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"ABSTRACT"
I approached the writing of this thesis after wondering if our government encourages the development of good citizens in the public school system like the Nazi and communist governments did. The thesis itself evolved into a brief study of how each of the three governments went about educating its school children in the ways of being a good citizen. I found that all three did indeed employ instructional methods, which inculcate preferred values in children. However, there are some differences in the methods and the extremes the totalitarian governments were willing to go to as opposed to the democratic one. While I explored these avenues, I also considered what was expected of me, as a teacher, and whether I was willing to be part of a system that imbeds values based on the survival of a political ideology. The opinions I formed surprised me.
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"We must ensure that our young people are equipped with the knowledge and skills necessary for active and successful participation in the economic, political, cultural, and community life of our nation."

- Laura F. Cavazos
  Secretary of Education
An Introduction

About a year ago, I sat in our family room watching George Orwell's 1984, a book I had never read, and a movie I had never seen. Relaxing over a hot cup of tea after a hard days work, I found myself reflecting that I was glad that this wasn't reality. No one person, organization, or government was indoctrinating me or mine with his or her viewpoint. I wasn't and hadn't been sculpted into an automated thinking machine, programmed to produce the correct thoughts and responses in a given situation. As my tea cooled, I squirmed about, my tranquility fading. Or had I? Something was poking at the tip of my brain. I sat up suddenly startling my husband out of his half nap. I recalled discussion and debate in a class a couple of years ago, Sociocultural Studies in Education, and construction of good citizens was at the top of the list. The catch phrase 'politically correct' began bouncing around my head, and I wondered, who chooses what is 'politically correct'? Who writes the checklist used to decide if a person has achieved the status of good citizen? What are the criteria and how is the goal accomplished?

Part of what the public education system in America does is preparing children to become effective, productive Americans. Our government revolves around people participating, working, paying their taxes, minding the laws, voting, and when necessary, soldiering. Because of the vast numbers of citizens in this country, it would have a negative impact if there were too many wave makers. Life would be chaos. As a result,
part of what the school system does is teaching children to be good citizens. Only it isn't
the 'school system' that teaches children; it's teachers, which is exactly what I am
becoming. The age of the students doesn't matter. Instruction goes on in second grade
and eleventh grade. Content area doesn't matter. Instruction goes on in social studies
and English. The more I considered this, the more I realized that I could very well be
becoming the indoctrinator, and how did I feel about that? In a nutshell, the public school
system and individual classrooms are microcosms of society. It is the responsibility of
teachers to develop an atmosphere of authority in their classrooms. A weighty question
is whether the culture of that class will be reflective of the democratic process, and
whether it is incumbent upon the instructor to use this extrinsic environmental
opportunity to teach the philosophical, political, and civic virtues of our democracy as he
or she teaches math, science, health, and creative writing. Bluntly put, should educators
teach citizenship values or should educators teach about citizenship values? There is a
huge distinction in the two concepts.

I began to question how other societies, other governments, have handled the
construction of good citizens. Surely America wasn't doing what a communist country
did. And, certainly, we weren't anything as extreme as the Nazis. Were we? Yet, it

occurs to me that a government which actively seeks to inculcate a specific set of civic
virtues does so in a prejudicial manner. Any democratic, communistic, or fascist
government will realize that the surest way to reinforce its structure will be to thread the
steel rebar of its political values and principles into the core element - its citizens.
Common sense tells us that the best place to start laying the social cement will be with the foundation. The education of the country's children will undergird the acceptance of political authority.

In American pluralistic society, it has become important to embrace a wide variety of races, religions, and nationalities in an equal manner. None of the citizens or represented cultures exist in a vacuum, and it has become educational practice to encourage interweaving of all while maintaining respect for diversity. As we seek to achieve a tossed salad society, are we graying our individual personalities? Is the government funding a school system which encourages tolerance and diversity to the extreme of eradicating personal heritages, opinions, and convictions? Is the symbolism of the gray coveralls worn by the citizens of Orwell's 1984, a novel I have since read, a reflection of the neutralizing of individuality in the pursuit of the quintessential good citizen? Do other governments follow a similar pattern?

Following a set of competing values, the Nazis discouraged diversity and interweaving of its citizens. They specifically sought to imbue children and all citizens with a deep-seated racial consciousness. The practice was specifically termed "racially-oriented educational philosophy" (Koch, 162) and outlined set criteria for the hierarchy of races and religions, as well as mental and physical health standards. According to Koch, civic virtues imposed by Nazis and taught to children were so focused on physical characteristics of its citizens that intelligence and education took a back seat. The ultimate goal of the German child's education was to "convince him of his
absolute superiority over others" (Koch, 164).

Like American and Nazi schools, Bolsheviks elected to use schools to train children to be good communists or, in their view, good citizens. The ultimate goal was to develop comrades who would embrace the good of the collective. Individualism and passivity were to be trained out. Schools were to be integrated into the overall social structure and students would participate in the work of society. As with Nazism, loyalty to the government was to be unerring and blind. Teachers, initially, were weeded out until any who did not espouse Marxist values were no longer involved in the educational process. The communist tradition was taught so faithfully that the idea of 'socially useful labor' and unswerving allegiance became an intrinsic value in citizens thus producing a good communist or a good citizen.

Leaders of the three societies have recognized the immense importance of developing citizens who will believe in the political authority and civic virtues of their own particular brand of government. In the Hearing Before the Subcommittee On Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Ninety-Seventh Congress, U.S. Representative Charles E. Bennett said, "One of the most critical factors in the survival of any society has always been its ability to transmit effectively its carefully achieved values to each succeeding generation . . . Therefore, it becomes a responsibility of our American schools to educate our children about our values" (2). Similarly, V.I. Lenin tells us, "The entire purpose of training, educating and teaching the youth of today should be to imbue
them with communist ethics" (222). Eerily, Nazi policy reflected that of American and the U.S.S.R. when Hitler said, "One of the main functions of general education should be to raise nationalist enthusiasm in youth . . . prosperity would arise from readiness for sacrifice by the individual on behalf of the nation rather than from materialistic egotism" (qtd. in Koch, 164).

The concepts are triplets although not identical. So, if the concepts are fraternal, rather than identical, then what are the differences? For the purposes of this study, I will explore the basis of American, Nazi, and Marxist ideologies and strategies for construction of good citizens. I will spend some time comparing and contrasting the theories of each. In what ways are they the same and in what ways are they different? Were and are the efforts of each government successful? Can children be sculpted into model citizens and if so how? This study will concern itself with asking whether I, as a teacher, will be an indoctrinator or a facilitator. It will debate whether the construction of good citizens is a positive and necessary process or an infringement on human and individual rights.

Should I, as an English teacher, discourage a free thinker or encourage the radical? I will be faced with that decision time and time again since I will be reading the essays of thousands of students before I retire. I believe that my critique should 'first do no harm'. The last thing I will want to do is put a student off writing because I judge his or her opinions to be too radical. On the other hand, radical and responsible must work hand in hand to be effective in society. As a responsible teacher, I will need to understand the implications of what our government has charged educators to do. The
surest way to understanding an issue is through assimilating knowledge and a wide variety of opinion.

The leader of the Nazi Teacher's League, Hans Schemm, told us in plain German, "Wer Jugend an seiner Seite hat Kontrollt die Zukunft" (qtd. in Noakes, 222). The sentiment seems to bounce around from government to government, ideology to ideology, culture to culture as in a house of mirrors. Whether we listen to the words of political leaders from America, the U.S.S.R., or Nazi Germany, they all reflect in one form or another, the sentiment of Schemm, "Those who have the youth on their side control the future."

7.

"We publicly declare that education divorced from life and politics is lies and hypocrisy."

-V.I. Lenin
August 28, 1918
Educational Practices and Philosophical Arguments in the Communist Tradition

One of the most interesting differences as I examined the educational goals and practices of the three government types is that although they each strive to develop citizens who will benefit their society, they each define the ideal citizen differently and therefore, their educational goals vary. The educational regime in the Bolshevik tradition sought to harvest trained and skilled laborers. They shied from churning out intellectuals. In a speech to congress shortly after the successful October Socialist Revolution, V.I. Lenin explained:

We want to transform Russia from a poverty-stricken and wretched country into one that is wealthy. The Young Communist League must combine its education, learning and training with the labour of the workers and peasants so as not to confine itself to schools or to reading communist books and pamphlets. Only by working side by side with the workers and peasants can one become a genuine Communist. (10)

Early in his career, Lenin recognized the educational plight of the vast majority of Russians. On April 27, 1913 Lenin wrote of his frustrations. The reigning monarchy elected to keep the masses in ignorance and serving as peasants to the wealthy. Eighty percent of children of the Russian Empire were refused educational opportunities—a situation Lenin found untenable. He railed, "[. . .] the masses of the people are robbed (emphasis Lenin's) to such an extent of education, light and knowledge [. . . ]" (21).

Later, in January 1914, Lenin continued in this vein as he held the Ministry of Public
Education guilty of using strong arm tactics to subdue education. Specifically, he accused the Ministry of destroying school libraries (48). Once Lenin had power, he aggressively set out to take control of the educational system and increase the number of literate persons. Indeed in a 23-year period, the literacy rate increased 79.9% (250). As shown in the table below, the advances included both male and female citizens:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: U.S.S.R. Literate Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literates per Thousand Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to accomplish these striking advances, Lenin worked to ensure educational success by including his dictates in the Communist Russian constitution. Written in April and May of 1917, the government began to standardize public education in the Communist tradition with the following five dictates:

8. The right of the population to receive instruction in their native tongue in schools to be established for the purpose at the expense of the state and local organs of self-government;
13. Separation of the church from the state, and schools from the church; **schools to be absolutely secular** (emphasis Lenin's);
14. Free and compulsory general and polytechnical education (familiarizing the student with the theoretical and practical aspects of the most important
fields of production for all children of both sexes up to the age of sixteen; training of children to be closely integrated with socially productive work; 15. All students to be provided with food, clothing and school supplies at the cost of the state; 16. Public education to be administered by democratically elected organs of local self-governments not to be allowed to interfere with the arrangement of the school curriculum, or with the selection of the teaching staff; teachers to be elected directly by the population with the right of the latter to remove undesirable teachers. (Lenin, 53-54)

The goal was to allow communities to run their own schools and to give average citizens strong control over how children were taught. If a teacher were to do anything contrary to popular public opinion, that public would have the absolute authority to remove the teacher. Teachers, in essence, became elected officials with their eminent hiring based on touting popular party line. The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party called for all student and youth groups to make it a primary focus of their education and practices to teach the tenets of Marxism, thus instilling an intrinsic system of communist values and thereby creating the sought-after good citizen. The general public grew to understand that education was fundamental in every comrade's success and in the success of the state. In a word, education was freedom from oppression by the bourgeoisie.

The state understood the necessity of training children in order to build a compliant society full of civic virtue. Education committees worked to devise a method of standardizing educational process so that Marxist dictates were the core values and would become the social cement under girding society. In addition to these goals, Labor Party leaders understood that they must have strong support from adults in the
community and therefore, adults were encouraged and invited to aggressively participate in the education of the young, which undoubtedly fostered a sense of ownership in society that had not existed under the previous monarchy. In an attempt to make these ideals come to fruition, the R.C. P. wrote in its Draft Programme:

[. . .] The object [. . . is] to convert the school from an instrument of the class rule of the bourgeoisie into an instrument for the overthrow of that rule and for the complete abolition of the division of society into classes. The schools must become an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., a vehicle not merely of the general principles of communism but also of the ideological, organizational and educational influence. The immediate tasks in this field are, for the present, the following:
1) the further development of the initiative of the workers and working peasants in the sphere of education with the all-round assistance of the Soviet government;
2) securing complete command not only over a section, or the majority, of the school-teachers, as is the case at present, but over all school-teachers by weeding out the incorrigible bourgeois counter-revolutionary elements and securing the conscientious application of communist principles [of policy];
3) the implementation of free, obligatory general and polytechnical education (acquaintance with all the main branches of production theoretically and in practice) for all children of both sexes up to the age of 16;
4) the closest connection between schooling and productive social labour of the child;
5) the provision of food, clothing, books and other teaching aids for all school children at the expense of the state;
6) the working people must be drawn into active participation in the work of public education (the development of the public education councils, mobilization of the educated, etc.);
7) to secure the closest contact between school-teachers and the agitation and propaganda machinery of R. C. P. (Lenin, 197-98)

The new ruling proletariat found that the old educational system had been focused on force-feeding factual and unnecessary knowledge to its students. The new educational system would ideally teach students fundamental facts, which they could then use to
assimilate important understanding, learning, and skills. The ultimate goal was to create a society of critical thinkers and problem solvers who could work as part of a well-oiled cog in a smoothly run society of equality, atheism, and political activists.

According to Mervyn Matthews in his book *Education in the Soviet Union*, the ‘general school’, also called the unified labour school, was formed and continued in its current metamorphosis of that form until Khrushchev came to power in 1953. Between the time of Lenin and the time of Khrushchev, students were to be involved in “socially useful labor” and were expected to be devout Marxists. Teaching materials were quickly censored and textbooks rewritten. By 1921 teachers were required to belong to a controlled trade union (Matthews, 3). Matthews tells us that the school system went through three distinct phases of development.

The first, in 1918, saw the construction of the administration manned by local citizens, teachers, and one Soviet official. The government abolished testing, homework, and corporal punishment. Groups of students would learn through observation and practicing whichever craft they were assigned to learn. The second stage, in 1923, moved ultimate control of administration to a ‘manager’ who had the right to overrule local citizens and teachers, the school council. All teaching had to be based in productive activity and was closely tied to local production of goods. Lastly, testing was reconfigured and reinstituted and students could only advance through formal assessment. The third and final stage of educational development occurred starting in
1931. Here, many of the original philosophies fell to the wayside. Traditional schooling was reintroduced calling for strict, regimented study. On-the-job training became a thing of the past. In 1933, officially approved textbooks were introduced and in 1935 a “rigorous system of marks, examinations, incentives and awards” (Matthews, 6) was developed. The government controlled all aspects of the curriculum with no deviance permitted.

Matthews relates, “It was a closely controlled institution, disciplined and academic in orientation, scientific in bias and demanding of time. The humanities as taught there were heavily impregnated with Stalinist ideology” (18). Students attended classes six days a week and attended four to five - 45 minute periods a day. The maximum class size was 40. Students were encouraged arduously to be, “clean, tidy, obedient, punctual, helpful and assiduous in their studies [. . . to] sit straight, refrain from leaning on their elbows, stand when the teacher entered the room and sit only with his or her permission” (Matthews, 16-17). Students now received a grade for conduct and were assigned one to four hours of homework per day. Corporal punishment was still outlawed. Testing was based on a five point system with five being the highest score. In order to advance, students must score a minimum of a three. The seventh and tenth grades were required to take final examinations, both written and oral. A score of four or five on tenth grade exams opened the door to university. Any scoring less than a four went into the work force.

The Soviet government had lost the original focus of Lenin. It had wavered and then completely veered from the worker-bee, all for one and one for all mentality. The
carefully groomed citizens of the U.S.S.R. once again lost control and ownership in their country. This morphing communist regime had become as all controlling and regimented as the monarchy of old. Once again, the fate of the people was, in essence, slave labor with only elite reaching upper echelons of educational and social Soviet society. Children were threatened with the boogieman of factory work if they didn’t tow the line, work hard, and pull the grades in school. Factory work became a prison of the underachiever instead of socially productive work slated to build a strong community and healthy citizens proud of their lives. Gradually the skilled work force diminished and new problems emerged.

Then in the 1950’s a struggling educational system reintroduced polytechnical education in all its glory. The new system closely followed the old. Students were sent out into the community to observe and work in community labors. Science was “reoriented to practical, every-day applications” and mathematics “became more concrete” (Matthews, 19). Once again, the goal of communist educational theory and practice aimed at producing a citizen who, upon graduation, could go into the workforce as a trained employee. A report from a school director written in August 1956 explained:

We had to coordinate teaching in school with production practice at the factory. The pedagogical council decided to form one class with production training among the ’parallel’ classes of the eighth grade. Entry into this class was voluntary, but required the assent of the council.

Twenty-eight pupils who desired to learn the trades of turner, fitter, or milling machine operator applied. The party bureau of the factory commissioned several engineers to work out a production programme [. . .] with the teachers. Saturday became ‘factory day’ for the school children [. . .] In addition, a period of practice lasting three weeks, with a four-hour working day was organized for them in the summer holidays. (qtd in Matthews, 22)
Concern about attitudes of young people of the Republic was growing in the late 1950's. Khrushchev expressed his unease in a speech to the Thirteenth Congress of the Komsomol in April 1958. It was his opinion that young people were resisting working in collectives, in factories, in manual labor, and on farms. He called this a, "condescending, negligent and incorrect attitude to physical labour" (qtd. in Matthews, 24). As a result, Khrushchev began to revamp the system. Once again, students attended general school through the eighth year and then moved to a trade school for the ninth and tenth years. The ability of students to choose what they would study gradually diminished until there were only two courses of study. One was for boys and one was for girls. Homework was reduced from the one to four hours previously required and teachers were pressured to be certain that every student passed. Schools became a factory for new laborers and quality control was not an issue.

Once Brezhnev took office, reform was once again sorely needed. The Council of School Affairs was organized and in 1970 a new school statute was penned. There were six main points:

1. Some course material "did not reflect a contemporary level of scientific knowledge"
2. What was taught in what year needed to be rearranged
3. Slim down obligatory lessons to prevent superficial learning
4. The examination system needed revamping to improve academic standards
5. Teachers needed to concentrate more heavily on the use of the collective to enhance pupil's individual abilities
6. Manual and polytechnical training was still needed (Matthews, 46)

Over the history of the United Soviet Socialist Republic, the educational system was in a continuous flux, seeming to never be able to settle comfortably into a system
that supported the creation of good citizens. Initially, Lenin's educational practices embraced the community and allowed community members to work as a whole and to have ownership of their children's education. People who had been denied education prior to the Bolshevik revolution embraced Lenin's concept to train children as skilled laborers. Still ripe with fervor for freedoms and potentially for a more comfortable future offered under the new government, people tended to be willing to work together to create new citizens of the communist regime. The light still shone bright with hope and idealism.

Eventually a fatal flaw emerged. Government grew power hungry and wrested control from community members. The remainder of the educational history is a wane and ebb of original educational communist pedagogy. It all depended on who the leader of the day was. The masses grew disillusioned and this extended to children. Victorian-esq schools that developed in the thirties and forties turned out discontented citizens rather than the good citizens the Republic needed. Had the government been able to maintain the balance struck early in the educational system, it may have succeeded. Unfortunately, the construction of good citizens became a superficial enterprise secondary to current political practice.

16.

“No boy or girl should leave school without realizing the necessity and the nature of the purity of blood.”

- Adolph Hitler

Mein Kampf

National Socialist Educational Ideology of Citizens of the Folkish State
“Aristotle observed centuries ago that if we desire to understand a people we must first examine the education they provide for their children” (Blackburn, 3). Germanic history reveals a nation intent on impressing a strong sense of national heritage and superiority. The administration, prior to Hitler's, consistently used the educational system to imbed an extreme nationalism in its citizens. The tenets of Nazi regime, although different from those of Kaiser Wilhelm, didn't hesitate to continue using the schools to immerse children in doctrines of Nazi citizenship. National Socialists, like Lenin Soviets, clearly understood the unique opportunity available to them to inculcate children with state promoted propaganda in order to grow compliant, strong, devoted Nazi citizens. Hans Schemm, the leader of the Nazi Teacher's League, expressed it well, "Those who have youth on their side control the future" (qtd. in Noakes, 222).

Hitler viewed the primary task of education, in order to make children valuable members of German society, to be the imbedding of an unquestioning attitude that purity of blood and racial consciousness was supremely important. To facilitate this learning, a racially oriented pedagogical philosophy was outlined:

1) non Arian races did not have high intellect

2) a healthy body was the equivalent of a high intellect
3) physical training was more important than intellectual training - intellect was secondary to the physical
4) it was important to cultivate a strong will and decisiveness
5) students were to train to assume responsibility
6) a scientific education is of the least importance (Koch, 162)

It was understood that a strong, healthy, physical specimen was far superior to an
intelligent one with little physical prowess. Secondary, but not unimportant to physical fitness of a citizen, was a character built of willpower, faithfulness, and reliability. Students were to be taught, through general education in the classroom and through participation in the state sponsored youth groups, to be ready and willing to sacrifice for Homeland and Fuhrer. This, combined with a strong sense of social responsibility, would create a nation of young people forged together in an unbreakable bond. This unity would be the social cement that provided the under girding of the National Socialists. Hitler explained, "In our eyes the German youth of the future must be slim and slender, swift as the greyhound, tough as leather, and hard as Krupp steel. We must educate a new type of man so that our people is not ruined by the symptoms of degeneracy of our day"

[. . .]" (qtd. in Noakes, 222-23).

To further develop this man of steel, every child joined an organization at the age of ten. For boys, this was Jungvolk. Here children were oriented to Nazi way of thinking and learned nothing other than how to become a good German. Noakes further explains that if a boy were to fail at this enterprise after four years, he would then be moved to the Jugend for another four years. Following this indoctrination, the 18-year-olds were moved immediately to the Party and into specific groups such as the Schutzstaffel--an elite defense echelon (SS) and the Sturmabteilung--storm troopers (SA). After another two years of education, if young people were not yet Party members, they would receive an additional half-year of training in the Labour Service. If a young person still resisted his education, he would be taken under the wing of Wermacht (the army) for two to four
years of inculcation of finer aspects of Nazi German citizenship. Once old affiliations were no more, young men would then enter such organizations as SS and SA. After the stringent education of the Nazi citizen, "[. . .] they will not be free again for the rest of their lives" (Hitler qtd. in Noakes, 223).

Schoolteachers were required to recruit the young into youth organizations. If a student resisted, the teacher was to try to persuade the pupil. One teacher assigned a homework essay titled "Why am I not in the Hitler Youth." Members had no homework to do (Noakes, 224). When one child expressed the desire to leave the organization, his teacher informed him that he would be given 40 additional math problems for homework every time he missed a Hitler Youth activity (Noakes, 224). In order to increase the importance and strength of the Hitler Youth, a law was enacted. The law decreed:

The future of the German nation depends upon its youth and German youth must therefore be prepared for its future duties. The Reich Government has accordingly decided on the following law which is published herewith:
1) The whole of German youth within the borders of the Reich is organized in the Hitler Youth.
2) All German young people, apart from being educated at home and at school, will be educated in the Hitler Youth physically, intellectually, and morally in the spirit of National Socialism to serve the nation and the community.
3) The task of educating German youth in the Hitler Youth is being entrusted to the Reich Leader of German Youth in the NSDAP. He therefore becomes the 'Youth Leader of the German Reich'. His office shall rank as a Supreme Governmental Agency with its headquarters in Berlin and he will be directly responsible to the Fuhrer and the Chancellor of the Reich.
4) All regulations necessary to execute and supplement this decree will be issued by the Fuhrer and Reich Chancellor (Noakes, 225). After 1939, there was no choice for the German people but to comply with the educational law.
Schools were also considered a valuable, although secondary, front in the education of Germany's citizens. Education was declared compulsory and teaching students about the maintenance of the race primary and mandatory. Prior to the Nazi regime, physical education, or gym, was held two hours a week. Now, it would be conducted two hours a day. The sport of boxing was promoted to increase decision-making skills and to increase aggressiveness. Textbooks were rewritten. Koch relates:

Unverified and absurd theories found their way into the textbooks with the purpose of producing racial consciousness and racial feeling in German youth. Even arithmetic problems were set so as to influence children in the direction [. . .] Children were confronted with [such] grisly problems as, 'A mentally handicapped person costs the public 4 Reichmark per day, a cripple 5.50 Reichmark and a convicted criminal 3.5 Reichmark. Cautious estimates state that within the boundaries of the German Reich 300,000 persons are being cared for in public mental institutions. How many marriage loans at 1,000 Reichmark per couple could annually be financed from the funds allocated to the institutions? (Koch, 174).

Studying German heritage was deemed more important than classics, and so many students read the folklore of Germany. However, the availability of state sanctioned German literature didn't fill pedagogical needs and many teachers took it upon themselves to teach classics as well. Fearing reprisal, the unapproved alteration of the Nazi curriculum bred unease among teachers who failed to stick to the curriculum.

Attempts were made by the government to weed out Jews and non-believers. "Murder Committees" were formed and operated between April 1933 and July 1934 to purge the teaching profession of undesirables. Nazi education committees questioned how teachers not steeped in Nazi ideologies could mould good citizens for the Reich. As
a result, one hundred eighty head teachers, 47 secondary teachers, 355 primary teachers, and 60% of college lecturers were purged (Noakes, 236). Like the communists, Nazis desired an ideologically sound pool of educators and were going to extreme measures to insure this. By 1937, 97% of the teachers of Germany had joined the National Socialist Teacher's League (NSLB). This organization released a mission statement in 1938, which was telling:

National Socialism is an ideology whose claim to validity is total and does not wish to be subject to the random formation of opinion. The means of implementing this claim is through education. German youth must no longer - as in the Liberal era in the cause of so-called objectivity - be confronted with the choice of whether it wishes to grow up in a spirit of materialism or idealism, of racism or internationalism, of religion or godlessness, but it must be consciously shaped according to principles which are recognized as correct and which have shown themselves to be correct: according to the principles of ideology of National Socialism. Naturally, the German teacher must first be converted to this completely new task of German youth education. The real task of the NSLB is to create the new German educator in the spirit of National Socialism. It is being carried out with the same methods with which the movement has conquered the whole nation: indoctrination and propaganda. (Noakes, 238)

Because of the implementation of National Socialist policies, German schools found themselves short 5,500 teachers when this mission statement was released. Politics and power plays further handicapped the educational system. The Reich Youth Leader repeatedly attacked teachers in speeches and in interviews with press. Because of this behavior, the Reich lost the cooperation of many of the teachers it tried so hard to convert. Some teachers went so far as to undermine Hitler Youth by giving so much homework that children were forced to miss activities in order to do schoolwork.
Successful education was interrupted to another degree with the onset of war. Koch tells us that whole days of school were spent on scrap metal drives and grammar-school children manned anti-aircraft guns.

In his book, Blackburn suggested, "Perhaps the rapier mind of Joseph Goebbels most succinctly identified the function of education in the Nazi state. The propaganda minister compared the educational process to a 'kneading machine', which processed raw human material into a 'coherent mass' capable of being 'utilized and manipulated for the political aims of the state'" (2). Children of educational practices including state youth organizations were being systematically entrenched in National Socialist ideology. Whether they receive their education in the large cities where immersion was intense or whether they were rural children, some level of acceptable civic virtues were involved. No child existed in a vacuum.

In the process of researching this paper, I had the enviable opportunity of interviewing an elderly woman who was raised in rural Nazi Germany until the war ended when she was ten. Mrs. W. agreed to speak with me only if I agreed to keep her identity completely anonymous. Although a legal alien, wife, mother, grandmother, and great grandmother of Americans, she fears deportation. Mrs. W. is about 70 years old. She

attended primary school for four years before the war ended. Since the war ended just before her tenth birthday, she never belonged to Hitler Youth. But, she wanted to. Mrs. W. was raised in a village atmosphere. Because of this, she has no recollection of the extreme measures used in education of children cited in this paper. Perhaps Hitler didn't
have the time and resources to extend absolute control to rural areas. She does, however, recall watching the older children, members of Jugend, hiking several miles to the forests for the day or going kite flying. "Nobody had anything but those children got to have fun. I wanted to have fun too." She remembers being bitterly disappointed when the Hitler Youth was disbanded before she got to join in the activities. Mrs. W. also spoke to me about "interruptions" in schooling. "If we had air raids after midnight, we didn't have school the next day. Before midnight, we did." She related a tale of missing two or three days of school because of potato beetles. "The American bombers dropped potato beetles on our potato fields one time and we children were pulled out of school. We were each given a jar with a lid and sent out into the fields to pick potato beetles."

Mrs. W. refused to accept or admit that she had been a recipient of any form of National Socialist education. But, as I listened to her stories, I understood that the attempt at inculcation was occurring even as she watched older children having fun marching to the woods for a picnic. She wanted to be a part of this cultural event.

The primary task of the Nazi educational system was, like the Soviets, to make children valuable members of society. However, Nazi pedagogy’s primary objective was to impart an unquestioning attitude that maintaining a purity of blood and racial consciousness was supremely important. The Nazi regime may have succeeded if they had more time. History shows us, however, that with war, resources and focus were diluted. Hitler's ultimate goals can be pinpointed and analyzed by the greatest minds but no one expresses the overreaching purpose of the Nationalist Socialist domination more succinctly than Hitler himself:
The folkish state will have to make certain that by a suitable education of youth it will some day obtain a race ripe for the last and greatest decision on this earth [. . .] The crown of the folkish state's entire work of education and training must be to burn the racial sense and racial feeling into the instinct and the intellect, the heart and the brain of the youth entrusted to it. No boy and no girl must leave school without having been led to an ultimate realization of the necessity and essence of blood purity. (qtd. in Blackburn, 13)

24.

“Democracy has to be born anew every generation and education is the midwife.”

- John Dewey

Competing Values in Democratic Educational Ideology, Tradition, and Practice
Nazi educators concerned with the construction of good citizens were faced with the development of one philosophical approach, one not to be argued or debated but enforced. Communist educators concerned with construction of good citizens were initially faced with the development of one philosophical approach that overtime was warped and rewritten by various leaders. Yet, at any given point in the history of tradition of communist citizenship education, there was never more than one educational approach. Contrary to this single-minded political authority, democracies are faced with a culture that encourages and practices freedom of thought and opinion. American experience has been a study in evolutionary process, and the construction of good citizens has evolved with the country. Today, it is politically correct in America to believe in and promote diversity, tolerance, and cultural relativism balancing this with individualism and uniqueness. The government does not overtly express the core values of a good citizen. Principles, as you will see, are implied. Interpretation and implementation of those values is left to educators. As a result, at any juncture in the history of American tradition, there will be a plethora of unique interpretations of what the education of good citizens incorporates and of exactly how a good citizen should be defined.

Some will suggest that the education of good citizens should be constructed around core values expressed by the founding fathers. Another group follows dictates of the fundamental religious interpretation of civic virtue and values education. A third reflection of creating a good citizen, that of conservatives, will incorporate some values
of the founding fathers and some values of the fundamentalists, minus the religious aspect. Lastly, of the major interpretations, is that of the liberal argument where a pluralistic society and globalism are encouraged. Regardless of the approach to citizenship education, there are an additional two schools of thought, which must be considered. First is that the American experience has cycled out of the pattern of educating for good citizenship. In this view, students are no longer being exposed to behaviors and values which have traditionally been taught in the public school system. Second is the idea that citizenship is the glue that holds together widely diverse elements in American society and education is cornerstone. In Renewing Civic Capacity: Preparing College Students for Service and Citizenship, Suzanne Morse quotes Ernest Boyer and Fred Hechinger when they suggest, "For all the nagging doubts of the contemporary age, the belief persists that the process most capable of holding the intellectual center of society together, preventing it from disintegrating into unconnected splinters, is education [. . .]" (33).

In 1978, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published a tract titled "Key Concepts of Citizenship: Perspectives and Dilemmas." In this, the government attempted to discuss and define what citizenship education is and what role schools and government should play. Robert Salisbury suggested that the principle role of citizenship education is production of a mature citizen. He also suggested that "citizenship education must teach that instrumental participation almost invariably presupposes conflicting interests or it would not be needed in the first place and conflict means that some will win and others lose"(13). Conflict surfaces as a key word in debate over
citizenship education. There are elements of democratic society who promote the idea
that educating for citizenship negates basic tenets of a democracy and that by inculcating
predetermined values education and definitions of civic duty, instruction leaves little
room for free will. Goal number three of the National Educational Goals of Student
Achievement and Citizenship states:

[. . .] every school in America will ensure that all students learn to
use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship
[. . .] All students will be involved in activities that promote and
demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility."
(U.S., 5-6)

There is concern that students today are being educated without benefits of
citizenship education or, in other words, values and civic virtues education. But exactly
what are acceptable values and civic virtue? Because of diverse lifestyles, religions, and
cultural experiences, and because of democracy’s intent to allow diversity and freedom of
thought, it is virtually impossible to define the terms for the whole. Unlike the definitive
definitions and single minded focus of Nazis and Bolsheviks, Americans find themselves
challenged as to how to appeal to the whole. Beyond that rages a virulent debate over
what values to teach or whether the government, through schools, should impose its
brand of values on students. U.S. Representative Charles E. Bennett of Florida fears that
escalated juvenile crime statistics are symptoms of a societal illness that

is a "lack of knowledge and a lack of practice of the principles of good citizenship in our
democracy" (U.S., 2). In his comments at the Hearing before the Subcommittee On
Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education and the Committee on Education and
Labor House of Representatives, Bennett continued to express his concerns:
"This failure by the schools - at a time when family life is becoming increasingly fragmented - is giving us a new generation of Americans no longer guided by the principles that have made our Nation great [. . .] One of the most critical factors in the survival of any society has always been its ability to transmit effectively its carefully achieved values to each succeeding generation [. . .] Therefore, it becomes a responsibility of our American schools to educate our children about our values [. . .] America is in the process of bringing up a generation illiterate in good citizenship [. . .] This trend can hopefully be reversed through proper educational programs in our schools." (2-3)

Bennett makes an impassioned argument but fails to nail down the definition of the values he wishes to see taught. Such a vague approach leaves room for massive debate. Whose values will be taught? For example, liberal ideas would have the schools teaching values that include tolerance of many lifestyles including those that are considered morally corrupt by some conservatives and the fundamentalist right. The fundamentalist right would have certain books banned because they reveal 'unacceptable' lifestyles. Many parents would not have their children read about premarital sex, drug use, and homosexual relationships as a norm. Resulting lawsuits have filled the courts for years. Conservative Christian members of this democracy insist on their right to shield their children from 'unacceptable' education and liberal members of this same democracy insist that children be educated to be tolerant of our pluralistic society.

The Maryland State Values Education Commission created a list of citizenship values in an attempt to define the idea of being a good citizen:

One, patriotism: Love, respect, and loyalty to the United States of America, and the willingness to correct its imperfections by legal means;
Two, an understanding of the rights and obligations of a citizen in a democratic society;
Three, an understanding of other societies in the world which do not enjoy the rights and privileges of a democratic government;
Four, respect for the U.S. Constitution, the rule of law, and the right of every citizen to enjoy equality under the law. An understanding of the Bill of Rights and a recognition that all rights are limited by other rights and by obligations;
Five, respect for legitimate authority at the local, state, and federal level;
Six, allegiance to the concept of democratic government as opposed to totalitarian rule. A recognition that such government is limited by the separation of powers and by the counter vailing - the role of other institutions in a pluralistic society - principally the family, religion, the school, and the private sector of the economy;
Seven, recognition of the need for an independent court system to protect the rights of all citizens;
Eight, an acceptance of all citizenship responsibilities at the local, state, and national levels and commitment to preserve and defend the United States and its democratic institutions. (U.S., 3-4)

The 97th Congress went so far as to define the term "citizenship education":

A) an understanding of and commitment to the civic principles underlying a democratic society, governed under the constitution and just laws, particularly those principles related to individual liberty and rights, and
B) the knowledge and skills to exercise those liberties and rights and to engage in full civic participation, nationally and internationally while avoiding infringement on the rights and liberties of others." (U.S., 103)

The search for a basic and clear understanding of direction for citizenship education in a democracy is challenging. Developing educational practices which celebrate and respect such a conglomeration of cultures, embracing their uniqueness and yet tying everything up into a neat, standardized package is a difficult task. The very nature of empirical aspects of citizenship, varying philosophical beliefs, and competing values create a perpetual debate. Yet, most would agree that educating for citizenship is the cement that under girds the very essence of democratic society. Democracies, by definition, are formed and shaped by majority consent. The 13th Gallup Poll reveals the public views discipline, or lack of it, as a major concern and 70% of Americans favor
values instruction in the schools (U.S., 22). Of course, the values taught are the variable. In 1916, John Dewey wrote, "A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living [. . .]" (qtd. in Barber, 478-79).

There are certain fundamental ideas threaded into the fabric of the term democracy. Initially democratic education reflected core values of the founding fathers, the freedoms, including religion. However, the idea of democracy allows for an evolution of culture and, therefore, morality of the society. Education of good citizens will be a perpetually evolving system seeking to reflect the current American experience.

Alice Meil, a progressive advocate of democratic social learning, believed students should be taught

[to] bear a friendly feeling; having concern for all mankind; valuing difference; being a contributing member of a group; seeing the necessity of a cooperative search for conditions guaranteeing maximum freedom for all; taking responsibility for a share of a common enterprise; problem solving and working for consensus; evaluating and cooperating with authority; refining constantly one's conception of the "good society'; and learning effective communication. (Crocco, 213)

Current educational practices concerning construction of good citizens include these values. Educators seek to develop team players, leaders, communicators, and critical thinkers. The premise of this pedagogical practice is that citizens with these skills will be equipped to handle any number of situations in a positive and productive way.

With erasure of boundaries in an ever-smaller world, these skills are well suited to a world citizen. Meil wrote, "The process of democratic socialization means learning more and more responsible membership in a society whose discipline requires that the individual maintain his integrity and discover his uniqueness within the context of a
group which supports him but which he also supports and enriches. In other words, democratic socialization embodies the interwoven process of individuation and socialization" (qtd. in Crocco, 228). This ideal requires the walking of a fine line. Students are, based on this philosophy, taught the importance of working toward civic responsibility through personal contribution to society while promoting individual interests. Developing a synergistic relationship between that civic responsibility and realization of the citizen as an individual is the ideal (Morse, 7).

It is at this philosophical juncture that debate ensues. "The liberal state is one that refuses to impose on its citizens a single conception of the good life, or of virtuous character" (Becker, 465). "The desire for political unity will suppress difference, and tend to exclude some voices and perspectives from the public" (Iris Marion Young qtd. in Macedo, 468). Each viewpoint leads to a common question, "How can such a state survive without common substantive purposes? And how can such common purposes be pursued (and transmitted in civic education) without injustice to those whose way of life differs markedly from the norm?" (Becker, 466). Yet another vital question, "How can tolerance be taught without exposing children to diversity and asking them to forebear from asserting the truth of their own particular convictions, at least for political purposes?" (Macedo, 471).

Fundamentalist conservative citizens are concerned that a liberal state is on a mission to inculcate basic civic virtues revolving around tolerance and those who disagree with this premise are being required to set aside their own core values, their moral conceptions, and are being required to bow to the political authority of a group
whose values differ from their own. The political liberal, on the other hand, suggests it is important to "recognize that the question of religious truth must be bracketed in order to justify the basic principles that will guide the coercive power we hold together as a political community" (Becker, 480). As these warring factions and others continue to spar, the construction of good citizens in the public school system continues to evolve and the moral fiber of current political authority continues to be inculcated. For example, as I write this thesis, a debate rages as to whether the inauguration of President George W. Bush should include Christian prayer, which is reflective of the President’s value system. Thousands of school children will undoubtedly watch this historic event. But should the belief system and morality of the President be forced on the students?

In the meantime, the rebar holding the democracy together is woven through education of students. Common ground held by fundamentalist conservatives and liberals or other groups with differing viewpoints is that, as a democracy, the common citizen has the right to disagree with current policy and the right to object officially to current educational practices. So, through all the debate, the student learns, by example, that the good citizen is concerned about the condition of society. The good citizen is willing to advocate a position following structure provided by the democratic government in an attempt to alter current philosophy and practices while understanding that decision is made and policy written by majority rule.

American democratic experience providing for construction of good citizens is mercurial. One finds it difficult to pin down the definition of a good citizen or the outline
educators should follow to teach citizenship skills. The system appears to lack a focus because there are so many viewpoints. By the very nature of a democratic society, no one person has the last and definitive word about what constitutes a good citizen. This elusive quality leads to some confusion as teachers attempt to get a handle on ethereal wisps of guidance while trying to understand exactly what they should be teaching in the way of good citizenship.

Today, it is politically correct in America to believe in and promote diversity, tolerance, and cultural relativism and balance this with individualism and uniqueness. In question are the civic virtues, which have their basis in the religious tenets of the founding father's expectations. Do we teach the practice of morals or do we teach about morals? Or, neither? Political authority on the question is vague. One judge, ruling on the right of schools to teach tolerance said, "Public schools may teach civil tolerance which is the notion that in a pluralistic society we must 'live and let live" (Macedo, 473). Yet, with all the vagueness, the system has worked so far. The democracy is intact although in an altered state. The American experience has been a study in evolutionary process and construction of good citizens has evolved with the country.

"To educate a person in mind and not in morals is to educate a menace to society."

- Theodore Roosevelt

Creating Good Citizens, the Costs, the Benefits and the Educational Tradition,
Regardless of politics involved, regardless of whether a country lives under
democratic rule or totalitarian rule, in order to survive, citizens must be of a like mind
with leaders. The people must work for common good. If citizens of a nation are
working at cross-purposes from its government, anarchy will prevail and sooner or later,
the government will topple. The masses in any country are the structure which supports
the whole. They are the rebar, the under girding holding together the social fabric of the
state. This is basic, an uncontested rule of existence. It is therefore wise for any
government to take steps to educate its populace to good citizenry. The place to start is,
of course, at the beginning - with children. It is an inculcation of ideology of political
authority that rules the country. Governments operate smoothly when the public follows
blindly. Adolph Eichmann said at his trial for Nazi war crimes, "Where would we have
been if everyone had thought things out in those days" (qtd. in Lickona, 228). He makes
a point. The Fascist government ruling Germany couldn't have its people questioning
decisions made by its leaders. Hitler would never have succeeded had the news media
revealed all to the general public. He had to have total control. Educating the children
not only permitted total control but also virtually guaranteed that as they became adults,
their values, their morality would echo Hitler's. Lenin and his successors followed a
similar concept. Students were educated, ideally, to work for the good of the collective.
Differences in opinion were soundly stopped. Dissenters disappeared. Unfortunately for
Nazis and communists, although generations were schooled to be good citizens, their
ultimate control was instilled and delivered through fear. Fear is corrosive and repression is caustic.

In the American democratic experience, students are encouraged to be good citizens. But part of the behavior of a good citizen is the ability to think critically, to question current policies, and to work within the system. The suggestion of values education will forever have Americans debating the approach to be taken and which values are the right values. It is the hallmark of our government that we are permitted to dissent and express an opinion other than that of policy makers. Because of this, there will never be hard and fast rules for American educators to follow as there were in Nazi and communist systems. Our students will be encouraged to understand our system of government and how to use it effectively. Every generation will be exposed to current trend in values education. Now, schools are promoting tolerance and globalism. In the fifties, extreme nationalism and anti communism were politically correct values.

Citizenship is a unique way of thinking and of being and is reflective of the times we live in. Lickona suggests:

"[. . .] wise societies since the time of Plato have made moral education a deliberate aim of schooling. They have educated for character as well as intellect, decency as well as literacy, virtue as well as knowledge. They have tried to form citizens who will use their intelligence to benefit others as well as themselves, who will try to build a better world." (6)

Lickona went on to explain that the founding fathers believed moral education was necessary for the success of the democracy because moral people will be committed to the tenets of our system: "respect for the rights of individuals, regard for the law, voluntary participation in public life, and concern for the common good" (6).
Jefferson believed these attitudes must be taught from a very early age. Following this logic, schools must teach or inculcate the values of the country so that the country can continue to develop in a way that benefits its members. A.K. Benjamin of the Center for Human Development and Social Change asserts, "The good of a nation demands the consideration of serious ethical questions. If education ignores the value and moral aspect of the human psyche, where will society find citizens able to make mature moral decisions" (qtd. in Lickona, 268).

This is where educators must enter into the equation. "Schools must do what they can to contribute to the character of the young and the moral health of the nation" (Lickona, 5). The lack of direction imposed by our government in construction of good citizens revolves on the premise that teachers themselves are good citizens, that we will, by example, guide children into an understanding of responsible citizenship. We will gently guide them into skills needed to think critically. We will assist them in developing their unique understanding of the world and how to weave their attitudes, values, and philosophies into the whole fabric. It is this quilt of competing values that enriches the American experience and allows such a diverse group of peoples to cohabitate.

A teacher of English in Ohio, John Gaughn, wrote that teaching:

"[. . .] is about creating opportunities for students to become thoughtful, committed citizens. It is about encouraging them to air their views honestly and forthrightly. Those views don't exist in a vacuum, though, and students need to realize that. They need to explore the assumptions that underlie their opinions and consider how those opinions relate to their peers, their community, and their country." (11)

If teachers of any subject can encourage students to think this critically, to understand far reaching implications of their viewpoints, and to realize that their beliefs don't exist in a
vacuum, then educators are stepping strongly in the direction of creating good citizens. The goal isn't to teach a child a specific set of values but to assist the child in understanding the values imbedded by their lives - parents, peers, church, school, and so on - and with the understanding of their values, can come understanding of the far reaching effects of the child's behaviors.

Of course, teachers aren't blank slates nor are we robotic. We too are citizens and human beings with a personal set of core values. We will, directly or indirectly reveal our values system. A teacher, like Gaughn, may believe in tolerance and diversity, "I believe in democracy, in an educated citizenry. I believe our country (and my classroom) should be inclusive and that each of us should tolerate and appreciate difference. I'd like to see students embrace these values [...]" (35). But what happens when there is a teacher who isn't so politically correct? What happens when a teacher disagrees with the current trend? Is that teacher silenced? How does our free society, which advocates the appreciation of difference deal with an educator who doesn't tout the party line? What about a parent who doesn't agree with the values being taught in schools? Macedo suggested, "Each of us can reasonably be asked to surrender some control over our own children for the sake of reasonable common efforts to insure that all future citizens learn the minimal prerequisites of citizenship" (485-86). Does democratic ideal exist only for those who agree with current popular sentiment?

Democracy isn't unconditional freedom. Those who are charged with the education of future citizens, generally follow dictates of the majority. Those who openly defy the acceptable criteria for good citizenship education will be silenced. A teacher,
who advocates homophobia or hatred of a race, will more than likely lose his or her job. Thomas Jefferson told us, "I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of the society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise control with a wholesome discretion the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education" (qtd. in Morse, vi). Those who educate future citizens must understand and express the enlightened and wholesome values of the majority.

So, what are the criteria of good citizens? Is it necessary to develop good citizens in any society? If a political entity hopes to survive, it must have the hearts of the people. Because of this, it is imperative to educate children to function as good citizens as defined by the political authority of the time. Each government discussed within the confines of this paper actively practiced the education of its children to develop a sympathetic citizen. Any government, which actively seeks to inculcate a specific set of civic virtues, does so in a prejudicial manner. "Educational systems have goals about the kind of human being they want to produce. All political regimes need citizens who follow and support their fundamental principles" (Morse, 36). Formal education is the rebar behind construction of good citizens, whatever the description. Citizenship by definition is a collective behavior (Nie, 5). Every political authority develops a philosophical argument and a set of values, attitudes, and virtues, which are prized in its citizens. The government then sets up an educational regime designed to inculcate those values. These intrinsic values become a standard that enriches the social cement of the society government wishes to
promote. Regardless of whether the government is that of Nazis, Soviets, or Americans, the ultimate goal of citizenship education is to develop members who will work to the betterment of society and who will embrace a well developed sense of civic duty. The difference between goals of the totalitarian governments and the democratic one is that members of the democracy are also encouraged to develop individually and are encouraged to challenge the government and the system when and if it begins to fail the people. Education is the tool used to create societies good citizens.
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