tragic dichotomy. The reviewed standards also utilize the monolithic mandate of Manifest Destiny as a catchall explanation for westward expansion and the displacement of Native populations. The analysis also revealed that Washington State is exceptional because it adopts a case study approach to Native history, while Arizona, South Dakota, and Florida implement a more traditional comprehensive treatment of Native peoples. While Washington State's approach displays a greater commitment to nuanced historical thinking than the comprehensive strategy does, both tactics raise a number of problematic issues related to presentism and cultural bean-counting in social studies curricula.

Celebrity Heroes of the Frontier

The reviewed standards typically idealize stock heroes who appease present-day multicultural concerns. This strategy signifies an attempt to read back into history a narrative of racial reconciliation that seems appropriate today. Native peoples today are full citizens, but they came to consider themselves and to be considered U.S. citizens only gradually, which allowed the federal and state governments to feel justified in nineteenth-century Indian removal policies. Imposing a "citizenship" frame on the past is legally anachronistic because

Native peoples were not given full U.S. citizenship until 1924 (Cornell, 1988; Ngai, 1999), but there is a fundamental disjuncture between the documented historical record on Native relations and how Americans would like to remember this history. Thelen (1989) maintains that "in each construction of a memory, people reshape, omit, distort, combine, and reorganize details from the past in an active and subjective way. They mix pieces from the present with elements from different periods of the past" (p. 1120), while Lowenthal (1989) contends that "nostalgia tempts people to see the past less as precedent than as alternative: not just what has happened but what could happen, an option still open" (p. 1279).

One of the preeminent examples of nostalgic heroification both in the reviewed standards and in American popular culture is the canonization of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. The reviewed standards adopt a one-dimensional narrative of the Lewis and Clark expedition that takes for granted their seemingly timeless historical significance. South Dakota includes Lewis and Clark in the pantheon of American legends that kindergarten students are expected to know, as students should "identify examples of legendary and/or historical American figures. Example: Create a class big book about American figures such as Johnny Appleseed, Lewis & Clark, Sacagawea, Abraham Lincoln, George Washington, Squanto, and George Washington Carver" (South Dakota K.US.1.1**:** 1, C). This standard adopts an additive approach toward racial inclusion, as Sacagawea is paired with Lewis and Clark both to lend legitimacy to the goals of the expedition and to provide multicultural balance to the narrative. The standard also presumably includes Squanto to add legitimacy to the English colonization of North America, while George Washington Carver adds legitimacy to the trope of the self-made

man who triumphs through perseverance and a belief in the endless possibilities of American capitalism.

Sacagawea embodies the ideal multicultural foil to Lewis and Clark because she epitomizes racial reconciliation rather than discord and conflict over land claims. McBeth (2003) claims that "the name Sacagawea or Sacajawea evokes the image of a young Indian woman – her infant strapped to a cradleboard – pressing westward, pointing out the way to the Pacific for the famed Lewis and Clark expedition of the early 1800s" (p. 3). This appropriation of Sacagawea for the purposes of multicultural sensitivity, however, risks both essentializing her identity and overstating her historical significance, since there is "little agreement concerning the roles that Sacag/jawea played in the Lewis and Clark expedition" (McBeth, 2003, p. 4). As a young girl Sacagawea was captured and enslaved by a rival Native tribe but she was later purchased by Toussaint Charbonneau, a French Canadian settler. Lewis and Clark subsequently hired Charbonneau, who had married and fathered a child with Sacagawea, to be their interpreter, and Charbonneau offered up Sacagawea as an intermediary between the expedition and the Shoshone Indians (McBeth, 2003). As the wife of a French Canadian and the mother of a young mixed-race child, Sacagawea's social identity was sufficiently pliable to lend legitimacy to the expedition. McBeth (2003) maintains that female Native heroes like Sacagawea and Pocahontas serve especially important historical roles because they highlight the edifying function of early territorial expansion:

> It was also the case that women like Sacajawea and Pocahontas were suitable
> candidates because they mediated between white and Indian cultures. They are
> perceived as having assisted America in "civilizing" the land and its indigenous

populations. The citizens of this country may also have been more accepting of these historical Indian figures because they could be seen as exonerating the notion of manifest destiny. (p. 9)

Several other standards also deploy multicultural heroes to legitimize westward expansion and Native displacement. Florida asks students to "identify roles and contributions of significant people during the period of westward expansion: Examples are Lewis and Clark, Sacagawea, York, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Tecumseh, Jean Baptiste Point Du Sable" (Florida SS.5.A.6.2: 0, C). In addition to the customary pairing of Sacagawea with Lewis and Clark, the standard identifies York, who was William Clark's slave, as a historically significant person during westward expansion. Just as Sacagawea provides the crucial female and Native presence in the expedition, York's place alongside Lewis and Clark further legitimates the expedition in American memory because he represents the stock African American figure that virtually completes the portrait of multicultural reconciliation. York's presence on the expedition represented a cultural buffer between European American settlers and the various Native tribes that the expedition encountered:

> To those Indians who had never seen a black person, York was a remarkable phenomenon, "big medicine" to be viewed with astonishment and awe, thereby enhancing the prestige of these white strangers who informed them that their Great White Father now resided in a place called Washington. (Betts, 2000, p. 4)

Even Tecumseh, the Shawnee leader who vehemently resisted European American territorial expansion at every turn in the early nineteenth century, can be appropriated today as a symbol of catharsis for a tragic period in U.S. history. Sayre (2005) argues that Americans

tend to posthumously valorize Native resistance leaders who fought nobly against the

inevitable march of westward expansion and technological progress:

> If we want to understand the exhilaration of these warriors and soldiers in the midst of
>
> battle and their grief or relief in its aftermath, we cannot aestheticize it as nostalgia or
>
> melancholy. The emotional process of Indian tragedy is instead catharsis, for only
>
> catharsis reconciles the contradictory reactions of enmity and admiration, pity, fear, and
>
> censure and articulates the responses of both historical agents and distant audiences.
>
> (pp. 5-6)

Sayre further contends that "in Tecumseh, the figure of the Indian resistance leader as hero

reached its apogee" (p. 268). As seen in the Lost Cause explanation of the Civil War and the

memorialization of Custer's Last Stand, the myth of honorable defeat is often a powerful shaper

of cultural memory. Kammen (1991) maintains that "we arouse and arrange our memories to

suit our psychic needs" (p. 9), and present-day society's psychic needs seem to revolve around

legitimization of conquest through diverse racial inclusion.

The legitimization process also necessitates uncomplicated portrayals of Lewis and Clark

themselves. Despite present-day notions of Lewis and Clark as cultural icons, they were not

always considered heroes or even very significant figures in U.S. history. Many Americans

initially viewed the Lewis and Clark expedition as unsuccessful, including Thomas Jefferson, who

was disappointed that the Corps of Discovery had not found the Northwest Passage.

Meriwether Lewis's 1809 suicide also damaged his legacy and delayed the publication of his

journals (Ambrose, 1996). Trofanenko (2008) maintains,

Prior to 1904 the Lewis and Clark expedition remained obscure to most Americans . . . .

This changed with the centennial celebration of Lewis and Clark where they were

remembered in popular literature, reprints of the original expedition journals, and a

World's Fair (which was also referred to as the Manifest Destiny centennial). (p. 590)

Lewis and Clark thus represented something very different in 1904 than they had during and

immediately after the conclusion of their expedition. By 1904 the United States had undergone

such tremendous geographic and economic growth that the notion of American "Manifest

Destiny" could ostensibly be read back into history, and Lewis and Clark embodied this trope of

American exceptionalism (Kammen, 1993).

<div style="text-align:center">Nobility, Tragedy, and the Native Experience</div>

The trope of Native resistance as "noble or "tragic" is a persistent cultural signpost.

Early U.S. History textbook writers faced a crisis of representation about how to depict the

original inhabitants of North America:

If Indians did have virtues, then the founding of the United States and its westward

expansion raised a troubling ethical dilemma. If Indians were unredeemable savages,

they were not worthy of an epic, nation-building contest with White settlers. All writers

had to confront this difficult question, and most equivocated. In their books Indians

were not simple brutes . . . . Indians had many positive attributes. (Moreau, 2003, p. 155)

Many textbook authors adopted a "noble savage" framework for describing Native resistance in

which "the savage can earn nobility precisely because he is no longer a threat to, or continuing

moral responsibility for, the nation" (Moreau, 2003, p. 156). In this sense, argues Loewen

(1995), "Casting Indian history as a tragedy because Native Americans could not or would not acculturate is feel-good history for whites" (p. 133).

The notion of Native history as "tragic" is prevalent in the reviewed standards. Florida largely frames nineteenth-century Native history as a courageous but futile struggle to resist a vague historical imperative toward progress. Florida expects students both to "explain how westward expansion affected Native Americans: Examples are Trail of Tears and Indian Removal Act" (Florida SS.5.A.6.6: 0, DC), and to "review the Native American experience: Examples are westward expansion, reservation system, the Dawes Act, Wounded Knee Massacre, Sand Creek Massacre, Battle of Little Bighorn" (Florida SS.912.A.2.7: 0, PE). These standards focus only on rote cognitive processes of recall and description and they construct their examples as inevitable consequences of progress rather than as historical outcomes that were contingent upon the agency and intervention of both European American and Native peoples. The standards also suggest that Native displacement in the nineteenth century was unquestionably a tragedy and that Americans should all pay homage to their sacrifice, but they imply that it is less important that students be able to connect this tragic experience to the historical justification for westward expansion.

Many nineteenth-century Americans were motivated to move West by an inchoate sense that the revolutionary ideals of liberty and equality could only be realized by procuring more land and thereby creating new economic opportunities, rather than by a crude desire to remove the "savage" population (Brands, 2004). Ellis (2007) also draws a distinction between federal Indian policy in the early American republic and the cumulative individual ambition of European American settlers. Ellis maintains that while "the leadership of the national

112

government created by the recently ratified Constitution declared its determination to avoid a

policy of Indian removal at almost any cost" (p. 128), at the same time "ultimate power lay with

those white settlers streaming over the Appalachians into Indian Country, a relentless tide that

swept all treaties, promises, excellent intentions, and moral considerations to the far banks of

history" (p. 130). The reviewed standards, however, convey the notion that the Native tragedy

unfolded according to its own internal logic. As Moreau (2003) contends, "It was a decree

ordained by God, or chance, or both. That such a fate was unavoidable, in fact, lent tragic

power to the story of the noble savage who fought against it anyway" (p. 155).

The reviewed Florida standards also sketch an over-simplified portrait of Native peoples

as historical beings, collapsing hundreds of Native groups into a monochromatic catchall

category. The standards expect students to review a unitary "Native American experience," as

well as to explain how westward expansion affected a homogenized and fabricated group of

"Native Americans." These constructions ignore the diversity of Native experiences:

At the time of the earliest European contact with North America, there were no

American Indians. The aboriginal inhabitants of North America encountered by

European travelers spoke myriad languages; possessed a wide variety of cultures;

displayed a broad diversity of social, economic, and political organization; and had no

conception of themselves as a single "race," group, or people. (Nagel, 1996, p. 3)

Nagel (1996) maintains that the desire to pigeonhole various Native groups into one

overarching category long dictated the politics of both European colonialism in general and

North American Native policy in particular, as colonial policies "divided human populations into

two camps: those who were and those who needed to be civilized; those manifestly destined to rule and those in need of rule" (p. 3).

The reviewed standards occasionally distinguish between tribes when discussing Native history, but these distinctions typically denote a localized and contributory curricular approach rather than a nuanced treatment of how various identity groups differentially shaped history. South Dakota expects students to be able to "explain factors affecting the growth and expansion of South Dakota" and "identify historic tribes: Examples: Arikara, Lakota, Dakota, Nakota" (South Dakota 4.US.1.1: 0, C). South Dakota also asks students to "identify the locations of the nine major reservations in South Dakota" (South Dakota 4.US.2.2: 0, C), while Washington State expects students to "explain how the growth of major tribes helps to define the history of the Pacific Northwest prior to 1854" (Washington 4.1.2: 0, C). While students should certainly be able to identify the Native groups that have influenced and in some cases continue to influence their regional culture, curricula that overemphasize content coverage may encourage students to conceptualize this history as ancillary to larger narratives of national development. A more nuanced approach, on the other hand, might emphasize the complicated political interplay between the U.S. government and the various Native groups rather than focusing so heavily on documenting what each group contributed to the local culture.

The issue of treaties exemplifies the convoluted nature of Native affairs in early America. Rains (2006) contends that "the federal government could simultaneously make a treaty with one Nation or set of Nations, while at the same time, practice a form of ethnic cleansing on other Native Nations" (p. 140), and furthermore, "Since Indians were not legally considered

human beings until 1879, they had little recourse when treaties were broken" (p. 141). While both South Dakota and Florida ask students to identify and explain the short-term historical impact of one or two Native treaties, only Washington State includes standards that expect students to engage with the long-term implications of such treaties (Washington 4.3.1: 4, DC, 4.4.1: 2, DC, 4.1.2: 2, DC). One such long-term consequence was that the U.S. government could regularly utilize one or several Native groups in violent conflicts against another group, thus dividing their potential opposition. Axtell (2001) remarks that "the American encounters were never between generic 'Indians' and 'Europeans' but always between segments or factions of native groups (which we call 'tribes' for convenience) and similar, equally interested subgroups of European nationalities" (p. 296). The reviewed standards, however, discount the ambiguity of Native relations in favor of a reductionist meta-narrative of an inexorable clash and unavoidable tragedy.

Manifest Destiny, Indian Removal, and the Myth of the Frontier

The inevitability of America's Manifest Destiny was contested even during the height of nineteenth-century westward expansion and the concurrent Indian removal policies. Rifkin (2009) maintains that Americans too often oversimplify the role of Manifest Destiny in national development:

The concept of "manifest destiny" often is invoked in ways that create the impression of a *zeitgeist* in which public policy and popular opinion merge to create to create an unstoppable force. It largely appears as a monolith, an integrated totality rather than a shifting matrix in which national territoriality remains haunted by geopolitical formations absorbed but not entirely eliminated. (p. 7)

115

Both popular opinion about westward expansion and official government Indian policy during the nineteenth century were informed by a host of often conflicting motivations. The controversy over "Indian removal" that erupted during the Andrew Jackson administration in the early 1830s reveals considerable equivocation over the best course of action both for the U.S. government and for Native peoples. One writer assails Jackson as an unredeemable "Indian hater" and "the single figure most responsible for Indian destruction in pre-Civil War America" (Rogin, 1991, p. 13), while other scholars advance more nuanced and balanced appraisals of Jackson and by extension the U.S. government's position on the Native population. Brands (2005) argues that Jackson "avowed benign motives regarding the Indians" (p. 489), and that he "remained convinced that the only long-term answer to the Indian question was for the tribes to move beyond the reach of the whites" (p. 489).

The reviewed standards, however, typically frame Native displacement as a one-dimensional extension of Manifest Destiny. Arizona asks students to "identify reasons (e.g., economic opportunities, forced removal) why people in the United States moved westward to territories or unclaimed lands" (Arizona Concept 5: PO 2**:** 1, PE). This standard conflates historical causation with contingency because while economic opportunity was a significant motivator for western settlement, forced removal of Native peoples was not a motivation but a tool needed to realize this economic opportunity. The standard conveys the viewpoint that European American settlers acted on their economic ambitions only *after* Native peoples were already safely out of the way, freeing them to stake out "unclaimed" territory. Brands (2005) points out, by contrast, that individual settlers were not inclined to wait until the government

or the courts sanctioned such settlement, and thus westward migration was highly contingent upon the local level of Native resistance.

South Dakota expects students to be able to "describe the unfolding of westward expansion and reform movements in the United States" (South Dakota 8.US.1.2**:** 0, PE), as well as to "describe the impact of Manifest Destiny" (South Dakota 8.US.2.2**:** 0, PE). Florida asks students to "discuss the concept of Manifest Destiny" (Florida SS.5.A.6.7**:** 0, PE), while Arizona requires students to "describe the different perspectives (e.g., Native Americans, settlers, Spanish, the U.S. government, prospectors) of Manifest Destiny" (Arizona Concept 5: PO 2**:** 1, PE). Each of these standards take for granted a monolithic Manifest Destiny and South Dakota's passive construction of the "unfolding of westward expansion" implies that the process was driven by supernatural forces and not by human beings who acted according to a diverse set of motivations. Writing about the treatment of the Lewis and Clark expedition in schools, Trofanenko (2008) claims that history curricula often deploy Manifest Destiny as an incontrovertible justification for the settlement of the West through "themes such as the 'discovery' of an empty land, the 'survival' of the fittest in natural unexploited areas, and the self-made man of a 'frontier' society" (p. 580).

The notion of Manifest Destiny as a Darwinian mandate is especially intriguing given the origins of both "Manifest Destiny" and "Survival of the Fittest" as cultural tropes. The term "Manifest Destiny" was first used in an 1845 article by the newspaper editor and prominent Democrat John L. O'Sullivan to promote the annexation of Texas, and Horsman (1981) argues that O'Sullivan's expansionist views reflected a popular shift in mid-nineteenth century America toward viewing the world in increasingly racialized terms:

By the 1850s it was generally believed in the United States that a superior American

race was destined to shape the destiny of much of the world. It was also believed that

in their outward thrust Americans were encountering a variety of inferior races

incapable of sharing in America's republican system and doomed to permanent

subordination or extinction. (p. 6)

The trope of the "survival of the fittest" was also popularized in the mid-nineteenth century to

justify the imperial claims of the "Anglo-Saxon" race. First coined in 1852 by philosopher

Herbert Spencer in an article on Malthusian population theory, "Social Darwinists"

subsequently appropriated "survival of the fittest" to advance elaborate biological theories of

racial hierarchy. In this newly racialized worldview "race was now assumed to be a determinate,

independent factor in human evolution" (Claeys, 2000, p. 238), and quasi-sciences like

phrenology were developed to provide academic justification for these claims:

The language of race, omnipresent at least tacitly in the discourse of civilization

generally, now not only hardened considerably as a result; the imputed distance

between the "higher" and "lower" races widened perceptibly, and a dismissive

contempt for the "lower" races grew markedly. (Claeys, 2000, p. 238)

The notion of the "frontier," too, played an important role in justifying the ostensibly

divine mandate of Manifest Destiny. Slotkin (1985) argues that the "Myth of the Frontier,"

popularized in academic circles at the end of the nineteenth century by the American historian

Frederick Jackson Turner and continually re-inscribed throughout U.S. history in popular

literature and film, is one of Americans' most cherished cultural tropes. According to Slotkin's

frontier myth hearty and ambitious pioneers "civilized" unsettled lands and peoples in order to

regenerate America's divine mandate. The "civilized/uncivilized" binary that this frontier

narrative advances suggests a racialized reading of history, wherein "the story of American

progress and expansion thus took the form of a fable of race war, pitting the symbolic opposites

of savagery and civilization, primitivism and progress, paganism and progress against each

other" (Slotkin, 1985, p. 53). As a persistent and reified cultural trope Manifest Destiny is the

historical embodiment of American exceptionalism, but when history curriculum documents fail

to contextualize the origins and implications of Manifest Destiny teachers and students are

likely to treat it as a self-evident and universal construct.

<p align="center">The Special Case of Washington State</p>

Washington State is an exceptional case because it adopts a social issues approach to

history education that places much greater emphasis on sustained analysis of persistent social

problems than on "covering" the typical historical content on Native peoples. This curricular

stance mirrors Evans's (2001) formulation of "issues-centered" history education as "an

approach to education centered on reflective questions, open-ended questions which have no

'right' answer. It is an approach to education that emphasizes thoughtfulness and depth,

weighing evidence, values, and consequences" (pp. 294-295). Washington State expects

students to be able to "construct an historical account of how treaties affected changes in land

ownership for the native tribes in the Pacific Northwest using evidence from multiple sources"

(Washington 4.3.1: 4, DC). More specifically, Washington State asks students to "explain how

the Stevens treaties with native tribes led to the Boldt decision and current tribal fishing rights"

(Washington 4.4.1: 2, DC), as well as to "critique different positions on the Boldt decision based

on an analysis of the Stevens treaties" (Washington 4.4.1: 4, DC). Washington State also

expects students to "explain how the exchange of land for continued fishing and hunting rights in the Point No Point Treaty helps to define the treaty-making period" (Washington 4.1.2: 2, DC), as well as to "examine the motives and interests behind different interpretations of the Makah's right to hunt whales" (Washington 4.3.1: 2, DC). Additionally, Washington State asks students to "examine how local tribes used the court system to regain their sovereign rights" (Washington 4.2.2: 2, DC).

The above standards recognize that rigorous historical study is both interpretive and evidence-based and they reject a "right answer" approach to history education, but they also recognize that treaties and Native rights are likely still germane to a significant segment of Washington State's population, and by extension, a given school's population. Many of the reviewed Arizona, Florida, and South Dakota standards, by contrast, imply that there is a single appropriate answer, or at most a few appropriate answers, to a historical question. Arizona expects students to be able to "describe the impact of European-American expansion on native peoples" (Arizona Concept 5: PO 4: 1, DC). Florida asks students to "identify the causes and effects of the Seminole Wars" (Florida SS.4.A.3.10: 0, PE), as well as to "explain the importance of the explorations west of the Mississippi River" (Florida SS.5.A.6.4: 0, PE). Although these standards are seemingly open-ended in that they do not explicitly list the possible answers, the verbs "describe," "identify," and "explain" suggest a low cognitive load, whereas Washington State's directive that students "construct," "critique," and "examine" reflects a greater emphasis on deploying historical evidence to advance and sustain an argument.

At the same time, Washington State's standards involve inherent curricular trade-offs. The case study approach, while promoting engagement with and analysis of ostensibly relevant

historical issues, also potentially substitutes one form of minutiae for another. By expecting

students to master different interpretations of the Stevens Treaties and the Boldt decision, as

well as the Point No Point Treaty, the standards beg the question of historical significance. It is

important for students to be able to draw upon historical evidence to weigh competing

viewpoints and defend a position, but Washington State does not justify why these narrow and

parochial examples are sufficient to strengthen students' broader historical understanding. The

danger here is that by focusing so intently on the details of the "case" students will be unable

to connect the details to the larger American political, economic, social, and cultural context

that shaped these events. Seixas (1993) maintains that "given too much interpretive leeway,

students may construct and reinforce untenable views of the past and of their place in historical

time" (p. 320).

The reviewed Washington State standards may also function more as political advocacy

than as content benchmarks, especially where they implicitly adopt a Native perspective. By

employing the phrases "the Makah's right to hunt whales" and "local tribes used the court

system to regain their sovereign rights," the standards tacitly claim sympathy with the Native

cause. These rhetorical constructions reflect what some scholars have called a "historical

empathy" stance toward the curriculum, which encompasses among other things the ability to

recognize multiple perspectives on historical issues (Marcus, Metzger, Paxton, & Stoddard,

2010). When curriculum standards angle an empathic stance toward a particular social group,

however, they risk oversimplifying contested historical issues. Washington State renders those

who contest Native land-based prerogatives as inherently reactionary. This form of

"particularist multiculturalism" (Ravitch, 2000) or "compensatory history" (Schlesinger, 1992) is

designed to preemptively prevent charges of eurocentrism, but it also potentially limits the possibility for history curricula to engage students in historical thinking about why social issues are contested at all.

The Makah whale hunt is a particularly instructive case of the potential pitfalls of empathic political advocacy. Marker (2006) contends that "no recent event has exposed the present limits to 'multicultural openness' and classroom cultural responsiveness more than the Makah whale hunt and the anti-Indian backlash that followed" (p. 482). In May, 1999 the Makah tribe hunted and killed a whale off the coast of Washington State, igniting a national political firestorm and a backlash against the Makah and other Native peoples. This backlash was two-pronged, as animal rights environmentalists condemned the Makah for what they perceived to be a barbarous act, while non-Native fisherman criticized what they perceived to be an unjust bias toward protecting Native rights through exclusive treaties. In the aftermath of the whaling incident Native schoolchildren were also subjected to levels of hostility and intimidation reminiscent of the fishing rights controversies of the 1970s and 1980s. As Marker points out, "The expression of local indigenous culture becomes contentious whenever claims on land and resources from tribal representatives are made from claims about historic cultural identity" (p. 485).

While the Makah whale hunt would seem to be an ideal opportunity to deploy a recent historical event to initiate cross-cultural conversation in a social studies classroom, the risks to such an approach are considerable. The largest potential hazard to adopting such an approach is the temptation to caricature social identity groups in order to construct an accessible narrative. Teachers tasked with leading an open-ended exploration of treaty rights in

Washington State could potentially resort to constructing artificial Native/non-Native binaries

in order to facilitate a coherent discussion. Students who may lack a nuanced understanding of

the history of treaty rights, moreover, may also rely on stereotypical portrayals of Native and

non-Native peoples to justify their conclusions. Marker (2006) claims that "because of

stereotypes, the public has come to expect that 'real' Indians would never harm a whale, hence,

the Makah became regarded as hypocrites and frauds" (p. 490), and thus classroom discussions

of the whale hunt would potentially have to contend with a host of misconceptions about the

very legitimacy of Native claims to the land.

Washington State's adversarial curricular approach also potentially devalues historical

cooperation between Native and non-Native peoples. In addition to the prior examples of

social conflict over treaties and tribal rights, Washington State also expects students to be able

to "compare the account of the Whitman Massacre from the perspective of the missionaries

and the perspective of the Cayuse native people (Washington 4.3.1: 2, DC)," as well as to

"construct an historical account of the Pig War using evidence from artifacts and primary

sources" (Washington 4.3.1: 4, DC). The standards also ask students to "present a position on

the causes and outcomes of the Indian Wars in Washington Territory demonstrating

understanding of varying viewpoints of the conflict" (Washington State 4.3.2: 4, DC), as well as

to "explain how the rise of prominent American Indian leaders in resistance movements against

U.S. encroachment helps to define U.S. history at the end of the 19th century" (Washington

State 4.1.2: 1, DC).

Washington State offers not a single example of Native cooperation with settlers in their

treatment of westward expansion from the early republic through the end of the nineteenth

century. The only instance of Native-settler cooperation mentioned anywhere across the four

standards documents, in fact, is the seemingly obligatory pairing of Sacagawea with Lewis and

Clark (South Dakota K.US.1.1: 1, C; Florida SS.5.A.6.2: 0, C). The absence of cooperation in the

reviewed standards reinforces a meta-narrative of guilt catharsis wherein the "Indian question"

is both one-dimensional and settled. The "guilt catharsis" model portrays Native peoples as

perpetual victims who are forever fated to remain isolated from mainstream society, despite

the fact that the "Indian Wars" ended over a century ago. Kilpatrick (1999) argues that "the

new image of Native Americans held by many Americans is also changing – but at a snail's pace

because the noble and bloodthirsty images of the past are hard to disassemble" (p. 177). While

there is a place for engaging students in analysis of social identity-based conflict in history, an

exclusive focus on conflict risks oversimplifying the dynamics of historical agency and

contingency. In the reviewed standards the absence of cooperative or at least bargaining

strategies between Native and non-Native peoples perpetuates the notion that westward

expansion under the mandate of Manifest Destiny was inevitable whether or not the Native

peoples chose to give their consent, and that the present-day political disputes over treaty

rights are intractable.

<p align="center">Discussion</p>

Two themes that emerge out of this chapter's analysis are the pervasiveness of

"presentism" and "bean-counting" in the reviewed standards. Lowenthal (1989) argues that

presentist constructions are problematic because they inhibit historical understanding of

complex social issues:

Present-day aims and deeds are regularly imputed to folk of earlier times; history is

either denied efficacy or held to be preordained. Progress either leaves us helpless

agents of overwhelming historical forces or arms us with a fiercely righteous faith that

history is on our side. (p. 1276)

A presentist lens applied to this chapter's subject matter might encourage present-day

Americans both to view nineteenth-century Native peoples as incredibly naïve for attempting

to resist Manifest Destiny and the "unfolding of westward expansion," and simultaneously to

castigate many nineteenth-century European Americans for their deplorable and

incomprehensible (to present-day majority opinion) belief in racial hierarchy.

Despite this tendency to evaluate the past through present-day social sensibilities, both

school curricula and popular culture often fail to acknowledge the present-day implications of

the historical policies and ideologies that we feel empowered to judge. The legacy of inequality

and discrimination against Native peoples is still very much entrenched in American society.

Cornell (1988) contends that "from the end of organized Indian resistance in the nineteenth

century until the last few decades, Native Americans have been barred systematically from

meaningful participation of almost any kind in those decision-making processes most affecting

their communities and lives" (p. 5). At the same time, many Native peoples continue to resist

their subjugation. Native history is not a closed book, even though the 1890 Wounded Knee

Massacre represented symbolic closure to the "Indian Wars":

Since the 1940s – and particularly in the last two to three decades – Indians not only

have demanded a voice in decision making, but they have *appropriated* such a voice for

themselves, forcing the surrounding society to respond once again to their actions and agendas. (Cornell, 1988, p. 5)

Aside from Washington State, however, the reviewed standards generally do not confront the historical legacy of discrimination against Native peoples. Clinging to the past provides the advantage that, although riddled with unfortunate events, "people think of it as fixed, unalterable, indelibly recorded" (Lowenthal, 1985, p. 4). The reviewed standards ultimately settle for perpetuating simplistic notions of Manifest Destiny and the Myth of the Frontier, as well as canonizing archetypal frontier heroes, to rationalize America's nineteenth-century westward expansion, rather than engaging students in thoughtful analysis of historical context, contingency, causation, and significance around nineteenth-century Native history. This seemingly contradictory tendency among curriculum developers to simultaneously encourage moralistic judgment of historical beings while refusing to acknowledge the present-day implications of discriminatory policies like Indian removal limits the ability of teachers and students to deploy historical analysis to disrupt superficial cultural tropes. This disjointed curricular approach, however, may actually best serve the interests of educational policymakers by striking a curricular bargain in which the standards appease politically liberal proponents of multicultural tolerance and empathy, while simultaneously placating political conservatives by avoiding conveying the notion that race continues to be a powerful shaper of human destiny in the United States.

The notion of contributory bean-counting is another problematic feature of this chapter's reviewed standards. Factual details are important in history education, but too many of the standards are overloaded with details that are not particularly historically significant.

The details are likely included, however, to satisfy a multicultural inclusion criterion and thereby avoid potential political controversy. The case of William Clark's slave York is particularly instructive. The reviewed standards do not make it clear how familiarity with York's individual story increases students' ability to engage in substantive analysis of race in American history, but several standards nonetheless include York in their narrative of westward expansion (Florida SS.5.A.6.2: 0, C, SS.8.A.4.3: 2, C).

It is tempting to get distracted by the itemization of names, dates, and key events listed in U.S. History standards and evaluate them largely on who or what "gets in" and who or what "gets left out," rather than on the substantive language that the standards employ. South Dakota frequently lists a great deal of factual information under the "examples" for a given standard. While the quantity of information that students are to master is mentally taxing, the quality of historical thinking expected is relatively superficial. South Dakota expects students to be able to,

> Describe the influence of notable South Dakotans on our state. Examples: Red Cloud,
> Sitting Bull, John B. S. Todd, Frederick Taft Evans, Laura Ingalls Wilder, James Scotty
> Philip, Niels E. Hansen, Gertrude (Zitkala-Sa) Bonin, Peter Norbeck, Francis Case, Spotted
> Tail, Crazy Horse, Ben Reifel, Billy Mills. (South Dakota 4.US.2.3: 0, C)

This list is multiculturally balanced and includes some relatively obscure individuals whom U.S. History standards typically do not include, but this inclusion is meaningless without situating the listed individuals within historical context and assessing their respective significance to the development of South Dakota and the United States. One way to tackle the "significance problem" is to tie it to the notion of historical contingency: that is, to what degree would South

Dakota and America have developed differently without the influence of Sitting Bull or Crazy

Horse, or had their actions been different or resulted in different outcomes? The standard

expects students to enumerate a few accomplishments for each notable figure but not

necessarily to analyze the historical and contemporary implications of these individuals' actions.

Even though the standard would satisfy any criterion for multicultural inclusion, it does not

meet any persuasive benchmarks for promoting historical thinking.

South Dakota also reveals a "quantity over quality" orientation in its treatment of

nineteenth-century Native-settler conflict. South Dakota expects students to be able to,

> Describe the causes and effects of interactions between the U.S. government and Native
>
> American cultures. Examples: Fort Laramie Treaties of 1851 and 1868, Minnesota
>
> Uprising (1862), Sand Creek Massacre (1864), Red Cloud's War (1864-1868), Battle of
>
> Little Big Horn (1876), Manifest Destiny, Black Hills Cession of 1877, General Allotment
>
> Act/Dawes Act (1887), Ghost Dance religion, Wounded Knee Massacre (1890). (South
>
> Dakota 9-12.US.2.1: 1, DC)

While each of these policies and events influenced U.S. history and are therefore important for

students to at least be able to identify, the standard conveys the notion that encyclopedic

knowledge of the basic facts of these items is sufficient for historical understanding. Such a

contributory approach, however, deemphasizes nuanced analysis of the overall historical

significance of Native-settler conflict.

An alternative approach to South Dakota's coverage orientation would be to focus on a

pivotal event, such as the Wounded Knee incident, and engage students in sustained and

substantive analysis of its historical significance. In contrast to the relatively parochial

examples that Washington State draws upon in its case study approach, Wounded Knee, though part of South Dakota's state history, is historically significant because it was the final battle of the "Indian Wars" and as such represented to many Americans the closing of the frontier. Wounded Knee also remains a relevant cultural and political symbol, as seen in the American Indian Movement's (AIM) 1973 occupation of the battle site and calls by survivors' descendants in 1990 for a formal congressional apology and reparations. Today the very label assigned to the Wounded Knee incident is contested, as it is either a "battle" or a "massacre" depending upon one's social perspective (Ostler, 2004; Rosenzweig & Thelen, 1998).

The alternative Wounded Knee approach would necessarily entail considering different perspectives and weighing evidence in order to formulate interpretations or conclusions about the event. A deeper understanding of the context and contingencies surrounding the event could also potentially lead students to meaningful generalizations about how Native-settler relations shaped the development of the United States. Few state-level polities, however, are seemingly willing to sacrifice a coverage curricular orientation, and as the example of Washington State reveals even the case study approach has problematic features. The coverage approach is ultimately so appealing because it allows policymakers to substitute factual memorization for interpretive analysis and thereby distract students from deeper thinking about the politics of social systems, institutions, and identity construction.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

While the previous three chapters largely addressed descriptive and analytical questions about how U.S. History content standards represent the experiences of people of color within distinct time periods in U.S. history, this concluding chapter is a more holistic, interpretive investigation into overall themes of racial representation within the standards. I begin by presenting the overall quantitative outcomes in the historical thinking and style of use data, and then I discuss these results by addressing three common patterns of representation across the data: history as treasure hunt, the code of silence, and the allure of presentism. I conclude the chapter by discussing the epistemological tensions inherent in any discussion of how history is taught in schools, as well as the policy implications of this study's findings.

Quantitative Outcomes

One striking trend that emerges out of the quantitative data is that there is a large disparity in the overall quality of historical thinking evinced between New Jersey and Washington State on one hand and every other polity in the study. Of the 13 reviewed New Jersey standards 10 standards, or 77%, received an overall historical thinking score of at least "2," while of the 13 reviewed Washington State standards 9 standards, or 69%, received an overall historical thinking score of at least "2." The next highest percentage of overall historical thinking scores receiving at least a "2" in the study's sample was Florida at 30%. One could attempt to explain this discrepancy by pointing to the relatively small sample sizes of the New Jersey and Washington State data compared to samples like South Carolina and Washington, D.C., which include 49 and 34 standards respectively. On the other hand, the smallest sample in the study, Arizona's 12 standards, contains only one standard that received an overall

historical thinking score of at least "2." Additionally, two of the other small-to-medium sample

sizes, South Dakota at 20 and Virginia at 22, received at least a "2" in historical thinking on only

5% and 9% of standards respectively. When breaking down the data by theme, however, the

results are more consistent, with the exception of the issue of slavery. Only 4 of the 43 (9%)

that treat slavery received at least a "2" in overall historical thinking, while the other four

topical categories (Westward Expansion, the Civil War, Reconstruction, and the Civil Rights

Movement) ranged between 19% and 31% of standards receiving at least a "2" in overall

historical thinking.

The "style of use" data is also quite revealing. Across all nine polities the reviewed

standards are heavily weighted toward contributory and progressive/exceptional stylistic

approaches rather than discordant/conflict approaches. Washington State is the only polity in

the study where the discordant/conflict approach predominates in the reviewed standards.

While 46% of Washington State's standards reflect a discordant/conflict stylistic orientation,

the next highest percentage of discordant/conflict standards is 25% in both Arizona and South

Dakota, and every other polity in the sample falls either at or below 15% discordant/conflict.

Florida, Virginia, and South Carolina also present interesting case studies in stylistic tendency.

Even though all three polities largely avoid discordant/conflict perspectives, Florida (61%) and

Virginia (59%) adopt largely contributory approaches, while South Carolina reflects a mainly

progressive/exceptional stance (59%). Thematically, the style of use data also reveals a de-

emphasis on discordant/conflict perspectives, with Westward Expansion and Reconstruction

standards tying at 28% for the most frequent use of this style. Another interesting outcome is

the contrast between the largely progressive/exceptional treatment of Reconstruction (52%)

and the predominantly contributory treatment of the Civil Rights Movement (57%). Perhaps

the most striking result here is that none of the 26 standards that treat the Civil War reflects a

discordant/conflict perspective.

History as Treasure Hunt

Many of the reviewed standards employ omniscient linguistic structures that invite

students to develop their own "answers" about history but only within a very narrow and vague

framework. Florida asks students to "identify the causes and effects of the Seminole Wars"

(Florida SS.4.A.3.10**:** 0, PE), as well as to "describe the causes and effects of the Louisiana

Purchase" (Florida SS.5.A.6.1**:** 0, PE). New Jersey expects students to "determine the impetus

for the Civil Rights Movement, and explain why national governmental actions were needed to

ensure civil rights for African Americans" (New Jersey 6.1.12.D.13.a**:** 2, PE), while Michigan

requires students to "explain the ideology of the institution of slavery, its policies, and

consequences" (Michigan 8-U4.2.2**:** 0, PE). These standards are each seemingly open-ended

and non-prescriptive, but a closer look indicates that in each case students are expected to

perform rote cognitive tasks that derive from an objectivist epistemological perspective (Novick,

1988). Each standard suggests a previously agreed upon list of possible answers and each

presumes that teachers will be able to guide students to the approved responses by marshaling

the appropriate historical evidence. This notion of teachers as omniscient conduits between

state-level policymakers and students is problematic because it presupposes that teachers can

and will act simply as bureaucratic "content-deliverers" intuiting and deferring to policymakers'

goals. (Tyack & Cuban, 1995).

Reductionist approaches to history education also appear to be oblivious to the

tentative and argumentative nature of historical interpretation. Reductionist standards adopt

what I term a *history as treasure hunt* epistemological perspective, in that objective knowledge

about the past is waiting to be discovered by those who possess an accurate map. Many

standards explicitly prescribe the boundaries within which students are to operate. Arizona

asks students to "identify reasons (e.g., economic opportunities, forced removal) why people in

the United States moved westward to territories or unclaimed lands" (Arizona Concept 5: PO 2**:**

0, PE), as well as to "discuss the effects (e.g., loss of land, depletion of the buffalo,

establishment of reservations, government boarding schools) of Westward Expansion on Native

Americans" (Arizona Concept 5: PO 5**:** 1, DC). South Carolina expects students to "explain the

reasons for South Carolina's secession from the Union, including the abolitionist movement,

states' rights, and the desire to defend South Carolina's way of life" (South Carolina 3-4.3**:** 0, PE),

as well as to "summarize the successes and failures that occurred in South Carolina during

Reconstruction, including the bribery of legislators, corruption in political parties, the

development of public education, and violence during the election of 1876" (South Carolina 8-

4.5**:** 0, DC).

Arizona provides teachers and students with a partial map to "historical truth" about

the causes and effects of westward expansion, but with the caveat that the full truth can only

be discovered through a semi-structured guessing game. South Carolina, on the other hand,

provides students with an unequivocal map to "historical truth," as the reasons for South

Carolina's secession from the Union and the successes and failures of Reconstruction in South

Carolina have ostensibly been agreed upon by a putative body of experts, and diligent students

have only to reproduce these answers to demonstrate historical knowledge. The standards also

expect students to make generalizations about cause and effect in history but they do not

provide any specific hypotheses to be tested. Instead, the standards expect teachers and

students to assemble the given information (correct responses) into coherent and testable

propositions.

The implicit and explicit rigidity of many of the standards has problematic consequences

for students' ability to think historically. Seixas (2000) argues that in most schools "only

marginal attention, if any at all, is devoted to learning how to question a historical account,

understand the evidentiary base upon which it rests, and to assessing it in relation to

competing accounts" (p. 24). The treasure hunt model precludes the possibility of generating

new or multiple understandings about the past and instead focuses narrowly on rote skills like

recall, explanation, and description of previously codified information. The treasure hunt

model also deemphasizes the importance of assessing significance in history education because

students are too busy locating and processing factual details to be able to think analytically

about the larger historical picture.

The Code of Silence

The reviewed standards typically adopt what Levstik (2000) calls a "code of silence"

about controversial aspects of U.S. history, particularly around constructions of social identity

related to race, class, and gender. Relatively few standards deploy historical content in a

discordant/conflict style that represents the U.S. as a nation of, in Epstein's (2009) phrase,

"limited progress marked by struggle, racism and inequality" (p. 2). The standards more

commonly adopt contributory and progressive/exceptional stances that focus primarily on the

cultural contributions of people of color and characterize the U.S. as a nation of linear progress on race relations respectively. The standards also generally adopt a teleological stance toward history, wherein "there is a sense of inevitable movement; things just happen without explanation or reasons being offered. Problems exist and are resolved, more or less, but there is little or no hint of human suffering, agency, conflict, or struggle" (Cornbleth, 1998, p. 629).

The reviewed standards' treatment of Martin Luther King, Jr. and the 1963 March on Washington is a representative example of the code of silence and the absence of discordant perspectives. Michigan asks students to "compare and contrast the ideas in Martin Luther King's March on Washington speech to the ideas expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the Seneca Falls Resolution, and the Gettysburg Address" (Michigan 8.3.2**:** 3, PE), while Washington D.C. expects students to,

> Identify and research outstanding statements of moral and civic principles made in
>
> Washington, DC, as well as the leaders who delivered them, that contributed to the
>
> struggle to extend equal rights to all Americans (e.g., Lincoln and his second inaugural
>
> address, Frederick Douglass and his speech against lynching at the Metropolitan AME
>
> Church, Martin Luther King Jr. and his speeches at the Lincoln Memorial in 1957 and
>
> 1963, and Rodolfo "Corky" Gonzales at the Poor People's March). (Washington D.C.
>
> 3.4.5**:** 3, C)

Florida also requires students to "assess the building of coalitions between African Americans, whites, and other groups in achieving integration and equal rights: Examples are Freedom Summer, Freedom Rides, Montgomery Bus Boycott, Tallahassee Bus Boycott of 1956, March on Washington" (Florida SS.912.A.7.7**:** 3, PE).

Michigan and Washington, D.C. effectively situate King's "I Have a Dream" speech within a tradition of American dissent, but the standards convey a stronger commitment to establishing a pattern of linear progress and social unity on race relations than to framing King's speech as an example of persistent racial discord. Michigan offers no indication that the ideas contained in the Declaration of Independence, the Seneca Falls Resolution, the Gettysburg Address, and King's speech were actually quite radical within their respective historical contexts, and thereby suggests that the speeches can be decontextualized and reliably compared to each other across time and space, including the present day. Isenberg (1998) argues, however, that nineteenth-century Americans "had a curious love-hate relationship with the principle and practice of equality. They eulogized the Declaration of Independence, granting it sacred status as national scripture, crediting the revolutionary text with having elevated equality into a 'self-evident truth'" (p. xi), while at the same time, "Equal rights were routinely denied to slaves, children, and the so-called dangerous classes of free blacks, paupers, resident aliens (particularly non-Caucasian or Catholic foreigners), criminals, and those considered insane" (p. xii). Isenberg maintains that women represented an even more ambiguous social subgroup, as "freeborn women had the appearance of citizenship but lacked the basic rights to be real citizens. Equality remained a concept that somehow did not apply to women" (p. xii).

The Seneca Falls Resolution and the Gettysburg Address cannot defensibly be framed as seminal links in a linear march toward social consensus on the importance of equality to what Lipset (1996) describes as the "American Creed." Definitions of what constitutes equality have changed over time, and DuBois (1987) contends that the notion of political gender equality was widely considered radical well into the nineteenth century. Although the Seneca Falls

Convention was a significant historical event that rhetorically linked the feminist movement

with the abolitionist and black suffrage movements in the radical republican cause, the feminist

movement failed to produce tangible results for several generations. Just as the end of

Reconstruction in the South reversed many of the political gains that African Americans had

achieved, the late nineteenth century was largely a period of regression on the notion of

women's equality, as "equal rights interpretations of the Constitution had been defeated, and

the women's rights movement itself began to move in less democratic, more conservative

directions" (DuBois, 1987, p. 837).

The circumstance of King's speech occurring exactly a full century after Lincoln's

Gettysburg Address indicates that egalitarianism in practice has been elusive. The standard

positions King's speech as one among many archetypal "outstanding statements of moral and

civic principles" that rhetorically reiterate Americans' collective belief in social equality. The

speeches, however, were significant to contemporary audiences precisely because there was

disunity on the necessity of extending equal rights to all Americans. Frederick Douglass's 1894

anti-lynching speech at Washington, D.C.'s African Methodist Episcopal Church was subversive

at the time because so many Americans rationalized lynching as a form of social control. The

twenty-first century perspective of lynching as a moral abomination perpetrated by dissolute

racists was not widely shared at the end of the nineteenth century, even in the North (McFeely,

1991).

The Florida standards also perpetuate an archetype of linear progress on social equality.

Florida suggests that the Civil Rights Movement and the March on Washington represented the

culmination of this progress, as "African Americans, whites, and other groups" banded together

for a common cause of integration and equality. This simplistic "social unity" narrative,

however, trivializes the nuances of King's message and appropriates the "I Have a Dream"

speech as a manifesto on the virtues of a "color-blind" society. Brown et al. (2003) maintain

that the "color-blind" society is a superficial construct meant to rationalize persistent racial

inequality:

> With the clarity of hindsight, we can now see that it was naïve to believe America could
>
> wipe out three hundred years of physical, legal, cultural, spiritual, and political
>
> oppression based on race in a mere thirty years. The belief, even the hope, that the
>
> nation would glide into color-blindness was foolish. Indeed, there are good reasons to
>
> believe the current goal of a color-blind society is at least as naïve as the optimism of
>
> the 1960s and conveniently masks color-coded privileges. (pp. 3-4)

Florida's standard, however, depicts racial progress through the lens of what Bonilla-Silva (2006)

describes as the "American mythology" – the notion that "social change should be the outcome

of a rational and democratic process and not of the government's coercive capacity" (p. 34).

Bonilla-Silva's "American mythology" speaks to a larger American desire to evaluate the past

based on present-day sensibilities. The archetypal social unity narrative that stresses color-

blind reconciliation fulfills this need by safely positioning racial discord in the past and

deemphasizing persistent economic issues attending to that legacy.

The Allure of Presentism

Many of the reviewed standards in this study deploy presentist techniques to

reconstruct the history of U.S. race relations. These standards work from a paradigm that

Wineburg (2001) labels the "usable past," wherein we manipulate the past to suit present-day needs:

> Because we more or less know what we are looking for before we enter this past, our encounter is unlikely to change us or cause us to rethink who we are. The past becomes clay in our hands. We are not called upon to stretch our understanding to learn from the past. Instead, we contort the past to fit the predetermined meanings we have already assigned it. (p. 6)

Washington State expects students to "examine how multicultural societies have responded to the challenge of creating unified nations that recognize the diversity of their citizens and embrace a set of shared values and goals" (Washington 4.2.2**:** 1, PE), while Florida asks students to "examine this time period (1763-1815) from the perspective of historically under-represented groups (children, indentured servants, Native Americans, slaves, women, working class)" (Florida SS.8.A.3.15**:** 2, C). Both standards employ late twentieth-century terms to describe historical processes and ascribe social mores that did not exist at the time to historical beings. Novick (1999) argues that the tendency to judge the morality of historical beings based upon present-day norms can be seen most clearly in the America's collective memory of the Holocaust:

> "The Holocaust," as we speak of it today, was largely a retrospective construction, something that would not have been recognizable to most people at the time. To speak of "the Holocaust" as a distinct entity, which Americans responded to (or failed to respond to) in various ways, is to introduce an anachronism that stands in the way of understanding contemporary responses. (p. 20)

Both Washington State and Florida, however, perpetuate an anachronistic brand of moral response-driven multiculturalism. Washington State suggests that there is broad acceptance among Americans that we live in a multicultural society and that we should attempt to unify the nation by recognizing diversity and embracing a communal social ethic. This claim is simplistically hopeful because while most Americans would agree that racism is a bad thing, there is considerably less social consensus on what racism actually looks like today and on what measures we should take to both combat racism and to promote tolerance. The notion of multicultural communalism is especially contested in education:

> To those who oppose multiculturalism's thrust, and in particular fear that it is fostering an education that emphasizes the faults and failures of America, multiculturalism has become a term describing all that has gone wrong in American education – indeed, more than that, in American public life generally. (Glazer, 1997, p. 11)

Washington State purports to evaluate the past according to a vaguely multiculturalist criterion that tends toward presentism. If students were actually to seriously examine the historical record in light of how well U.S. society has met the challenge of creating a unified nation dedicated to multicultural understanding, then they would invariably encounter more failure than success. According to this multiculturalist criterion slavery, the Trail of Tears, and the Second World War internment of Japanese Americans, for example, resulted from ignorance about the benefits of racial diversity and inclusiveness. If people "back then" had only been as morally enlightened as we are today, according to this line of thinking, then they would not have been stupid enough to maintain discriminatory practices.

Presentism not only results in less rigorous knowledge of the past but also in simplistic

understandings of present-day society. Teachers and students who adopt presentist moral

judgments about the actions of historical beings often harbor what Wineburg (2001) describes

as a narcissistic belief in the superiority of present-day social customs and relations:

> The narcissist sees the world – both the past and the present – in his own image.
>
> Mature historical knowing teaches us to do the opposite: to go beyond our own image,
>
> to go beyond our brief life, and to go beyond the fleeting moment in human history into
>
> which we have been born. (p. 24)

This notion of self-congratulatory narcissism can be seen in the persistent grip of the Watergate

scandal on America's cultural consciousness. Schudson (1992) points out that "in the years

after Watergate, people began to speak of a 'post-Watergate morality,' the emergence of a

newly stringent set of norms and expectations about the appropriate ethical conduct of men

and women in public life" (p. 154). Watergate serves as a seminal "lesson of history" because

American society has ostensibly progressed to the point where we hold our leaders to higher

standards than Americans must have done during the Nixon presidency, and furthermore, we

can now recognize and condemn immoral behavior before it rises to the level of "gate" status.

Florida's use of the phrase "historically under-represented groups" introduces a

decidedly ahistorical dynamic to U.S. social history. Children, indentured servants, Native

peoples, slaves, women, and the working class in the early American republic did not refer to

themselves as "under-represented," nor did they need a label to feel exploited and

dehumanized by unchecked capitalism and urbanization. These designations of marginalization

only make sense in the context of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century battles over

affirmative action and other race-based social policies. The label "historically under-represented" also trivializes the often catastrophic experiences of those designated as "Other" by dominant U.S. society. By cloaking these experiences in vague, euphemistic language, Florida conveys the dubious stance that the primary problem with this under-representation was a basic lack of political recognition, which was eventually solved by a more enlightened society some years later.

A more nuanced conceptualization of under-representation in the early American republic would recognize the interlocking nature of social identities during this time period. Native peoples and European American laborers did not live isolated lives, as "work and whiteness joined in the argument for dispossession. Settlers, whether or not they worked harder or more steadily than Native Americans, came to consider themselves 'hardworking whites' in counterpoint to their imagination of Indian styles of life" (Roediger, 1999, p. 21). The presentist tendency in this case would be to merely castigate working-class European Americans for their narrow-minded prejudice against Native peoples.   While moral response can be a valuable ingredient in mature historical thinking (Barton & Levstik, 2004), it is intellectually disingenuous to remove selected historical beings from their contemporary social contexts and judge them by twenty-first century moral standards. It is imperative that educational policymakers avoid engaging in lazy presentist constructions that lead both to superficial understanding of the past and the inability to engage with how historical social relations continue to shape present-day social identities and interactions.

Schooling, History, and Historiography

This study raises the question of whether it is appropriate for America's public schools

to engage students in historiography, especially in the elementary grades. This epistemological

dilemma has as much to do with how Americans would like to remember their past as with

whether school-age students possess the cognitive skills to be able to think historically. That is,

the issue is as much normative as it is technical or procedural. Many Americans of all ages

equate history with commemoration. From an early age American children are taught to revere

the nation's Founders and political traditions. In school textbooks American children are taught

to remember the Alamo, the Maine, Pearl Harbor, and other seminal historical events. Millions

of Americans have made pilgrimages to iconic American battlefields and countless historical

films have recreated and reshaped the public perception of American history. Most recently

the events of September 11th, 2001 have become a cultural touchstone to remind Americans

about the importance of remaining vigilant in promoting democracy and freedom throughout

the world. Ostensibly patriotic acts of remembrance and commemoration play an important

role in shaping the collective character of a nation and its diverse peoples, as patriotism "serves

as a symbol that 'coerces' the discordant interests of diverse social groups and unites them into

a 'unitary conceptual framework' which connects the ideal with the real" (Bodnar, 1992).

Commemoration and history, however, are not synonymous constructs. The United

States officially commemorates the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. each year, but the act of

commemoration alone is decontextualized and tells us nothing about King except that he was

born sometime in the middle of January and he is now dead. On Martin Luther King, Jr. Day

schoolchildren may learn that King was an important civil rights leader who was assassinated

143

and they may even read literature that provides further details about King's life. All of this detail is preface to history, or what I would term *tombstone history*, the central biography of a historical being's life. King's tombstone history is deservedly longer than most Americans who have ever lived, but one's tombstone history is relatively indisputable and concrete. King, as well as Abraham Lincoln and John F. Kennedy, were irrefutably shot and killed, although certain details of each case remain unclear. King's life enters the realm of history when we begin to ask conjectural and interpretive questions that defy easy explanation and that can be argued logically from more than one side.

Given the stylistic preferences of textbook companies, however, it is not surprising that many Americans tend to think of history as a straightforward chronicle of "what happened" during a particularly time period:

> Insofar as the schools conceive of the products of the historical community of inquiry –
> historical scholarship – as "fact," as what happened, those products have undergone a
> transformation in crossing the boundary that separates historians from everyone else.
> Among historians, they are put forward as arguments, tentative and invented, to be
> challenged and revised, contributions to an ongoing discussion within a community of
> inquiry. When taken out of that context, they dry up. (Seixas, 1993, p. 313)

This tombstone approach is efficient and supposedly accessible to a broad audience because it avoids cumbersome interpretive elements. The interpretive or historiographic act, however, is what makes history a relevant discipline. When shorn of interpretation history is dull and lifeless, and it is not surprising that many students tend to eventually lose interest in school history.

At the same time, the act of engaging young students in sustained critique of America's

traditions is a risky proposition because a critical look at our nation's past would reveal some

uncomfortable details. Is it appropriate for fifth grade, eighth grade, or even eleventh grade

U.S. History students to learn that Abraham Lincoln, despite being labeled the Great

Emancipator, actually supported the colonization of America's slave population for the vast

majority of his political life (Foner, 2010)? This is a normative question but it need not be

conceptualized in terms of a false dichotomy. Lincoln was neither a vehement racist nor a

radical abolitionist; he was a complicated individual who both shaped and was shaped by public

opinion on race and slavery (Foner, 2010). No matter the age of the student it is disingenuous

for educational policymakers and practitioners to represent historical beings like Lincoln or King

as one-dimensional stock figures in a linear march toward freedom and progress.

Cultural transmission and critical thought are not mutually exclusive constructs, and

they actually have the potential to be mutually reinforcing. Rosenzweig and Thelen (1998)

argue that while many Americans avow marked interest in studying and preserving local and

national heritage, they also generally reject simplistic and sanitized historical narratives that

celebrate shallow forms of heritage. Academic and popular debates about the tension between

cultural transmission and critical thought in history education are healthy in a democratic

society, and especially one whose demographic makeup is rapidly changing. Hess (2009)

contends that "you cannot *have* democracy without discussion" (pp. 15-16). Furthermore,

many of the most ostensibly fundamental elements of our "national heritage" remain disputed

constructs:

The meaning of some of our most cherished concepts such as freedom and equality are

contested. The very universality of their use hides a host of divergent connotations and

applications that make them subject to severe disagreements. The fixing of the social

meanings of such concepts does not come about without political, economic, and

cultural struggle. (Apple, 2000, p. xii)

Debates about what content should be included in U.S. History curricula are inherently

political because they revolve around the contested terrain of cultural values. Rather than

wishing this politicization were not so, the social studies academic and professional

communities would do better to engage the democratic potential of the curriculum by

promoting nuanced and critical thinking about how social identities have been constructed and

deployed both throughout American history and today. As historian Gordon Wood (2009)

maintains, however, this notion of "critical history" is admittedly a contrarian position in a

hyper-sensitive contemporary U.S. society:

History that reveals the utter differentness and discontinuity of the past tends to

undermine that crude instrumental and presentist use of the past that we Americans

have been prone to. We Americans resist this kind of historical consciousness. We do

not want to hear about the unusability and pastness of the past or about the limitations

within which people in the past were obliged to act. (p. 14)

As the implications of Wood's analysis suggest, most of the U.S. History curriculum standards

reviewed in this study adopt a compromise stance that avoids critical history, and by extension

politics, altogether.

Policy Implications

Even a cursory review of most U.S. History content standards is a mystifying experience. Most standards documents appear to be rigorous by expecting students to master a substantial body of factual knowledge, but they simultaneously deploy opaque language that obfuscates the origins of and warrants for that knowledge. This rhetorical approach is not a coincidence, as vagueness is a reasonable and rationale response to the confluence of contending pressures on the school curriculum. Many of these pressures arise from contending political values about the mobilization of social identities in social studies curricula – and particularly around racialized identities. "Race" is increasingly becoming a tenuous organizing construct in a globalizing world, and events such as the September 11th attacks have "complicated clear demarcations between 'here' and 'there,' 'self' and 'other,' 'first' and 'Third World'" (McCarthy, 2008, p. 336). This uncertainty about race also extends to uncertainty about the role of the nation-state, particularly the United States, in the political and economic world order, as "we live in a deeply interconnected world in which centers and margins are unstable and constantly being redefined, rearticulated, and reordered" (McCarthy, 2008, p. 321).

In addition to this epistemological uncertainty about both social identities and the role of the nation-state in the twenty-first century, various stakeholders expect social studies curricula to address a host of contradictory concerns. Cornbleth and Waugh (1995) argue that Americans have traditionally harbored unrealistic expectations for what schools can and should accomplish, as "schools are called on to resolve societal problems ranging from racial segregation to family breakdown to lagging competitiveness in the global economy" (p. vi). Politically motivated interest groups have taken advantage of this popular conception of the

147

schools as panaceas for various economic and social ills by attempting to map their ideological

agendas onto social studies curricula, and in this sense the seemingly paradoxical nature of

curriculum policy is not coincidental:

> At any given time, we do not find a monolithic supremacy exercised by one interest
>
> group; rather, we find different interest groups competing for dominance over the
>
> curriculum and, at different times, achieving some measure of control, depending on
>
> local as well as general social conditions. Each of these interest groups, then, represents
>
> a force for a different selection of knowledge and values drawn from the culture and
>
> hence a kind of lobby for a different curriculum. (Kliebard, 2004, p. 7)

The school curriculum is an inherently bounded construct, so curriculum policy work necessarily

involves choices and trade-offs about what a society deems most important for its children to

learn. Questions about *what* and *whose* perspectives should be included in the curriculum are

not merely academic, for "the question of whose cultural and moral values will emerge as

dominant in any society is hardly a trivial matter" (Kliebard, 2004, p. 290).

The notion of curricular "trade-offs" also implies a zero-sum political arena wherein we

can learn as much about a society's ascendant values from what gets *excluded* from the

curriculum as from what gets *included* in the curriculum. In recent years the increasing

prevalence of anti-racist, social justice, and critical global curricular orientations among

educational scholars committed to a radical critique of the tenets of multiculturalism has raised

the political stakes of social studies curriculum development. May and Sleeter (2010) argue

that in conventional multiculturalism "the focus is on getting along better, primarily via a

greater recognition of, and respect for, ethnic, cultural, and/or linguistic differences" (p. 4), but

148

while this curricular focus may be convenient and efficient "it abdicates any corresponding recognition of unequal, and often untidy, power relations that underpin inequality and limit cultural interaction" (p. 4). In a similar vein Giroux (2000) contends that "in its conservative and liberal forms multiculturalism has placed the related problems of white racism, social justice, and power off limits, especially as these might be addressed as part of a broader set of political and pedagogical concerns" (p. 196). Scholars who write from a critical global perspective have questioned the very legitimacy of organizing social studies curricula around discrete investigations of "U.S. History," "World History," "Geography," "Economics," and other archetypal categories.

> A critical global perspective advocates the value of going beyond the nation-state-centered approach to teaching about topics such as history, politics, culture, and so on. It calls for the need to develop curriculum that accounts for transnational formations: an intervention that asks us to go beyond issues that are confined within national borders. (Subedi, 2010, p. 2)

The authors of social studies standards documents have consistently adapted to the often contradictory social pressures on the curriculum by carving out a path of least resistance that above all seeks to avoid offending. Within this framework social identity, particularly around race, is both sacred and untouchable. People of color typically figure prominently in standards documents but teachers and students are usually not given the tools to critically analyze the construction of racialized identities. The compromise curricular stance, although seemingly crafted to appeal to the largest demographic possible, somewhat paradoxically ends up completely satisfying very few. Political conservatives find the compromise curriculum

problematic because they believe that the standards deemphasize America's Founding Fathers and political traditions in order to satisfy a multicultural inclusion criterion. Political liberals and critical scholars, meanwhile, find the compromise curriculum equally as problematic because they believe it promotes a linear consensus narrative that deemphasizes critical thinking about social relations in American history. The compromise curriculum is so prevalent because all of the major stakeholders in curriculum policy are afraid of complex, multi-causal, interpretive history. Policymakers fear that rigorous history cannot be easily tested, teachers fear that it cannot be easily taught, and students fear that it will require too much work. We are left, ultimately, with curricula that avoid both political controversy and historical rigor – and that thereby fall short in helping students to think more critically about their social world.

Based on this study's findings, I am pessimistic about the current direction of history education in the United States. I am more hopeful, however, about the possibility that this study will offer educational policymakers an alternative lens through which to conceptualize the goals of historical study. Despite significantly increased attention in schools to Language Arts and Mathematics in light of NCLB's laser focus on improving test scores in these areas, U.S. History remains a curricular staple in every state-level polity. The potential exists for U.S. History curricula to provide students the analytical skills that they need to contextualize how social identities have been constructed and mobilized throughout American history to the present. The potential also exists, however, for curriculum developers to unwittingly sabotage students' ability to think critically about the past and about their own social worlds by patronizing them with sterilized historical narratives that perpetuate limited contributory and normative progressive conceptions of social change. As educational stakeholders consider the

degree to which U.S. History should be integrated in the Common Core Standards discussion it

behooves all involved to think deeply about whether the full inclusion of U.S. History would

result in even more simplified and sanitized content objectives. The compromise curriculum

may have been a politically palatable outcome in the past, but teachers and students deserve

better than to be pawns in an intractable ideological contest between warring stakeholders

who are removed from the consequences of their actions.

REFERENCES

Alozie, N. (1995). Political tolerance hypotheses and White opposition to a Martin Luther King holiday in Arizona. *The Social Science Journal, 32*(1), 1-16.

Alridge, D. (2006). The limits of master narratives in history textbooks: An analysis of representations of Martin Luther King, Jr. *Teachers College Record, 108*(4), 662-686.

Ambrose, S. (1996). *Undaunted courage: Meriwether Lewis, Thomas Jefferson, and the opening of the opening of the American West*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Anderson, J. (1994). How we learn about race through history. In L. Kramer, D. Reid, & W. Barney (Eds.), *Learning history in America: Schools, cultures, and politics* (pp. 87-106). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Anderson, J. (2004). Crosses to bear and promises to keep: The jubilee anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education*. *Urban Education, 39*(4), 359-373.

Apple, M. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Appleby, J., Hunt, L., & Jacob, M. (1994). *Telling the truth about history*. New York, NY: Norton.

Aptheker, H. (1993). *American Negro slave revolts: 50th Anniversary Edition*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Arizona Department of Education (2005). *Social Studies Standard Articulated by Grade Level*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://www.ade.state.az.us/standards/sstudies/articulated/SSStandard-full-05-22-06.pdf

Armento, B. (1993). Reform revisited: The story of elementary social studies at the crest of The 21st century. In V. Wilson, J. Litel, & G. Wilson (Eds.), *Teaching social studies: Handbook of trends, issues, and implications for the future* (pp. 25-44). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Axtell, J. (2001). *Natives and newcomers: The cultural origins of North America*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bain, R. (2006). Rounding up unusual suspects: Facing the authority hidden in the history classroom. *Teachers College Record, 108*(10), 2080-2114.

Baptist, E. (2001). "Cuffy," "Fancy Maids," and "One-Eyed Men": Rape, commodification, and the domestic slave trade in the United States. *American Historical Review, 106*(5), 1619-1650.

Barton, K. (2001). A sociocultural perspective on children's understanding of historical change: Comparative findings from Northern Ireland and the United States. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 881-913.

Barton, K. (2008). Research on students' ideas about history. In L. Levstik & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 239-258). New York, NY: Routledge.

Barton, K., & Levstik, L. (1998). "It wasn't a good part of history": National identity and students' explanations of historical significance. *Teachers College Record, 99*(3), 478-513.

Barton, K., & Levstik, L. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bazerman, C. (2006). Analyzing the multidimensionality of texts in education. In J. Green, G. Camilli, & P. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 77-94). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Berlin, I. (2003). *Generations of captivity: A history of African-American slaves*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Bernstein, I. (1990). *The New York City draft riots: Their significance for American society and politics in the age of the Civil War*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Betts, R. (2000). *In search of York: The slave who went to the Pacific with Lewis and Clark* (Rev. ed.). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Blight, D. (2001). *Race and reunion: The Civil War in American memory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Bloom, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook 1: Cognitive domain*. New York, NY: Longman.

Bodnar, J. (1992). *Remaking America: Public memory, commemoration, and patriotism in the twentieth century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2006). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brands, H. (2004). *Lone star nation: How a ragged army of volunteers won the battle for Texas independence – and changed America*. New York: Doubleday.

Brands, H. (2005). *Andrew Jackson: His life and times*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Brown, A., & Brown, K. (2010). Strange fruit indeed: Interrogating contemporary textbook representations of racial violence toward African Americans. *Teachers College Record, 112*(1), 31-67.

Brown, M., Carnoy, M., Currie, E., Duster, T., Oppenheimer, D., Shultz, M., & Wellman, D. (2003). *Whitewashing race: The myth of a color-blind society*. Berkeley, CA; University of California Press.

Buras, K., & Apple, M. (2006). The subaltern speak: Curriculum, power, and educational struggles. In M. Apple & K. Buras (Eds.), *The subaltern speak: Curriculum, power, and educational struggles* (pp. 1-39). New York, NY: Routledge.

Carlson, D. (2003). Troubling heroes: Of Rosa Parks, multicultural education, and critical pedagogy. *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies, 3*(1), 44-61.

Castenell, Jr., L., & Pinar, W. (1993). Introduction. In L. Castenell, Jr. & W. Pinar (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as racial text: Representations of identity and difference in education* (pp. 1-30). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cherryholmes, C. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Claeys, G. (2000). The "Survival of the Fittest" and the origins of Social Darwinism. *Journal of the History of Ideas, 61*(2), 223-240.

Colaiaco, J. (2006). *Frederick Douglass and the Fourth of July*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Conley, D. (1999). *Being black, living in the red: Race, wealth, and social policy in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Connelly, T. (1977). *The marble man: Robert E. Lee and his image in American society*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Cornbleth, C. (1998). An American curriculum? *Teachers College Record, 99*(4), 622-646.

Cornbleth, C. (2000). National standards and curriculum as cultural containment? In C. Cornbleth (Ed.), *Curriculum politics, policy, practice: Cases in comparative context* (pp. 211-238). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cornbleth, C., & Waugh, D. (1995). *The great speckled bird: Multicultural politics and education policymaking*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Cornell, S. (1988). *The return of the native: American Indian political resurgence*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J., & Clark, V. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Crismore, A. (1984). The rhetoric of textbooks: Metadiscourse. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 16*(3), 279-296.

Dallek, R. (2003). *An unfinished life: John F. Kennedy, 1917-1963*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Co.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

District of Columbia Public Schools (2006). *District of Columbia Public Schools Social Studies Pre- K – Grade 12 Standards*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://www.k12.dc.us/DCPS/standards2005/SocialStudies/SocialStudies.pdf

Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857).

Drop political games from social studies plan: Don't let African history cut into teaching time for U.S. history. (2007, September 17). *The Detroit News,* p. 10A.

DuBois, E. (1987). Outgrowing the compact of the Fathers: Equal rights, woman suffrage, and the United States Constitution, 1820-1878. *The Journal of American History, 74*(3), 836-862.

DuBois, W. (1903). *The souls of black folk*. Chicago, IL: A.C. McClurg.

Ellis, J. (2007). *American creation: Triumphs and tragedies at the founding of the republic*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Epstein, T. (2009). *Interpreting national history: Race, identity, and pedagogy in classrooms and communities*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Evans, R.J. (1999). *In defense of history*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Evans, R.W. (2001). Teaching social issues: Implementing an issues-centered curriculum. In E. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (Rev. ed.) (pp. 291-309). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Evans, R.W. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Evans, R.W. (2008). The (unfulfilled) promise of critical pedagogy. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 32*(2), 16-25.

Faust, D. (1988). *The creation of Confederate nationalism: Ideology and identity in the Civil War South*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

Feagin, J., & O'Brien, E. (2003). *White men on race: Power, privilege, and the shaping of cultural consciousness*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Finn, C., & Petrilli, M. (Eds.)(2000). *The state of state standards, 2000*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Finn, C., Petrilli, M., & Julian, L. (2006). *The state of state standards 2006*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Fitzgerald, F. (1979). *America revised: History schoolbooks in the twentieth century*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.

Florida Department of Education (2008). *Next Generation Sunshine State Standards*. Retrieved July 26, 2010, from http://www.floridastandards.org/Standards/FLStandardSearch.aspx

Foner, E. (1970). *Free soil, free labor, free men: The ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Foner, E. (1988). *Reconstruction: America's unfinished revolution, 1863-1877*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Foner, E. (2010). *The fiery trial: Abraham Lincoln and American slavery*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co.

Gay, G. (2003). Deracialization in social studies teacher education textbooks. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on the social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 123-148). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Genovese, E. (1969). *The world the slaveholders made: Two essays in interpretation*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Genovese, E. (1976). *Roll, Jordan, roll: The world the slaves made*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Genovese, E. (1979). *From rebellion to revolution: Afro-American slave revolts in the making of the modern world*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

Giroux, H. (2000). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In E. Duarte & S. Smith (Eds.), *Foundational perspectives in multicultural education* (pp. 195-212). New York, NY: Longman.

Giroux, H. (2004). Critical pedagogy and the postmodern/modern divide: Towards a pedagogy of democratization. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 31*(1), 31-47.

Giroux, H. (2006). *Stormy weather: Katrina and the politics of disposability*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Gitlin, T. (1993). *The sixties: Years of hope, days of rage* (Rev. trade ed.). New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Glazer, N. (1997). *We are all multiculturalists now*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Good, A. (2009). Framing American Indians as the "First Americans": Using critical multiculturalism to trouble the normative American story. *Social Studies Research and Practice, 4*(2), 49-66.

Gordy, L., & Pritchard, A. (1995). Redirecting our voyage through history: A content analysis of social studies textbooks. *Urban Education, 30*(2), 195-218.

Grant-Thomas, A. (2009). Introduction: The past as racial prologue? In A. Grant-Thomas & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Twenty-first century color lines: Multiracial change in contemporary America* (pp. 1-24). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Grant, S., & Horn, C. (2006). The state of state-level history tests. In S. Grant (Ed.), *Measuring history: Cases of state-level testing across the United States* (pp. 9-27). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Grant, S., & Salinas, C. (2008). Assessment and accountability in the social studies. In L. Levstik & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 219-236). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hall, J. (2005). The long civil rights movement and the political uses of the past. *The Journal of American History, 91*(4), 1233-1263.

Hess, D. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hirsch, E. (1996). *The schools we need and why we don't have them*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Holt, T. (1995). Reconstruction in United States History textbooks. *The Journal of American History, 81*(4), 1641-1651.

Horsman, R. (1981). *Race and manifest destiny: The origins of American racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hursh, D. (1997). Multicultural social studies: Schools as places for examining and challenging inequality. In E. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 107-119). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Isenberg, N. (1998). *Sex and citizenship in antebellum America*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Jackson, T. (2007). *From civil rights to human rights: Martin Luther King, Jr., and the struggle for economic justice*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Johnson, W. (1999). *Soul by soul: Life inside the antebellum slave market*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Journell, W. (2008). When oppression and liberation are the only choices: The representation of African Americans within state social studies standards. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 32*(1), 40-50.

Kamb, L. (2005, March 25). Duwamish take issue with history bill: Landless tribes say proposal excludes them. *Seattle Post-Intelligencer,* p. B1.

Kammen, M. (1991). *Mystic chords of memory: The transformation of tradition in American culture*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kammen, M. (1993). The problem of American exceptionalism: A reconsideration. *American Quarterly, 45*(1), 1-43.

Keyes v. Denver School District No. 1, 413 U.S. 189 (1973).

Kilpatrick, J. (1999). *Celluloid Indians: Native Americans and film*. Lincoln, NE: University of
Nebraska Press.

Kim, C. (2004). Imagining race and nation in multiculturalist America. *Ethnic and Racial
Studies, 27*(6), 987-1005.

Kincheloe, J. (1993). The politics of race, history, and the curriculum. In L. Castenell, Jr. & W.
Pinar (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as racial text: Representations of identity and
difference in education* (pp. 249-262). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kliebard, H. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958* (3rd ed.). New York,
NY: RoutledgeFalmer.

Kohl, H. (1991). The politics of children's literature: The story of Rosa Parks and the
Montgomery Bus Boycott. *Journal of Education, 173*(1), 35-50.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Just what is critical race theory, and what's it doing in a nice field
like education? In L. Parker, D. Deyhl, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race Is…RaceIsn't* (pp. 7-30).
Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Put up or shut up: The challenge of moving from critical theory to
critical pedagogy (a formative assessment). In D. Hursh & E. Ross (Eds.), *Democratic
social education: Social studies for social change* (pp. 149-163). New York, NY: Falmer
Press.

Lee, T. (2002). *Mobilizing public opinion: Black insurgency and racial attitudes in the civil
rights era*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Levstik, L. (2000). Articulating the silences: Teachers' and adolescents' conceptions of
historical significance. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching,
and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 284-305). New York,
NY: New York University Press.

Lewis, A. (2001). There is no "race" in the schoolyard: Color-blind ideology in an (almost) all-
white school. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 781-811.

Lintner, T. (2004). The savage and the slave: Critical Race Theory, racial stereotyping, and the
teaching of American history. *Journal of Social Studies Research, 28*(1), 27-32.

Lipset, S. (1996). *American exceptionalism: A double-edged sword*. New York, NY: W.W.
Norton.

Loewen, J. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook
got wrong*. New York, NY: Touchstone.

Lowenthal, D. (1985). *The past is a foreign country*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lowenthal, D. (1989). The timeless past: Some Anglo-American historical preconceptions. *The Journal of American History, 75*(4), 1263-1280.

Malott, C., & Pruyn, M. (2006). Marxism and Critical Multicultural Social Studies. In E. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3rd ed.) (pp. 157-170). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Marcus, A., Metzger, S., Paxton, R., & Stoddard, J. (2010). *Teaching history with film: Strategies for secondary social studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Marker, M. (2006). After the Makah whale hunt: Indigenous knowledge and limits to multicultural discourse. *Urban Education, 41*(5), 482-505.

Massey, D., & Denton, N. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mathison, S., Ross, E., & Vinson, K. (2006). Defining the social studies curriculum: Influence of and resistance to curriculum standards and testing in social studies. In E. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3rd ed.) (pp. 99-114). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

May, S., & Sleeter, C. (2010). Introduction. Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis. In S. May & C. Sleeter (Eds.), *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Routledge.

McBeth, S. (2003). Memory, history, and contested pasts: Re-imagining Sacagawea/Sacajawea. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 27*(1), 1-32.

McCarthy, C. (2008). Understanding the neoliberal context of race and schooling in the age of globalization. In C. McCarthy & C. Teasley (Eds.), *Transnational perspectives on culture, policy, and education: Redirecting cultural studies in neoliberal times* (pp. 319-340). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

McCarthy, C., & Crichlow, W. (1993). Introduction: Theories of identity, theories of representation, theories of race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (pp. xiii-xxix). New York, NY: Routledge.

McFeely, W. (1991). *Frederick Douglass*. New York, NY: Norton.

McGreal, C. (2011, January 22). Tucson teachers fight to overturn ban on Mexican American classes. *The Guardian*, p. 27.

McKnight, G. (1998). *The last crusade: Martin Luther King, Jr., the FBI, and the Poor People's Campaign*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Michigan Department of Education (2007). *Grade Level Content Expectations*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/SSGLCE_218368_7.pdf

Michigan Department of Education (2007). *High School Content Expectations*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/SS_HSCE_210739_7.pdf

Milliken v. Bradley, 418 U.S. 717 (1974).

Moreau, J. (2003). *Schoolbook nation: Conflicts over American History textbooks from the Civil War to the present*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Mucher, S. (2006, June 29). Don't lower expectations on teaching U.S. history: Michigan plan should get students to think critically. *The Detroit News,* p. 17A.

Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy*. New York, NY: Harper.

Nagel, J. (1996). *American Indian ethnic renewal: Red power and the resurgence of identity and culture*. New York, NY: oxford University Press.

Nash, G., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R. (1997). *History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past*. New York, NY: A.A. Knopf.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Governors Association for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers (2010). "Common Core Standards Initiative." Retrieved March 29, 2010, from http://www.corestandards.org/

Nelson, J., & Pang, V. (2006). Racism, prejudice, and the social studies curriculum. In E. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3rd ed.) (pp. 115-135). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ngai, M. (1999). The architecture of race in American immigration law: A reexamination of the Immigration Act of 1924. *The Journal of American History, 86*(1), 67-92.

Ngo, B. (2010). Doing "diversity" at Dynamic High: Problems and possibilities of multicultural education in practice. *Education and Urban Society, 42*(4), 473-495.

Novick, P. (1988). *That noble dream: The "objectivity question" and the American historical profession*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Novick, P. (1999). *The Holocaust in American life*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2007). *Historic reversals, accelerating resegregation, and the need for new integration strategies*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles, Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles.

Ostler, J. (2004). *The Plains Sioux and U.S. colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Patterson, O. (1998). *Rituals of blood: Consequences of slavery in two American centuries*. New York, NY: Basic Civitas.

Paxton, R. (1999). A deafening silence: History textbooks and the students who read them. *Review of Educational Research, 69*(3), 315-339.

Peräkylä, A. (2005). Analyzing talk and text. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 869-886). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

Porter, A., Polikoff, M., & Smithson, J. (2009). Is there a de facto national intended curriculum? Evidence from state content standards. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 31*(3), 238-268.

Rains, F. (2006). The color of social studies: A post-social studies reality check. In E. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3rd ed.) (pp. 137-156). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ransom, R. (1989). *Conflict and compromise: The political economy of slavery, emancipation, and the American Civil War*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ravitch, D. (2000). Multiculturalism: E pluribus plures. In S. Steinberg (Ed.), *Race and ethnicity in the United States: Issues and debates* (pp. 267-276). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Rifkin, M. (2009). *Manifesting America: The imperial construction of U.S. national space*. Oxford, UK; Oxford University Press.

Robelen, E. (2010a, March 31). Rewriting of states' standards on social studies stirs debate. *Education Week*, *29*(27), 1-3.

Robelen, E. (2010b, June 9). Debate over social studies shows little sign of abating: Some lawmakers seeking to rein in Texas board. *Education Week, 29*(33), 1-2.

Roediger, D. (1999). *The wages of whiteness: Race and the making of the American working class* (Rev. ed.). London, UK: Verso.

Rogin, M. (1991). *Fathers and children: Andrew Jackson and the subjugation of the American Indian*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Roithmayr, D. (1999). Introduction to critical race theory in educational research and praxis. In L. Parker, D. Deyhl, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is…race isn't* (pp. 1-6). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Rosenzweig, R., & Thelen, D. (1998). *The presence of the past: Popular uses of history in American life*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Ross, E. (2006). The struggle for the social studies curriculum. In E. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (3rd ed.) (pp. 17-36). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sánchez-Eppler, K. (1988). Bodily bonds: The intersecting rhetorics of feminism and abolition. *Representations*, 24, 28-59.

Saxe, D. (1998). *State history standards: An appraisal of history standards in 37 states and the District of Columbia*. Washington, D.C: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Sayre, G. (2005). *The Indian chief as tragic hero: Native resistance and the literatures of America, from Moctezuma to Tecumseh*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Schlesinger, Jr., A. (1992). *The disuniting of America*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Schudson, M. (1992). *Watergate in American memory: How we remember, forget, and reconstruct the past*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.

Sears, D. (2000). Urban rioting in Los Angeles: A comparison of 1965 with 1992. In P. Kivisto & G. Rundblad (Eds.), *Multiculturalism in the United States: Current issues, contemporary voices* (pp. 81-92). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Segall, A. (1999). Critical history: Implications for history/ social studies education. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 27*(3), 358-374.

Seixas, P. (1993). The community of inquiry as a basis for knowledge and learning: The case of history. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*(2), 305-324.

Seixas, P. (2000). Schweigen! Die Kinder!: Or, does postmodern history have a place in the schools. In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, & S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing, teaching, and learning history: National and international perspectives* (pp. 21-37). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Severson, K., & Brown, R. (2011, January 15). For some students in the South, a King Day lacking that 'holiday' feature. *The New York Times*, p. A11.

Sinha, M. (2000). *The counterrevolution of slavery: Politics and ideology in antebellum South Carolina*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Slotkin, R. (1985). *The fatal environment: The myth of the frontier in the age of industrialization, 1800-1890*. New York, NY: Atheneum.

South Carolina Department of Education (2005). *South Carolina Social Studies Academic Standards*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Standards-and-Learning/Academic-Standards/old/cso/standards/ss/index.html

South Dakota Department of Education (2006). *Social Studies Content Standards*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://doe.sd.gov/contentstandards/social/docs/Full_Social%20Studies.pdf

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.) (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Standards, assessments, and accountability. (2010, January 14). In *Education Week quality counts 2010: Momentum and challenges in the new surge toward common standards, 29*(17), 39-41. Retrieved January 26, 2010, from http://www.edweek.org/media/ew/qc/2010/17sos.h29.saa.pdf

State of New Jersey Department of Education (2009). *New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards for Social Studies*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://www.state.nj.us/education/cccs/2009/final.htm

State of Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2008). *Washington State K-12 Social Studies Learning Standards*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://www.k12.wa.us/SocialStudies/pubdocs/SocialStudiesStandards.pdf

Stauffer, J. (2008). *Giants: The parallel lives of Frederick Douglass and Abraham Lincoln*. New York, NY: Twelve.

Stern, S. (2003). *Effective state standards for U.S. history: A 2003 report card*. Washington, D.C: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

Students should study tribal history. (2004, February 16). *Seattle Post-Intelligencer,* p. B5.

Sturm, C. (1998). Blood politics, racial classification, and Cherokee national identity: The trials and tribulations of the Cherokee freedmen. *American Indian Quarterly, 22*(1/2), 230-258.

Subedi, B. (2010). Introduction: Reading the world through critical global perspectives. In B. Subedi (Ed.), *Critical global perspectives: Rethinking knowledge about global societies* (pp. 1-18). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1 (1971).

Symcox, L. (2002). *Whose history? The struggle for national standards in American classrooms*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Taubman, P. (1993). Separate identities, separate lives: Diversity in the curriculum. L. Castenell, Jr. & W. Pinar (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as racial text: Representations of identity and difference in education* (pp. 287-306). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Thelen, D. (1989). Memory and American history. *The Journal of American History, 75*(4), 1117-1129.

Thornton, S. (2008). Continuity and change in social studies curriculum. In L. Levstik & C. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 15-32). New York, NY: Routledge.

Trofanenko, B. (2008). More than a single best narrative: Collective history and the transformation of historical consciousness. *Curriculum Inquiry, 38*(5), 579-603.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Unger, I. (1996). *The best of intentions: The triumphs and failures of the Great Society under Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

van Hover, S., Hicks, D., & Stoddard, J. (2010, April). The development of Virginia's History and Social Studies Standards of Learning (SOLs), 1995-2010. *The Virginia News Letter, 86*(2), 1-6. Retrieved May 12, 2010 from http://www.coopercenter.org/publications/development-virginias-history-and-social-studies-standards-learning-sols-1995-2010

VanSledright, B. (2008). Narratives of nation-state, historical knowledge, and school history education. *Review of Research in Education, 32*(1), 109-146.

VanSledright, B. (2011). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices, theories, and policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Virginia Department of Education (2008). *History and Social Science Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools*. Retrieved March 22, 2010, from http://www.doe.virginia.gov/testing/sol/standards_docs/history_socialscience/review.shtml

Warren, M. (2007, October 5). State gets it right with new social studies curriculum. *The Detroit News,* p. 13A.

Washburn, L. (1997). Accounts of slavery: An analysis of United States history textbooks from 1900 to 1992. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 25*(4), 470-491.

Washington State Substitute House Bill 1495, 59th Legislature (2005) (enacted).

Wertsch, J. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

West, C. (1993). *Race matters*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Whelan, M. (2001). Why the study of history should be the core of social studies education. In E. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (Rev. ed.) (pp. 43-56). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wills, J. (1996). Who needs multicultural education? White students, U.S. history, and the construction of a usable past. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 27*(3), 365-389.

Wills, J. (2001). Missing in interaction: Diversity, narrative, and critical multicultural social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 29*(1), 43-64.

Wills, J. (2005). 'Some people even died': Martin Luther King, Jr, the civil rights movement And the politics of remembrance in elementary classrooms. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 18*(1), 109-131.

Wills, J., & Mehan, H. (1996). Recognizing diversity within a common historical narrative: The challenge to teaching history and social studies. *Multicultural Education, 4*(1), 4-11.

Wilson, S. (2003). *California dreaming: Reforming mathematics education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wineburg, S. (1991). On the reading of historical texts: Notes on the breach between school and academy. *American Educational Research Journal, 28*(3), 495-519.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wineburg, S., Mosborg, S., Porat, D., & Duncan, A. (2007). Common belief and the cultural curriculum: An intergenerational study of historical consciousness. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(1), 40-76.

Wood, G. (2009). *The purpose of the past: Reflections on the uses of history*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Zehr, M. (2010, May 19). Ethnic-studies classes subject to sharp curbs under new Ariz. Law. *Education Week, 29*(32), 24.

Zimmerman, J. (2002). *Whose America? Culture wars in the public schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zimmerman, J. (2004). *Brown*-ing the American textbook: History, psychology, and the origins of modern multiculturalism. *History of Education Quarterly, 44*(1), 46-69.

Zuczek, R. (1996). *State of rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

APPENDIX

Characteristics of Reviewed Standards

Abbreviation Key

Polities	Topics	Styles
AZ: Arizona	CRM: Civil Rights Movement	C: Contributory
DC: Washington, D.C.	CW: Civil War	DC: Discordant/Conflict
FL: Florida	RC: Reconstruction	PE: Progressive/Exceptional
MI: Michigan	SLA: Slavery	
NJ: New Jersey	WE: Westward Expansion	
SC: South Carolina		
SD: South Dakota		
VA: Virginia		
WA: Washington State		

Categories for Quality of Treatment ("yes" = 1, "no" = 0)
1. Evidence-based
2. Multiple perspectives
3. Evaluative/interpretive
4. Higher-order thinking
5. Overall score (listed parenthetically)

_____

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style

_____

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style
AZ	Concept 5: PO 1	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
AZ	Concept 5: PO 2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
AZ	Concept 5: PO 4	WE	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	DC
AZ	Concept 5: PO 5	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
AZ	Concept 6: PO 1	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
AZ	Concept 7: PO 2	WE	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	C
AZ	Concept 7: PO 3	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
AZ	Concept 9: PO 1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
AZ	Concept 9: PO 2	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style
AZ	Concept 9: PO 3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
AZ	Concept 9: PO 6	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
AZ	Concept 10: PO 3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	3.4.5	CRM	1, 1, 0, 1, (3)	C
DC	5.14	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	5.14.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	5.14.2	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	5.14.3	CRM	0, 1, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	5.14.4	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	10.11.4	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	11.8.8	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C
DC	11.10.5	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	11.10.6	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
DC	11.11	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
DC	11.11.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	11.11.2	CRM	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	PE
DC	11.11.3	CRM	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	DC
DC	11.11.4	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	11.11.5	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	11.11.6	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	11.11.7	CRM	1, 1, 0, 1, (3)	PE
DC	11.11.8	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	11.11.9	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	11.12.2	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	11.12.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
DC	11.12.7	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
DC	11.12.10	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	11.13.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	12.4.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	12.4.4	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
DC	12.5.8	CRM	1, 0, 0, 1, (2)	C
DC	12.6.6	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C
DC	12.10	CRM	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	PE
DC	12.10.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	12.10.3	CRM	0, 1, 0, 0, (0)	C
DC	12.11.9	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
DC	12.DC.15	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style
FL	SS.K.A.2.2	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.K.A.2.4	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.1.A.2.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.4.A.3.8	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
FL	SS.4.A.3.10	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
FL	SS.4.A.6.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.4.A.8.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.5.A.6.1	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
FL	SS.5.A.6.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.5.A.6.3	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
FL	SS.5.A.6.4	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.5.A.6.6	WE	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	DC
FL	SS.5.A.6.7	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
FL	SS.5.A.6.9	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
FL	SS.8.A.3.14	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.8.A.3.15	WE	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.8.A.4.1	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
FL	SS.8.A.4.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
FL	SS.8.A.4.3	WE	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.8.A.4.4	WE	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	DC
FL	SS.8.A.4.8	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.8.A.4.12	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
FL	SS.8.A.4.13	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.8.A.4.16	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.8.A.4.17	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C
FL	SS.8.A.4.18	WE	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.912.A.2.4	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
FL	SS.912.A.2.5	WE	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	DC
FL	SS.912.A.2.7	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.912.A.5.7	CRM	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.912.A.5.10	CRM	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.912.A.5.12	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C
FL	SS.912.A.6.4	CRM	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.912.A.6.5	CRM	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
FL	SS.912.A.6.9	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
FL	SS.912.A.7.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
FL	SS.912.A.7.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style
FL	SS.912.A.7.4	CRM	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.912.A.7.5	CRM	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.912.A.7.6	CRM	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	C
FL	SS.912.A.7.7	CRM	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	PE
FL	SS.912.A.7.8	CRM	1, 1, 0, 1, (3)	C
FL	SS.912.A.7.9	CRM	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
FL	SS.912.A.7.13	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
MI	1-H2.0.7	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
MI	4-H3.0.7	SLA	1, 0, 0, 0, (1)	C
MI	5-U2.2.1	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	5-U2.2.2	SLA	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
MI	5-U2.2.3	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
MI	5-U2.3.3	SLA	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
MI	5-U2.3.4	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	5-U3.3.4	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	8.3.1	CRM	1, 0, 0, 1, (2)	C
MI	8.3.2	CRM	1, 0, 0, 1, (2)	C
MI	8.3.4	CRM	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	C
MI	8.3.5	CRM	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	DC
MI	8-U3.3.3	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	8-U3.3.4	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	8-U4.2.2	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	8-U4.2.4	SLA	1, 1, 1, 1, (4)	DC
MI	8-U4.3.2	SLA	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
MI	8-U5.1.1	SLA	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
MI	8-U5.1.2	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	8-U5.1.5	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
MI	8-U5.1.6	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	8-U5.2.1	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	8-U5.2.2	CW	1, 1, 1, 1, (4)	PE
MI	8-U5.2.3	CW	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C
MI	8-U5.2.4	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
MI	8-U5.2.5	CW	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	C
MI	8-U5.3.1	RC	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
MI	8-U5.3.2	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
MI	8-U5.3.3	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style
MI	8-U5.3.4	RC	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	PE
MI	8-U5.3.5	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
MI	9.3.1	CRM	1, 1, 1, 1, (4)	PE
NJ	6.1.4.D.2	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
NJ	6.1.4.D.3	SLA	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	PE
NJ	6.1.4.D.9	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
NJ	6.1.8.D.4.c	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
NJ	6.1.8.D.5.c	CW	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
NJ	6.1.8.D.5.d	RC	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	PE
NJ	6.1.12.D.4.a	CW	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
NJ	6.1.12.D.4.c	RC	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	PE
NJ	6.1.12.D.4.d	RC	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	DC
NJ	6.1.12.D.4.e	RC	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	PE
NJ	6.1.12.D.13.a	CRM	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	PE
NJ	6.1.12.D.13.b	CRM	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	C
NJ	6.1.12.D.13.c	CRM	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	C
SC	K-3.2	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	K-3.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	1-4.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	3-2.7	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	3-4.2	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	3-4.3	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	3-4.4	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	3-4.5	CW	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	PE
SC	3-4.6	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	3-4.7	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	3-5.6	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	4-2.5	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	4-2.6	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	4-3.7	SLA	0, 1, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	4-4.6	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SC	4-5.7	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	4-6.1	CW	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	PE
SC	4-6.2	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	4-6.3	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	4-6.4	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	4-6.5	CW	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style
SC	4-6.6	CW	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	PE
SC	5-1.1	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	5-1.2	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	5-1.3	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	5-1.4	RC	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	PE
SC	5-5.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	8-1.4	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SC	8-1.6	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	8-2.2	SLA	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
SC	8-3.1	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	8-3.2	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	8-3.3	SLA	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	DC
SC	8-3.4	CW	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	PE
SC	8-3.5	CW	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
SC	8-3.6	CW	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
SC	8-4.1	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SC	8-4.2	RC	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
SC	8-4.3	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	8-4.4	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SC	8-4.5	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SC	8-5.1	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	8-7.4	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	USHC-4.1	SLA	0, 1, 0, 1, (0)	C
SC	USHC-4.2	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	USHC-4.3	CW	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	USHC-4.4	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SC	USHC-4.5	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SC	USHC-9.5	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SD	K.US.1.1	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C
SD	K.US.2.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SD	1.US.1.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SD	1.US.1.1	WE	1, 0, 0, 1, (2)	C
SD	2.US.1.3	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SD	4.US.1.1	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C
SD	4.US.1.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SD	4.US.2.1	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SD	4.US.2.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style
SD	4.US.2.3	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SD	5.US.1.4	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SD	8.US.1.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SD	8.US.2.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SD	8.US.2.4	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SD	9-12.US.1.1	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
SD	9-12.US.1.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
SD	9-12.US.2.1	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
SD	9-12.US.2.2	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SD	9-12.US.2.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
SD	9-12.US.2.3	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
VA	K.1	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
VA	VS.3	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
VA	VS.4	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
VA	VS.5	SLA	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
VA	VS.7	CW	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
VA	VS.8	RC	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
VA	VS.9	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
VA	USI.4	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
VA	USI.5	SLA	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
VA	USI.8	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
VA	USI.9	CW	0, 1, 0, 0, (1)	C
VA	USII.3	RC	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	C
VA	USII.4	RC	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	DC
VA	USII.8	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
VA	USII.9	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
VA	VUS.2	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
VA	VUS.3	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
VA	VUS.5	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
VA	VUS.6	SLA	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
VA	VUS.7	CW	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	C
VA	VUS.14	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	C
VA	VUS.15	CRM	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	PE
WA	4.1.1	WE	1, 0, 0, 1, (2)	C
WA	4.1.2	CRM	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
WA	4.1.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 0, (0)	PE
WA	4.2.1	CRM	0, 0, 1, 1, (2)	C

Polity	Standard	Topic	Quality	Style
WA	4.2.1	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	C
WA	4.2.2	CRM	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	C
WA	4.2.2	WE	0, 0, 0, 1, (1)	DC
WA	4.3.1	CRM	1, 1, 1, 1, (4)	C
WA	4.3.1	WE	0, 1, 0, 1, (2)	DC
WA	4.3.2	CRM	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	DC
WA	4.3.2	WE	0, 1, 1, 1, (3)	DC
WA	4.4.1	CRM	1, 1, 1, 1, (4)	DC
WA	4.4.1	WE	1, 1, 1, 1, (4)	DC

Curriculum Vitae of

Carl B. Anderson

107 Chambers Building
University Park, PA 16802
814-238-4210 (Home) 814-863-4521 (Office)
Email: cba120@psu.edu

EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION

2011	The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction Dissertation Title: "Contested Identities and Common Narratives: A Study of Racial Representation in State U.S. History Content Standards" (Dr. Scott Alan Metzger, chair)
2006	The Pennsylvania State University M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction
2004	The Pennsylvania State University B.A. in History

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2007 - 2011	The Pennsylvania State University Graduate Teaching Assistant Department of Curriculum and Instruction CI 295: Introductory Field Experience
2006 - 2007	The Pennsylvania State University Graduate Teaching Assistant Department of Curriculum and Instruction CI 495C: Pre-service Practicum
2009	The Pennsylvania State University Instructor Department of Applied Linguistics ESL 015: Composition for American Academic Communication II