ATTITUDES OF HIGH SCHOOL
STUDENTS ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

A Thesis Presented for the
Degree of Master of Arts

by

Katharine J. Jones, B.S.

The Ohio State University
1947

Approved by:

[Signature]
### INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Methods Used and Results Obtained in A Study of Students' Attitudes on International Relations</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. The Conflicting Beliefs of Students on International Relations</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. The Implications of the Conflicting Beliefs of Students for School Practice</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Conclusions and Recommendations</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A. International Relations Beliefs...

Appendix B. Results of the Rating of Statements by the Jury...

Appendix C. Results of Student Responses to the Lists of Statements International Relations Beliefs...

Appendix D. Number of Liberal, Conservative, and Undecided Responses to the Thirteen Pairs of Conflicting Statements...

Appendix E. The Number of Students Indicating Conflict on the Seven Pairs of Statements Regarding Which There Was the Most Discrepancy Between Liberal and Conservative Responses...
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Few will deny that men everywhere tend to identify themselves with groups for which they have feelings of loyalty. Human beings evidence these feelings of loyalty for such "in-groups" as their families, their churches, their clubs, their cities, their states, and their countries. The amount of loyalty a man gives to a group seems to depend upon how closely he is associated with it.

In his Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War, W. Trotter has this to say of the way group sympathy seems to operate:

In human society a man's interest in his fellows is distributed about him concentrically according to a compound of various relations they bear to him which we may call in a broad way their nearness. The centrifugal fading of interest is seen when we compare the man's feeling towards one near to him with his feeling towards one further off. He will be disposed, other things being equal, to sympathize with a relative as against a fellow-townman, with a fellow-townman as against a mere inhabitant of the same country, with the latter as against the rest of the country, with an Englishman as against a European, with a European as against an Asiatice, and so on until a limit is reached beyond which all human interest is lost.... The degree of sympathy varies directly with the amount of inter-communication with him.

Sutherland and Woodward discuss the operation of group

---

loyalty in terms of "in-group" and "out-group" attitudes:

One basis of classification (of groups) centering on the social attitudes related to membership in a group contrasts the "we-feeling", characteristic of persons who belong to the same group, with their attitude toward those who are members of "outside" groups. The individual thinks of the "we-group" or the "in-group" as "my group", the group "whose members I know, whose purposes I share, whose traditions I revere," in contrast with the "others-group" or the "out-group", "whose members I regard as strangers, foreigners, and sometimes as enemies, because their traditions and purposes are different, and in some cases antagonistic to those of my group." .......

Circles of varying dimensions separate "in-groups" from "out-groups", each depending upon the relationship in question. One may consider one's home community an "in-group" with reference to outside communities, but when one's attention is centered upon another relationship, let us say one's own family, one regards the family as an "in-group" in contrast with the rest of the community, who in this case belong to the "out-group".2

Such loyalties as those man displays toward his family, his fellow-workers, his church, and his country have an obvious survival value. Men seem to get along best with their fellows in work and in play when common purposes and interests with those fellows are clear. And the in-group spirit, which both builds and feeds upon common goals, does seem to give impetus to co-operative effort.

The in-group spirit, on the other hand, has thus far tended to narrow man's field of friendly association to such

an extent that the nation has become the final group to which he feels strong allegiance. To those of one nation, the members of all other nations constitute the out-group, the one that doesn't really count as "we" do.

Such a universal condition usually has been accompanied by the practice of fostering strongly nationalistic attitudes in the people of the various nations. Youth, in particular, have been exposed to nationalistic teaching.

In this country we say with disapproval that Hitler and Mussolini deliberately gave their youth a distorted picture of the world and taught them that their own countries were the greatest and most glorious on earth. Their strict programs of indoctrination make our accusations seem reasonable.

It is the conviction, however, of many informed persons that our schools, influenced by such cultural factors as books, civic organizations, laws, the press, and more recently the radio and the movies, have been generally and successfully fostering in our young people the same kinds of nationalistic attitudes that we deplore in the young German and Italian.

Merle Curti says that nationalist text-writing started in this country's infancy. As early as the eighteenth century, Noah Webster set to work to promote the national "prejudices" so necessary in his eyes to American well-being. His dictionary of American English and his "spelling-books"
popularized reforms in orthography which he deemed basic to the growth of a distinctly American language and literature. As the eighteenth century gave way to the nineteenth, Jedidiah Morse's school geographies were sparing no superlative in praising the American nation above all others, while the textbooks of Caleb Bingham and John Pierpont were filled with patriotic sentiments. All through the first half of the nineteenth century, publishers and authors vied with each other in giving full play to the patriotic impulse. Even arithmetic textbooks tried to instil lessons of patriotism in youthful minds. At least two authors claimed special consideration for their handiwork on the ground that boys and girls would imbibe patriotism in the course of reckoning sums and calculating problems.

The same writer relates that the early school textbooks in American history set the pattern in matters of patriotism for those that followed. The emphasis on the unprecedented progress of our young country, the evil policy of Britain with regard to the colonies in the pre-Revolutionary period, and the brave deeds of American soldiers and sailors found in early textbooks was to be carried over to later ones. And new areas in which our country excelled were to be brought to the attention of young readers. In 1824 in a

popular school history, Charles A. Goodrich even went so far as to uphold the study of American history on the ground that it was the history of the first civil government ever established on the genuine basis of freedom and that it furnished "lessons upon the science of civil government social happiness, and religious freedom of greater value than are to be found in the history of any other nation on the globe."  

Our more modern textbooks are less flamboyant in language than their predecessors, but the emphasis is often much the same. In 1930 Bessie L. Pierce analyzed nearly 300 textbooks used in American schools. She found that textbooks are permeated with a national or patriotic spirit; they are pro-American; they certainly cannot be charged with disloyalty to American ideals; and they evince very little criticism of American character or of American activities.  

Pierce goes on to point out that the attitudes engendered toward other peoples through a reading of these books must, in many cases, redound to their shame in contrast with the glory of America. Her study reveals that the Spaniard is pictured as harsh and cruel in our books; that England,


5 Bessie Louise Pierce, Civic Attitudes in American School Textbooks, p. 253.
though treated more generously than twenty-five years ago, is still the target of animosities springing from the Revolution and the War of 1812; that France, our traditional friend, receives the most praise of all the nations; and that militarism, greed, rapacity, and cruelty are charged against Germany, that most hated of nations.

According to Pierce, geographies are the least inclined to paint the American as superior to other peoples, readers and histories being the most guilty in this respect. Few books were found to teach the brotherhood of man, and the emphasis on war heroes and incidents was, in Pierce's judgment, such as to exalt war over peace.

The Lynds reported in the middle 1930's that community pressure forces in one midwestern industrial city were mobilizing against dissent on the part of some teachers on the subject of strong national loyalty. At the time, the Lynds made these observations:

The patriotic groups know what they want. The D.A.R. always on a hair-trigger of watchfulness for disloyalty is reported to feel that both the high school and the college have some pretty pink teachers; and it is reported as characteristic of its activity that sons and daughters in the classrooms of suspected teachers have been enlisted to check up on the latter's teaching.

---

6 Ibid., p. 254.
7 Ibid., p. 255.
The same authors report this editorial comment on a law passed by the State legislature in 1935 requiring a new compulsory high-school course on the Federal Constitution:

A rare opportunity for the public school teachers of (this state) to instil patriotism into the minds of high school pupils is given by the act of the 1935 State legislature which provides for the instruction of pupils in the National and State Constitutions. Much depends, however, upon the attitude the teachers take toward such instruction and their enthusiasm for the subject, or the lack of such enthusiasm.

The conscientious teacher will explain in detail the meaning of our Constitutions, how they came into being and the objects they are supposed to serve. She will show how it is the citizen's protection against various political theories.

A more general, documented discussion of patriotism in education, published in 1940, points out that few elementary and secondary school American history books explain how President Lincoln, in 1861, apparently had a clear-cut choice between war and peace and chose war without endeavoring first to test the possibilities of preserving peace through compromise. It also reveals the opinion that public do not school pupils usually learn that, in 1898, President William McKinley yielded to Congressional pressure for war with
Spain although he had been assured by trusted diplomats abroad that Spain probably would submit to the demands made upon her by the United States in the Cuban crisis.

The authors of this survey further state that although social science textbooks and teaching have become steadily more realistic during the past two decades, most American political education is still essentially conformist in its emphases. They tell of a federal law, for example, passed in 1935 but repealed in 1937, forbidding the teachers of the District of Columbia to teach their pupils anything about communism or, by implication, about the Soviet Union. Some teachers of geography, while this law was in effect, pasted blank paper over Russia in the post-war map of Europe. In answer to questions from curious pupils, the teachers explained that the Congress of the United States would have them discharged if they said anything at all about the country thus hidden.

Carlton J.H. Hayes expresses the following view regarding the role of our schools in the promotion of nationalism:

...... Elementary readers are packed with nationalist poems, with ultra-patriotic legends, and with tales of the mythical and

always exemplary deeds of ancestral national demigods. Geography is usually centered in the providential economic and territorial primacy of one's own country and from its study the pupils gather that their nation is, or should be, the most favoured of all God's creation, and that it has, or should have "natural boundaries", great "natural resources", and vast wealth. From their study of civics, the same pupils are led to believe that their country is the freest, the most liberty-loving, the most progressive, the best governed, and the happiest on earth. From their study of history (what amazing history it usually is) they derive an exaggerated notion of the bravery and worth of their own countrymen and an equally exaggerated notion of the viciousness and cowardice of foreigners.  

Edward H. Reisner, writing shortly after the First World War, deplored the nationalistic trend in the teaching of history, pointing out that there "seems to have been in this country a noticeable change during and since the war to a more conscious effort to inculcate patriotism through school subjects."

Charles E. Merriam speaks of the efforts our schools have made to insure national loyalty:

---


13 Edward H. Reisner, Nationalism and Education Since 1789, p. 559.
...... In the American system, the teaching of history is relied upon as one of the most important methods of inculcating ideas favorable to the maintenance of the political order and to the special form of it at the given moment. In recent years extraordinary measures have been taken to guard against any type of history teaching in which national heroes might not be fully appreciated. In some of the states laws have been enacted specifically prohibiting any form of teaching in any manner derogatory to the national historical characters. More commonly statutes have been enacted requiring the teaching of the Constitution or the principles of government as an obligatory part of the primary school instruction, the number of hours varying in different states.¹⁴

All these writers are agreed that our school system has engaged in promoting strongly nationalistic attitudes in students, especially through textbooks.

There is some evidence that the school may be merely the place where efforts to instil nationalism go on, rather than the force behind these efforts. The activities of such organizations as The American Legion, The Daughters of the American Revolution, The American Defense Society, and The America First Foundation, consisting of announcements of opinion, demands for laws affecting school practice, citizenship training courses, and preparation of ready-made textbooks, are discussed by Bessie Pierce, who quotes the President of the D.A.R. (in 1926) as follows:

It is alleged that there are over 8000 teachers in our schools who are not loyal to the Government and Constitution of the United States and who are using their opportunities to teach disloyal doctrines and to throw discredit upon the ideals and principles of this Republic which teach that spirit of pride in this country that befits a true American. We want no teachers who say there are two sides to every question including even our system of government; who care more for their academic freedom of speech and opinion (so-called) than for their country.\footnote{15}

In 1922, one patriotic organization, The American Legion, even went so far as to write a textbook in American history. The Story of Our American People embodies a type of history acceptable to the heads of the Legion at that time. It is in two volumes, the first devoted entirely to the Colonial period, and the second to the years following 1789. Herioc figures, to whom homage had been paid in the history texts of years ago, and whose deeds had not been strongly emphasized by recent writers, again meet the reader. Anecdotal narratives are retold, and the importance of wars is not minimized.

The American Defense Society in 1930 directed its attack against what it called communism in the schools. \footnote{16}

\footnote{15}{Bessie L. Pierce, \textit{Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth}, p. 21.}

\footnote{16}{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 39.}
This organization believed that "there is hardly a school or college in this country in which a communist nucleus, as they love to call it, has not been established."

According to Merle Curti, these organizations and other groups were agitating for laws affecting school practice, and during the years following the First World War, laws were being passed. This was not the first time, however, that laws to promote national loyalty through the school had been passed in this country. As early as 1827, laws requiring the study and teaching of American history were passed by the Massachusetts and Vermont legislative bodies. Other eastern states followed. The Middle West and South, excepting Virginia, stood aloof from the movement. After the Civil War, the movement spread until it became general.

In the years that followed the First World War, special demands were made in the name of patriotism for additional legislative requirements as to the extent and character of the civic instruction in the schools and as to the requirements that should be imposed on teachers. Curti tells us that the Lusk Laws in New York, which were


criticized by educators and the liberal public before they were repealed in 1923, introduced a program which was copied in other states. These laws supervised textbooks and the appointment and tenure of the teachers in the interest of Americanism—defined in broad, general terms of liberty and democracy but actually stipulating loyalty to the status quo; they required flag salutes and pledges of allegiance from pupils and loyalty oaths from teachers; and their enforcement made possible not only the dismissal of teachers of socialist and labor sympathies but even of those committed to old-fashioned American liberal faith.

Studies in Pennsylvania and Iowa suggest that various efforts to promote strongly nationalist attitudes enjoyed a measure of success. Inquiries into the social attitudes of 1125 school children, conducted in the late 1920's, revealed that, in the minds of the children studied, defense was apparently nine times as important as voting and twenty-five times as important as paying taxes. Only four children in the entire sample were willing to admit that the United States had engaged in some enterprises of which it could not be proud. In a similar study of over six thousand students in midwestern high schools, eighty-two per cent of the freshmen and fifty-four per cent of the

19 Ibid., p. 237.

seniors answered "yes" to the statement: "America has always dealt squarely with all nations."

The writer's personal experiences as a student in elementary and high school led her to beliefs much like those expressed by the authors cited. She came to believe that our schools have been a prime instrument through which we have been fostering highly nationalistic attitudes in boys and girls.

On looking back to elementary and high school days, the writer recalls that she picked up the notions that Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln were heroes approaching a perfection never sighted by men of other nations; that in its dealings with other countries, the United States had never been known to be anything but honest, straightforward, and fair; and that in the waging of wars, our country always had been forced to fight some evil country which had infringed upon our God-given rights or which had brutally attacked us. Since the radio then presented little beyond musical and comedy programs, since she was not in the habit of reading newspapers, and since patriotic movies were comparatively rare, the writer is reasonably certain these notions were imparted to her largely through her teachers and textbooks.

The evidence offered by authors and personal experience

---

Walter Sharp and Grayson Kirk, Contemporary International Politics, p. 118.
led to the decision that the twofold task of this thesis should be that of demonstrating, through a study conducted in a high school in Columbus, Ohio, the method by which nationalistic attitudes are now being fostered in young people and that of determining the beliefs that the young people of this school actually hold in the field of international relations which presumably are, at least in part, a result of the teaching in the school.

In the next chapter, the methods used in this study, and the results obtained will be discussed.
CHAPTER II

METHODS USED AND RESULTS OBTAINED IN
A STUDY OF STUDENTS' ATTITUDES ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The method decided upon for determining the manner in which nationalistic attitudes are being fostered in the school studied, if at all, was that of observing the practice of several teachers in social studies classrooms. Numerous visits to both World and American history classes and to social geography classes were made. No information as to the actual purpose of the observations was given the teachers visited. Neither did the writer attempt to determine in advance of any of the visits the subject matter to be dealt with in the classes.

The writer established the following criteria for determining whether the individual teachers observed were inculcating nationalistic attitudes in their students:

1. In dealing with the relationships between the United States and other countries, did the teacher fail to give information which might point to the fact that this country's conduct in matters involving other nations has sometimes not been above criticism?

2. Did he place strong emphasis upon the admirable qualities of our national political and military heroes without calling attention to qualities which might indicate these heroes were, or are, not perfect?

3. Did he take an isolationist point of view - stress the need for self-sufficiency, staying out of the disputes of other countries, etc.?
4. Did he strongly favor keeping "America for the Americans"?

5. Did he tend to point out the faults of other countries without discussing their strengths or good points?

6. Did he fail to call attention to textbook treatment of incidents in which the role of the United States has been distorted so as to make it appear that this country's conduct has always been above reproach when the facts indicate that our actions have not always been entirely justifiable?

7. Did he tend to favor a strong national military force in peacetime?

8. Did he indicate that he favored economic nationalism or imperialism in any form?

9. Did he seem to feel that the United States should guard her sovereignty in all areas?

10. Did he fail to stress the need for collective security through such an organization as the United Nations?

11. Did he emphasize in manner or presentation the "benevolence", "superiority", and "righteousness" of this country?

12. If his views were nationalistic, was he dogmatic in discussions in which they were expressed?

Upon setting up these criteria, the writer realized that she probably would not have occasion to judge the teachers observed by all of them. She also was aware that the criteria do not cover completely the whole field of international relations. She did feel, however, that the teachers observed probably would touch upon several topics which might be judged by some of them and that these criteria are sufficiently inclusive to cover most topics in the field
of international relations which might be discussed.

The results obtained from applying the above criteria to the classroom practices observed were interesting and somewhat surprising. Among the numerous classes that were visited, there were many in which there was no discussion pertaining to international relations or national loyalty. In twelve of the classes, however, questions and discussion in these fields did arise. Six teachers were observed, and of this number four of them dealt in some way with the area being studied by the writer. Two of these four touched upon the topic several times, while the other two referred to it one time each.

Of these four teachers, according to the criteria set up by the writer, there was not one who, it could be said, consistently promoted nationalistic attitudes, although two of them often did seem to do so. A third might possibly be considered to have promoted the cause of nationalism on one occasion. The remaining teacher of the four did not in any way, in the writer's judgment, foster nationalistic attitudes in his students during the one discussion in which the topic under study was considered by him and his class.

Some examples of the kinds of teaching in this field that did go on in the classes visited will serve to document the writer's conclusion that nationalism was being promoted in some of the classrooms, although not consistently so.

Teacher A, in an American history class discussing the
political events leading up to the construction of the Panama Canal, gave a reasonably unbiased account of the part played by the United States in the Panama revolt. In telling of our belated compensation to Colombia for territory lost in the Panama affair, however, the teacher assumed a righteous attitude and took the opportunity to mention the fact that the United States lends a great deal of money to other countries, much of which is not returned. According to the writer's criteria, the unbiased account concerning the politics involved in building the Panama Canal was not nationalistic, but the manner in which the teacher mentioned the loans might serve to foster nationalistic attitudes in his listeners.

In a class in social geography, Teacher B discussed the indignation of Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia with regard to our claims that Palestine should absorb large numbers of homeless Jews. She explained the plight of the Jews and their desire for a homeland. She did not raise any question as to why the United States does not relax its immigration requirements if it is so concerned about homeless Jews. It seems to the writer that such an omission, whether intentional or not, amounts to a distortion of facts regarding our relations with other countries, and consequently fosters nationalism.

On another occasion, Teacher B was summing up a unit
on Great Britain. In a part of her commentary, she remarked that England is a tiny country with a large population and that, because of this fact, she has had to bite off chunks of other lands from time to time to provide necessities and luxuries for the English. Not one word of criticism of imperialism was uttered by the teacher, and since no students raised a question, the writer assumed their attitudes, if any, in this particular situation, were as nationalistic as their teacher's. During the same class period, Teacher B told of the inability of the British to mingle readily with other peoples. She mentioned having seen Britons kicking coolies in China. She also related that she had seen an American doing the same thing. In this account, the teacher cannot be accused of having promoted nationalism, certainly.

The American history class of Teacher A was discussing review questions on a unit concerning international relations, during one class visitation. The question, "In what ways is our country closer to others than in Washington's day?" was asked. It was answered that we are closer in transportation, communication, trade, and friendship. One student said that Russia is not very friendly because of the fact that we hold the atomic bomb secret. The teacher replied that he thought we could get together for peace even with Russia. Another student asked the teacher if Molotov really had a bad disposition. The teacher answered that he did, but that many
persons representing the United States did not have good dispositions. Then the teacher commented that the Soviet Union is a young country which may be more reasonable in time. In applying her criteria to this particular classroom situation, the writer concluded that the teacher's presentation was not clearly nationalistic. Teacher A implied that the Soviet Union is unreasonable. That implication might be construed to be nationalistic. At the same time, he mildly defended that country through an explanation of a possible cause for her unreasonableness. That defense seemed more liberal than nationalistic to the observer. Then, too, on the liberal side, he expressed optimism through the belief that we can have "peace in our times", and he pointed out that not all of our citizens have good dispositions.

During an observation in Teacher C's class, the instructor was generalizing regarding self-sufficiency. He said that natives everywhere can eke out at least a bare existence on what they have at home. Referring to the United States, he stated that we have been treated more kindly by nature than most countries and observed that we can get along with what we have. One student was curious as to what Brazil could do with "all of that coffee" if all countries should supply their own needs. The teacher answered that Brazil would not have to raise so much coffee and that she could raise more of other commodities instead. He also
commented that Brazil has specialized simply to make profit. Teacher C did not actually say that self-sufficiency is desirable, but it seemed to the writer that his remarks implied as much and that the students in the class might interpret his statements as a plea for self-sufficiency. This teacher, then, by implication at least, seemed to the observer to be advocating self-sufficiency, and consequently promoting nationalism.

In Teacher D's class, a topic in the field of international relations arose only once during the writer's presence. The American System as devised by Clay was under consideration. The harm to the South, and ultimately to eastern shippers, wrought by protective tariffs was explained. In the course of the discussion, nationalism was characterized, in passing, as the practice by the various countries of concerning themselves primarily with their own interests while giving little thought to the welfare of the rest of the world. At this point, the teacher raised the following question: "Would you be willing to live a little less well to allow people of other countries to live better?" Several students said they would be willing, while one student replied his willingness would be determined by how well he was already living. Unfortunately, the period ended with this interesting observation. It seemed to the observer that in this situation the teacher was not promoting nationalistic attitudes. His clear explanation of the way protective tariffs work certainly could serve to nurture attitudes
unfavorable to that aspect of economic nationalism, while his question regarding sharing with peoples of other lands at least brought the idea of aiding less fortunate countries than ours to the attention of the members of the class.

The foregoing examples of classroom treatment of subjects relevant to international relations show, the writer believes, that a mixture of conservative or nationalistic and liberal points of view is being presented to the students of this school. The writer realizes that her sampling of the teaching in this field was of insufficient scope to warrant drawing any conclusions as to whether teaching in this school is more nationalistic than not. She does believe, however, that her evidence at least proves conclusively that there is no organized, concerted, or consistent attempt on the part of the teachers of this school to foster a strong nationalism in the students.

In order that it could be determined whether the beliefs held by students in the school actually were strongly nationalistic, a list of thirty statements to be marked "true", "false" or "undecided" was prepared. It was decided that the statements should concern several issues in the field of international relations about which there is a considerable amount of controversy. The general categories chosen were militarism and war, power politics, immigration and assimilation, isolationism, imperialism, and sovereignty.  

See Appendix A for complete list of statements.
Let the writer say at the outset that she does not claim the beliefs held by the students as reflected in their answers to this list of beliefs have been gained exclusively through school instruction. She does think, however, that it is reasonable to assume that classroom activities are partly responsible for these attitudes.

In the preparation of the statements that were to go into the list, it was believed that they should be as simple and understandable as possible so that the risk of their not communicating to the students should be minimized. Whenever possible, therefore, the beliefs have been stated in a form commonly seen or heard in our culture. Any concepts which might not be understood by those who are not students specializing in the field of international relations have been avoided.

The list was marked by 167 students, chosen at random, of whom fifty-two were sophomores, fifty-six were juniors, and fifty-nine were seniors.

As for the marking of the statements by the students, the writer felt that, simple as the list is, many students might not be familiar with the ideas in some of the statements, or that the form in which some of the beliefs are stated might cause some of the students to feel that qualifying factors not mentioned would prevent them from marking those statements either "true" or "false". Therefore, in order that as accurate a picture of the students' beliefs
as possible should result when the lists were scored, the choice of marks included that of "undecided".

Before the writer could discover whether the beliefs indicated by students were nationalistic, she had to devise some way to rate the statements in the list. It was decided that it might be possible to rate the statements as conservative or liberal, with the conservative statements being considered nationalistic. The writer did not feel that she should presume to use her own judgment as to whether the statements are conservative or liberal in a study of this kind. She, therefore, decided upon the jury method as suitable. She asked five faculty members of the Ohio State University, three from the Department of Education and two from the Political Science Department, to mark the statements "liberal", "conservative" or "uncertain". When their task was completed, the decision was made that regarding statements upon which as many as three of the jury agreed, the judgment of those three should be accepted.

When the ratings of the members of the jury were checked and tallied, it was found on all the statements except two that at least four of the judgments were in agreement as to the liberality or conservatism of the beliefs. The agreement was unanimous on nineteen of the thirty statements. With respect to the two statements regarding which there was not at least a four to one decision, one of them was considered to be liberal by two of the jury, conservative
by one, and uncertain by two; the other was found to be liberal by two, conservative by two, and uncertain by one. Naturally, in reporting the results obtained from the marking of the lists by the students, the writer will not include these two statements.

At this point it might be well to indicate no claim is made that the decisions of the jury prove the statements liberal or conservative. The liberal or conservatism of many or all of the statements is arguable, no doubt. Inasmuch as it appears impossible to prove certainly that statements of this kind are either liberal or conservative, however, it seems justifiable to the writer, in the light of the experience and scholarship of the members of the jury, to accept their judgments as a reasonably valid basis for determining whether the beliefs held by students taking part in the study conducted are nationalistic.

The results of this study were equally as interesting and surprising as were those from the writer's classroom observations. When the 4,676 responses of the students to the twenty-eight statements clearly designated by the jury as liberal or conservative were classified, it was found that 2,566 of them were liberal, 1,388 were conservative, and 722 were undecided. In other words, almost twice as many of the responses were liberal as were conservative.

---

2 See Appendix B for complete jury results.
There were only eight statements of the twenty-eight to which more students responded conservatively than liberally.

To some of the statements, the response was overwhelmingly liberal. For example, 161 of 167 participants said "yes" to the liberal statement, "The United States should cooperate with other nations in every way possible to prevent war from breaking out anywhere in the world."

One hundred and forty-four believed that immigrant groups have contributed much to the welfare and growth of the United States. To the statement that the people of the United States should try to help countries like China and India develop their industry and agriculture, 148 of the students liberally responded "true". That the United States can improve by using some ideas from other countries was believed to be true by 147 of them. Also, 147 thought the United Nations Organization ought to have the power to settle disputes between countries. And to the conservative statement that we ought to worry only about our own country and let the other countries take care of themselves, 140 of the responses made were "false".

As for the most nationalistic or conservative responses, 139 of the students believed that we ought not to let too many people from other countries come to the United States.

---

3 See Appendix C for complete results of student responses.
(There were only six "undecided" responses to this indefinite statement). One hundred and four students marked "true" this statement: "This country has a right to make all of its own decisions, and we should not be told what to do by anybody." To the nationalistic statement that the United States should keep out of disputes between other nations, ninety-nine participants responded "Yes". Ninety-six of the students believed that the United States should keep the Pacific islands won in World War II for naval and air bases. Eighty-six responded nationally, when they said "false" to the statement that our people are better off when we buy lots of goods from other countries. And the same number answered "true" to the following statement: "There always have been wars, and there always will be wars."

Several of the statements were marked "undecided" by large numbers of students. This indicated to the writer that these students felt too many factors not taken into account by the statements made it impossible to answer them clearly "true" or "false", that the students did not have enough information regarding these statements to answer affirmatively or negatively, or that these particular students did not understand the statements they marked "undecided" clearly enough to mark them "true" or "false". Fifty-six participants were undecided about this one: "When we encouraged Panama to revolt against Colombia, we were not treating
Colombia justly. Fifty-three could not decide on the statement, "We should let foreigners come here and make their homes if they wish." Also, forty-five students were undecided regarding the statement, "If a country like England cannot support its people on the land it has, it has a right to build up an empire to help take care of them."

The fact that more than a half of the responses of participants in this study were liberal does not conclusively prove, of course, that these boys and girls are not somewhat nationalistic in attitude, even with regard to the areas in which their responses were liberal. On a list of this kind, the writer suspects, some of the students may tend to sense, due to some of their church training pertaining to the brotherhood of man and to ideas picked up from the radio, the movies, and school about the excellences of cooperation, helping the downtrodden, etc., what a "decent" response is. Since they, like most of us, want to appear decent, they may choose to mark a statement liberally when they are not wholeheartedly liberal on the issue. Especially may they mark in this manner if they do not have to act upon their answers. That these boys and girls did respond liberally to statements similar to those answered nationally by students from the same section of the country in Pennsylvania and Iowa twenty years earlier, however, must mark a decided advance in the thinking of students toward the liberal point of view in the field of international relations.
The results from the two activities described in this chapter - the observations of social studies teachers' practices and the measuring of the beliefs of students in international relations - seem to show that in this school there is no organized or consistent fostering of nationalism. That this particular school is a typical one, the writer does not claim. Inasmuch as it is an urban school in a district drawing from lower class workers' homes to upper middle class homes of the white collar variety, however, it does appear that the claim can safely be made that the school certainly is not unique.

If the condition found in the school studied is general, the question arises as to what can account for the cropping up of liberal attitudes in students not discovered by Bessie Pierce and others who have made studies in this area. The writer can only make suggestions, based upon personal observations, as to possible answers to this question.

The lesson learned from the failure of our isolationist policy after World War I certainly may help to explain the change in attitude noted above. Our refusing to join the League of Nations and out attempt to "attend to our own business and stay out of the disputes between other countries" did not keep us out of World War II.

A growth in volume of internationalistic reporting, particularly by liberal radio commentators and even by commentators who are conservative in other fields, serves to
inform us of past failures and to tell us that we must now try another way to keep peace.

Both major political parties, unlike during the time of Woodrow Wilson, now claim to embrace the idea of collective security as necessary to the preservation of peace, and did so even as war raged. This country is one of the leading members of the United Nations Organization. This accomplished fact plus the mass media pleas already mentioned tend to influence the attitudes and beliefs of America greatly, the writer believes, particularly when the painful personal experiences of many World War I and World War II veterans, their families, and their friends have convinced them that future wars must be avoided.

The growth of democratic liberalism in general as nurtured by the New Deal and as encouraged in school practice by educators of the John Dewey school may help to answer the question regarding the reasons for the trend toward liberalism in the attitudes of students in general, in international relations.

Under Franklin D. Roosevelt liberal ideas and liberal practices came to the attention of the people of this country to an extent probably greater than ever before. Improved communication has helped on this score. (It is believed by some that Wilson might have successfully promoted the idea of the League of Nations if radio had been commonly in use as it is now). Certainly, the influence of Roosevelt upon
the thinking of the people of this country should not be minimized. And he was liberal in international affairs as well as in domestic matters.

As for our educators, under the influence of men like John Dewey and William James, they have come to advocate that teachers not dogmatically enforce their own views upon students, but rather that they allow students to reach conclusions on the basis of facts and evidence. Many teachers have been influenced, and thus their students now can entertain and accept, if they think evidence warrants it, liberal ideas to an extent probably not true at any earlier time.

The results of the writer's study do not prove a general trend toward a liberalizing of students' attitudes in international relations, of course. Nevertheless, the fact that there was discovered no concerted effort on the part of the teachers in the school studied to foster nationalistic attitudes and that there was found the students tested held more liberal than nationalistic beliefs seems to exonerate this school from blame for a strongly nationalistic bias.

However, the study made indicated other results, to be reported in the following chapter, which lead to another accusation.
CHAPTER III

THE CONFLICTING BELIEFS OF STUDENTS ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The results reported in the preceding chapter indicated that in the school studied there seemed to be no concerted attempt on the part of the teacher to promote nationalistic beliefs. The responses of the students to the lists of beliefs on international relations, however, revealed an overwhelming amount of inconsistency in the beliefs of the participants. That is, the students, in a great many cases, indicated by their responses that they held opposite beliefs at the same time.

The writer composed the lists of beliefs to be marked by the students so that for every statement included there was what she considered to be one that was opposing in principle. Except in the case of the two statements on which they did not agree, the jury rated the individual statements making up each pair oppositely. That is to say, if they rated one statement of a pair liberal, they marked the other conservative. Thus, on thirteen of the fifteen pairs prepared, the writer's judgment that the pairs conflicted in principle was substantiated.

In order that the conflict between the two statements making up each pair should not prove obvious, the statements were arranged in such a way that no two members of a pair
were listed consecutively. Also, the language composing the statements was chosen with care in order that the opposition of the members of each pair should not be obvious. For example, the opposite of the statement, "We can figure out a way to prevent wars if we want to" is "There always have been wars, and there always will be wars."

When the responses to the statements were counted, it was found that there was some confusion on all thirteen pairs in the beliefs of those marking the lists. There was a large to overwhelming amount of conflict indicated in the responses to seven of the pairs. For instance, to the statement that the United States should keep out of disputes between other nations, ninety-nine persons responded conservatively that it was true, while only three answered false to the opposite liberal statement that the United States should cooperate with other nations in every way possible to prevent war from breaking out anywhere in the world. Thirty-one were undecided about the former statement, but only three were about the latter.

One hundred and thirty-six students held the liberal belief that a strong country should not try to force a weaker country to do anything, but only fifty-seven responded liberally by answering false to the statement that the United States should not furnish money or supplies to countries that do not agree with our policies toward them. Fourteen were undecided on the first of these; thirty-four on the second.
Although but forty-four students liberally responded that they did not believe this statement: "This country has a right to make all of its own decisions, and we should not be told what to do by anybody", 147 gave the liberal answer, "true", to the opposite statement that the United Nations Organization ought to have the power to settle disputes between countries. Nineteen could not decide about the former statement; nine were undecided about the latter.

There was less conflict in beliefs indicated in the responses to six of the pairs of statements. For example, 140 students did not believe we ought to worry only about our own country and let the other countries take care of themselves, and 143 believed the opposite statement that the people of the United States should try to help countries like India and China develop their industry and agriculture. Six were undecided about the first statement; eight were not sure about the other.

One hundred and twenty-one participants indicated a liberal point of view when they said they did not believe having a large army and navy is the best way to keep peace, and 101 thought liberally that worldwide disarmament would be a good thing. Twenty-two could not decide about the former statement; twenty-five about the latter.

---

1 See Appendix D for complete account of the number of liberal and conservative responses to the thirteen pairs of statements.
The writer checked the lists of beliefs marked by the students to find out how many individual students were inconsistent on the seven pairs of statements showing the highest discrepancy between liberal and conservative responses.

Inconsistency in answers manifested itself even more strikingly under this kind of tallying than it did under that just reported. The confusion fell into two categories: (1) that in which students professed to believe both of a pair of statements which opposed each other in principle and (2) that in which they expressed a definite belief on one statement of the pair and indicated indecision on the other.

Regarding cases in which students were undecided about one of a pair of beliefs, the writer recognizes that the confusion may only have been apparent. The beliefs marked undecided may not have been understandable to the students as stated, or they may have been found ambiguous. The writer believes it probably may be assumed, however, that in many cases the indecision indicated was due to confusion in the beliefs of the participants.

The following pair of beliefs was marked inconsistently by more students than any other:

The United States should keep out of disputes between other countries.

The United States should cooperate with other nations in every way possible to prevent war from breaking out anywhere in the world.
Ninety-three students professed to believe both of these statements, thirty-three believed one and were undecided about the other, and only forty-one answered consistently.

A great amount of inconsistency in responses to the following pair was apparent, also.

This country has a right to make all of its own decisions, and we should not be told what to do by anybody.

The United Nations Organization ought to have the power to settle disputes between countries.

Ninety-nine participants believed both of these statements, twenty-six believed one and could not decide about the second, and forty-two were consistent.

Sixty-two students believed both of the following statements, thirty-eight believed one and were undecided about the other, while sixty-seven consistently believed one and not the other.

A strong country should not try to force a weaker country to do anything.

The United States should not furnish money or supplies to countries that do not agree with our policies toward them.²

The amount of inconsistency in answers naturally varied among the students who marked the lists. For example, one tenth-grade participant was inconsistent on all seven of those pairs of statements most often marked inconsistently,

² See Appendix E for results of tallying of the number of students indicating conflict on the seven pairs regarding which there was the most discrepancy between liberal and conservative responses.
while a classmate proved consistent on all but one of the seven pairs. Most of the students' responses fell between these two extremes.

When the students did mark a large percentage of the two members of the conflicting pairs consistently, they very frequently revealed inconsistency in attitudes regarding the whole field under consideration. That is, they were liberal in attitude on some pairs and not on others. Not a single student in the whole sample was liberal on all issues or conservative on all, even though a great many were predominantly liberal.

The writer's study indicates that among students in this school there is conflict in the beliefs they hold about issues in the field of international relations. It does not indicate, of course, that this conflict extends itself to the beliefs of the students on other social issues. It is generally believed among writers in social science, however, that ideas about "controversial" issues, in general, are all acquired in much the same way. That is, those ideas are picked up, with little critical consideration, at home, from playmates, in the church, at school, and through the radio and press, etc.

James Harvey Robinson in The Mind in the Making says that as we grow up we simply adopt the ideas presented to us in regard to such matters as religion, family relations, property, business, our country, and the state. We
unconsciously absorb them, he believes, from our environment.

Robert Sutherland and Julian Woodward include a documented account in their *Introductory Sociology* which states that class and race attitudes, sectional prejudices, patriotic sentiments, and attitudes toward mores and institutions, in general, are acquired in an informal manner in the home, and then stamped in by the school, the press, and the various special interests groups and organizations.

The writer and the authors cited do not claim that boys and girls never arrive at their ideas on social issues through reflective thinking — examining the ideas to determine whether evidence warrants their acceptance — but that they usually seem to acquire attitudes by the uncritical method described by Robinson and Sutherland and Woodward. Because the attitudes on international relations of the students tested indicated conflict, and because ideas about other "controversial" issues seem to be gained in much the same way as those acquired regarding international relations, it seems reasonable to the writer to assume that the attitudes of these boys and girls in such areas as race relations, the respective roles of the two sexes, social class, and labor-management relations probably show inconsistency, also.

---


The study conducted in one school and the conclusions drawn as a result of that study do not necessarily indicate that conflict in beliefs on social problems is general among boys and girls of this country. The school in which the study was conducted, however, is a large, urban high school, drawing from all social classes, except possibly the upper, and is probably by no means unique. Also, competent sociologists, psychologists, and educators have written much to indicate that they generally recognize inconsistency in the social attitudes of the people of this country. The writer, therefore, thinks it is fair to say that inconsistency in beliefs on social issues is probably general among the high school boys and girls of this country.

A sampling of the views of some of the authors on the subject of the ambivalence in our attitudes may serve to document the writer’s assumption. Robert S. Lynd in Knowledge for What? has this to say on our confusion:

As one begins to list the assumptions by which we Americans live, one runs at once into a large measure of contradiction and resulting ambivalence. This derives from the fact that these overlapping assumptions have developed in different eras and that they tend to be carried over uncritically into new situations or to be allowed to persist in long diminuendos into the changing future. And the greater the emotional need for them, the longer men tend to resist changes in these ideas and beliefs. These contradictions among assumptions derive also from the fact that the things the mass of human beings basically crave as human beings as they live along together are often
overlaid by, and not infrequently distorted by, the cumulating emphases that a culture may take on under circumstances of rapid change or under various kinds of class control. In these cases the culture may carry along side by side both assertions: the one reflecting deep needs close to the heart's desire and the other heavily authorized by class or by authority.  

Lynd lists a number of contradicting assumptions by which we Americans try to live. Some of them follow:

Individualism, "the survival of the fittest," is the law of nature and the secret of America's greatness; and restrictions on individual freedom are un-American and kill initiative. But: No man should live for himself alone; for people ought to be loyal and stand together and work for common purposes.

Democracy, as discovered and perfected by the American people, is the ultimate form of living together. All men are created free and equal, and the United States has made this fact a living reality. But: You would never get anywhere, of course, if you constantly left things to popular vote. No business could be run that way, and of course no business man would tolerate it.

Everyone should try to be successful. But: The kind of person you are is more important than how successful you are.

America is a land of unlimited opportunity, and people get pretty much what's coming to them here in this country. But: Of course, not everybody can be boss, and factories can't give jobs if there aren't jobs to give.

Patriotism and public service are fine things. But: Of course, a man has to look out for himself.

---


This author's view regarding our contradictory beliefs is documented by findings in "Middletown", a city in which he made an extensive study. In Middletown in Transition he sets down a more extended list of these "of course" assumptions which he found to be relevant to that particular city. And he believes that with allowances for the heavily native-born, Protestant, small-city, Middle Western character of Middletown's population, most of the assumptions there set down would probably apply widely throughout the country. If Lynd's ideas are correct regarding the ambivalence in attitudes of the American population in general, they may well apply to high school students.

Alan Griffin, in his pamphlet for adolescents, "What Do You Mean --- Be Good?" points out some of the conflicting rules or wise sayings we try to live by:

If Henry rushes off to school in order to be on time, and forgets to bring his homework, someone will point out to Henry that "haste makes waste". And if on the following morning, he carefully checks up to make sure that he hasn't forgotten anything, he may be late for school and learn to his sorrow that "He who hesitates is lost." .......

If you listen to wise sayings, you will learn that you should "Always be prepared for the worst," and that "If you look for trouble, you are sure to find it." You will discover that "where there's smoke, there's fire", and yet you will be told "Don't judge by appearances," You will find that "forewarned is forearmed" and then you will be told "Don't cross a bridge until you come to it." You will learn that "Opposites attract each other," and

---

Ibid., p. 62.
that "Birds of a feather flock together."

Griffin does not claim that people universally follow these wise sayings as guides to conduct without thinking about which of them, if any, apply to given situations. But, one cannot deny that these opposing rules quoted to young people without explanation may create conflict for many of them.

In the Public Affairs Pamphlet, "Toward Mental Health", George Thorman, discussing conflicts within personality, indicts our schizophrenic culture:

Conflicts within our personality are often embedded in our culture. For example, on the one hand we are taught to love one another, and on the other hand everything is done to spur us on to success at the expense of our fellow men. We are told that we are free to make our mark on the world, but we find that we are limited and hedged in by social convention and circumstance. It is no wonder that these contradictions in our culture reflect themselves in our emotional life and pull us in opposite and wholly different directions.

In their Introductory Sociology, Robert L. Sutherland and Julian L. Woodward discuss the ways in which children acquire attitudes toward particular groups of people with whom they do not come in close contact. They express the following ideas regarding the consistency of the pattern of these attitudes:

---

8 Alan F. Griffin, "What Do You Mean --- Be Good?" pp. 19-20.

9 George Thorman, "Toward Mental Health", Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 120, p. 20.
One must not be led to conclude that the pattern of out-group attitudes transmitted to the child is a completely consistent one. A variety of conflicting influences bear upon him, and he is often hard put to it to know which set of attitudes is really appropriate in a given situation. His dilemma may be concretely illustrated by the following sequence of pressures which may prey upon him while he is on the road to becoming an adult:

1. Encouragement to make social contacts with everyone during the pre-school period when the child is under constant protection of a parent or nurse.

2. Warning not to talk to strange people or people of another race or social class, not to play with the janitor's children or the children across the tracks (if one is middle class); warning that one may not be wanted across the tracks (if one's father is a workingman).

3. Contact with the intellectualism of democratic teachers or liberal churches who foster race and class equality in verbal terms.

4. Being caught in the tense stratifications of adolescent social structure where money counts.

5. Getting into the world of achievement in later high school and college where success on the college football team may cut across race and class lines to a degree.

6. Finding that any democracy that may have been developed in college sports and intellectual life becomes a hindrance in the race for success in the business world.  

These authors do not maintain that in this sequence there has been described a universal, or even a characteristic, experience. But one must admit this list of divergent

---

influences shaping out-group attitudes has at least the ring of familiarity. And the sequence does illustrate, the writer believes, that it is not easy in our culture to have consistent attitudes in the area of social relations.

John Dewey in *Freedom and Culture* speaks of our conflicts in terms of "beliefs" that we continue to hold after contradictory habits of action have been established due to a great change in environment. He makes these observations regarding the effect of the condition cited above upon democracy:

> No estimate of the effects of culture upon the elements that now make up freedom begins to be adequate that does not take into account the moral and religious splits that are found in our very make-up as persons. The problem of creation of genuine democracy cannot be successfully dealt with in theory or in practice save as we create intellectual and moral integration out of present disordered conditions. Splits, divisions, between attitudes emotionally and congenially attuned to the past and habits that are forced into existence because of the necessity of dealing with present conditions are a chief cause of continued profession of devotion to democracy by those who do not think nor act day by day in accord with the moral demands of the profession. The consequence is a further weakening of the environing conditions upon which genuine democracy occurs, whether the division is found in business men, in clergymen, in educators, or in politicians.

If the established habits Dewey talks about become verbalized into generalizations, as they sometimes do according to Lynd and others, then persons in a great many

---

cases may profess to believe these generalizations as well as the older, accepted principles which are contradictory.

If conflict in beliefs is general, as the evidence offered by the study conducted and the authors quoted have persuaded the writer may be the case, to what extent should teachers and schools be held responsible for the confusion that evidences itself in the beliefs of boys and girls?

The writer was not able to produce any conclusive evidence in the course of her observations of teachers in the school studied that these particular teachers were themselves guilty of confusing the students. No teacher advanced conflicting ideas for the students' acceptance on a single day, for example. One teacher, however, did say on one day that it is a moral obligation for us (and presumably other strong countries) to help weaker countries, and on another day she stated, without criticism, that England has had to bite off chunks of other lands from time to time in order to provide necessities and luxuries for the English. Such statements, obviously, could lead to her students' accepting both the ideas that weak countries should be helped by strong ones and that strong countries, on occasion, have a right to help themselves at the expense of weaker countries.

Another teacher tended to condemn United States imperialism in the political events leading up to the building of the Panama Canal. If the students who listened to this condemnation in Teacher B's history class should have heard
Teacher A's account in geography class of how England has had to bite off chunks of other countries, ambivalence in their beliefs on imperialism could result.

The examples cited do not constitute convincing evidence that the social studies teachers in this school are generally offering conflicting ideas for the acceptance of their students, of course. They do suggest that some of the conflict in the beliefs of students may be coming from teachers.

The writer noted in several classes and assembly programs during the study she conducted that teachers and speakers in the school tended to present their own views as facts without offering evidence to support them. For instance, one teacher, in answer to a student's remarks that her uncle had seen the people of India, in the absence of refrigeration, leave their food outside to become tainted, said flatly that practice was due to ignorance.

During an assembly program, a speaker on citizenship made a statement including the following ideas:

It is unfortunate that we have among us some people who say the atom bomb is going to wipe us off the face of the earth and that inflation is going to throw us into a devastating depression. It is fortunate that these people are in a minority. We can look forward to a bright future with hope. After all, this is America, and we won the war.

Another teacher characterized the French people as pleasure loving and the Dutch as serious and dependable.
In this case, as well as in the others cited, there was no attempt to offer evidence supporting the views expressed. This kind of teaching was found to be rather widespread in the classes observed. The witnessing of such teaching led the writer to the belief which she thinks the facts warrant, that the students in these classes are not being encouraged to examine ideas critically. The students, on the other hand, are being permitted to absorb without questioning all kinds of ideas, some of which, as has already been pointed out, conflict.

The kind of teaching just cited makes the teacher a giver of ideas, but allows students little opportunity to express their views. (The writer found few students expressing significant ideas in the numerous classes observed.) Such a situation obviously prevents teachers from adequately determining whether students are confused in their beliefs.

The writer's classroom observations did not indicate clearly that the teachers of the school studied are having any appreciable share in creating the existing conflict in the beliefs of their students. It is true, however, that none of the teachers observed called to the attention of their students the possibility that they may be holding conflicting beliefs. Neither did any of the teachers make any effort during the classroom observations to discover if students are confused in their beliefs. The writer thinks, therefore, it is fair to conclude that the teachers observed
are making no concerted effort to dispel the confusion in the beliefs of their students. Because the school studied seems to be by no means unique, this conclusion probably applies to other schools.

Assuming that confusion in the beliefs of students is general, the writer offers the following thesis. If students are to dispel the conflict in their beliefs on international relations, the schools of this country must help them to establish habits of reflective thinking. This is probably no less true for their beliefs on other vital social problems.

In the following chapter, the writer will try to make clear the importance of this thesis.
CHAPTER IV
THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE CONFLICTING
BELIEFS OF STUDENTS FOR SCHOOL PRACTICE

The writer takes it for granted that most of the people of this country, in spite of their confusions, conflicting prejudices, and casually acquired habits, do in last analysis, believe in democracy as a way of life. The assumption upon which democracy is based is faith in the ability of the common man to make intelligent choices. The writer is convinced that conflicting beliefs in the absence of reflective thinking interfere with the making of intelligent choices. She would insist, therefore, that confusion in beliefs on international relations and other vital social problems must be a matter of concern in a democratic society.

It must be admitted at the outset that the study made by the writer does not necessarily indicate that the conflicting beliefs of the boys and girls studied are held in the absence of reflective thinking. During the classroom observations made, however, the teachers showed no tendencies to help students dispel confusion. Neither did students in the classes observed give evidence of having established the habit of criticizing the ideas and beliefs advanced for their acceptance. The writer believes, therefore, that in many cases the conflicting beliefs of these
students have not been subjected to the tests of reflective thinking.

Confusion in beliefs interferes with the making of intelligent choices in many ways. Decisions may be haphazard, for example, when they are based upon one or another of two conflicting beliefs. When a person's notions about a problem oppose each other in principle, he tends to act upon that belief which first pops into his head, or which is most forcibly called to his attention. A man may believe, for instance, that freedom of speech should be given to all groups. He may also feel that groups ought not to be allowed to promote ideas which advocate working against democratic forms of government. If he constantly hears and reads comments to the effect that communists, socialists, and "fellow travelers" constitute a danger to democratic government, he may approve legislation or investigations designed to limit the free speech and activities of people branded as members of those groups. He is then acting upon the belief most forcibly called to his attention, and in opposition to another that may be equally dear to him.

If men do act in the way just described, it seems to the writer to follow that they make it possible for those who are not confused to dupe them. For example, a person may believe that the present tendency toward regulation of business should be halted. He may profess to believe also
that public regulation of business is necessary in order to protect the interests of the general public. Politicians promoting the interests of business and industrial groups with whom they identify themselves may tell the man through the radio and the press that such measures as price controls destroy the incentive of producers and thus interfere with production and a "natural" adjustment of prices through the working of the law of supply and demand. Or the announcer on a radio program sponsored by a large monopoly may assure the listener that the business his sponsor is engaged in has grown and flourished because free competition among numerous operators under the system of good old "free enterprise" has been operating. Hearing little from those favoring government regulation, the man may then act upon the belief that business flourishes best when unhampered by public control, and he may repudiate at the polls any man who seems to want strong controls.

Confusion in beliefs can expose people to more serious danger than that of being duped by advertising experts and politicians acting in the interest of big business. When people are unemployed, cannot pay their bills, see their children in want of health-giving foods, and can see no relief in sight, they seek desperately for something or some one to help them. If these people, in addition, are confused in their beliefs because they have never learned to think reflectively about vital problems, they are simply
asking for some demagogue with promises of "a chicken in
every pot" to come along and persuade them to give him
"emergency powers". The granting of such powers can re-
sult in dictatorship or, at least, in serious deprivation
of the liberties of those giving the authority.

A particularly serious possible consequence of hold-
ing conflicting beliefs, in the judgment of the writer, is
that the confused individual may fail, in a great many
cases, to see what his own best interests are. The confused
often do not even recognize their own needs because some of
their beliefs block the way. A few examples which show how
men's beliefs may keep their needs from being fulfilled may
make this point more clear.

According to Lynd, an assumption many seem to accept
in this country is that life would not be tolerable if we
did not believe in progress and know that things are getting
better. The same author says that the old, tried funda-
mentals are best, and that it is a mistake for busybodies
to try to change things too fast or to upset the fundamentals
1

1

Robert S. Lynd, Knowledge for What?, p. 60.
the second of these assumptions. Even though his income is moderate and his family could gain by the adoption of a public health insurance plan he feels that "the fundamentals" would be upset by it.

The following belief seems to be rather widespread in this country: most workers who are unable to provide for themselves during a period of unemployment have been too shiftless to save. It also appears to be widely believed that many workers' wages are too low even to furnish their families a decent living. Since a large percentage of the newspapers of this country are conservative in editorial policy, many of them may oppose measures such as those providing for public works programs to relieve unemployment in times of stress. They may do so by appeals to the first of the two beliefs cited above. Their appeals, stressing that the hard-working and conscientious have to pay for the irresponsibility of the shiftless, may reach many insecure wage earners without substantial savings. These workers are very likely to lose their jobs during time of depression and thus would benefit greatly by a public works program. But, because the belief held by these wage earners that many workers do not receive a wage large enough to furnish a decent living for their families even in normal times is obscured while its polar opposite is played up, they may oppose a public works program.
It may seem quite clear to a man that the sort of person he admires is the successful man. On the other hand, he may sometimes say that the kind of person you are is more important than how successful you are. If his environment is such that emphasis is placed upon the first of these beliefs, he may cultivate the friendship of aggressive, grasping, unfeeling, and even unscrupulous men whose interests are limited to business and whose loyalty to friends in time of trouble is questionable. He may not find time to make friends that are kind, sympathetic, entertaining, and loyal, and who could share a warm and satisfying personal relationship with him. His choice of friends is then such that his need for warm companionship is not served.

The examples given above, the writer believes, indicate that when people hold conflicting beliefs in the absence of reflective thinking, there is no certainty even that they will act upon those beliefs which will promote their own best interests. On the contrary, they may often act upon those beliefs which are inimical to their welfare. That this is so is not surprising when it is prevalent practice for privileged groups to use our media of communication to maintain their privileges by making mass appeals to widely held beliefs in order to win support for their

\[2\]
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own projects.

The writer thinks there is yet another significant reason why there should be concern about confusion in beliefs. Conflicting beliefs in the absence of reflective thinking may lead people into irrational social relations. Conflicting ideas about such matters as sex, race, and social class may bring about social behavior which is quite inconsistent.

For example, at his business luncheon club, a man may agree with his fellow club members that Negroes are all right if they stay in their place. At church the next Sunday he may be convinced that all men are God's children, whatever their color, and that good Christians must treat all men as brothers. How he treats Negroes at a given time probably will depend upon whether he is at that moment largely under the influence of his church about matters of race relations, whether the beliefs of his fellow club members are carrying the most weight with him, or whether some different influence is dominantly operative.

In the field of social class, it is as difficult to act rationally as it is in the field of race relations, if, in the absence of thinking, one's beliefs are conflicting. For instance, at a Parent-Teachers' Association meeting, a matron may heartily agree with the speaker that in a democracy all people are equal, perhaps not in ability but in the right to be treated as dignified human beings. The woman
may drink her tea and chat amiably with little Mrs. Brown who takes in washings to keep her children in school. But at the meeting of her bridge club in a downtown hotel dining room next day, she may be indignant along with her friends, at the boldness of the waitress who presumes to chat in a friendly and intimate manner with acquaintances who are also guests. In this situation, the matron is acting upon the belief that it is quite inappropriate for waitresses to be familiar with persons of superior social position.

People are often irrational in matters concerning the roles of the two sexes as a result of conflicting beliefs. A liberal father may consent to his son's becoming a musician at the expense of his own dream that he might some day see his son become a doctor. His consent may be based upon the belief that everyone should be allowed to enter an occupation he likes and has talent for. The same man may refuse to allow his wife to be employed at the local hospital, even though she is badly needed, is a competent nurse, and likes the work. He may refuse because he believes no self-respecting man would allow his wife to take a job.

The writer is convinced, as the discussion above shows, that conflicting beliefs in the absence of reflective thinking hamper effective social action and relationships. She would insist, therefore, that our schools should seek
ways to dispel confusion in the beliefs of boys and girls.

It is the writer's conviction that the schools of this country ought to assume the responsibility for dispelling young people's confusion because she feels other institutions are not sufficiently non-partisan nor adequately qualified to do it. Many believe the home can best guide young people to beliefs about the significant areas of living. Some argue for parental guidance to beliefs on the ground that parents are more interested in the well-being of their children than anyone else is. It must be admitted that some of them are not, if we are to believe the numerous reports blaming parental neglect for juvenile delinquency. Few will deny, however, that generally parents are quite concerned for the welfare of their children. That some of them are able to do an adequate job in guiding their children to consistent beliefs would, no doubt, be generally conceded. It is possible, however, to question the qualifications of many parents for the task of helping young people to arrive at consistent beliefs about social problems.

Parents have frequently objected to the kind of teaching in our schools which has challenged the beliefs boys and girls have gained at home. It is well known that the reluctance of schools to deal directly and honestly with "controversial" issues has resulted, at least in part, either from such parental objection or from fear of it.
The tendency of some parents to object to teaching which casts doubt upon the cherished beliefs they have handed down to their children suggests to the writer that the beliefs of those parents are not the product of reflective thinking. If they were in the habit of gaining beliefs rationally, it seems reasonable to the writer to suppose that they probably would want their children to arrive at their beliefs by a similar process.

Even if some find the above argument unacceptable, there are few who would deny that parents generally have not had sufficient training in the social sciences and in scientific method to offer the help in attaining consistency in beliefs that trained personnel of our schools should be able to give if encouraged.

Many say that the church, since it is concerned about ideals and moral development, is an appropriate agency to guide young people's beliefs. It is generally recognized, however, that orthodox religion has tended to concern itself with perpetuating its own beliefs, and that it has emphasized taking its teachings on faith. Since this is the case, it certainly does not seem to the writer that the church can be expected to encourage boys and girls to examine their beliefs, at least in the area of religion. The church may, it must be recognized, encourage openmindedness in fields other than religion. If an institution encourages unquestioning acceptance of beliefs in one field, however, it may do so in others.
The writer believes, therefore, that we cannot afford to rely on the church as the institution most suitable to guide the beliefs of young people.

Since the school, as has already been suggested, has not dealt as forthrightly as it might have with issues about which people feel strongly, it is reasonable to assume, the writer thinks, that the home and other institutions have had a large share in shaping the beliefs of boys and girls. And confusion in beliefs does seem to be rather general, as the writer's study suggests. It, therefore, appears that institutions other than the schools have not adequately been meeting the problem of dispelling conflict in the beliefs of the boys and girls of this country.

If they are to assume the responsibility, in what ways can the schools approach the problem of eliminating the evident confusion in the beliefs of young people? It must be admitted that there are possible ways to approach the problem besides encouraging reflective thinking.

One method which could be employed is that of indoctrination. By indoctrination is meant specific intent to get people to believe by suppressing or distorting evidence. School indoctrination could be reactionary or liberal. Either reactionary or liberal indoctrination should reduce confusion in beliefs considerably because it would teach students a single point of view on every vital question.
On philosophical grounds, the writer would emphatically reject this method. In this country we believe, or profess to believe, in democracy, and few would openly reject democratic ideals. The assumption upon which democracy rests is faith in the common man and his ability to make intelligent choices. The writer believes that indoctrination is not compatible with democracy. It interferes with man's right to choose what his destiny shall be. It imposes beliefs upon him and at the same time renders him incapable of making choices he thinks will serve human ends.

Reactionary indoctrination - the deliberate introduction of evidence to support the prejudices most deeply embedded in the culture - the writer is convinced is especially vicious. In the first place, it prevents satisfactory human relations. In the field of race relations, for example, many prejudices held by the majority toward minority races block friendly intercourse and association among the various racial groups of our country.

It seems to be widely believed that Negroes are naturally inferior in intelligence to whites, that Mexicans are naturally shiftless and lazy, and that all Orientals are treacherous. If these beliefs are re-inforced in our schools by the introduction of evidence that supports them and never casts doubt upon them, it is clear that racial groups in this country are not likely to grow in understanding and appreciation of each other.
In international relations, effective leadership and cooperation in the cause of world peace and friendly relations among the peoples of the various countries cannot be expected of the United States, if the people of this country believe and are taught to do so by our educational system, that our country has a right to make all of its own decisions and that there always will be wars.

Reactionary indoctrination also interferes with the development of those who are under-privileged, since it keeps them where they now are by opposing change. Thus, the poor are kept poor because it is widely "known" that "the poor we always have with us", and any attempt on the part of the government to set up programs to help the poor be not so poor is "known" to be interfering with individual initiative somehow. Or, the oppressed are kept oppressed because "everybody knows if they weren't inferior to the rest of us, they wouldn't be in their inferior position today."

Reactionary indoctrination perpetuates attitudes like these. And such attitudes are in conflict with the democratic principle.

As for liberal indoctrination -- the specific intent to get people to reject on a non-rational basis the prejudices most deeply embedded in the culture -- the writer believes that society would not tolerate it. The prejudices
most deeply imbedded in the culture are those most widely accepted and fondly cherished. It seems reasonable to the writer to suppose that the community would very soon object strenuously to the schools attacking its cherished beliefs. Since it would be withholding evidence supporting beliefs it deemed undesirable, the school could not then defend itself on the grounds that it was simply impartially presenting evidence bearing upon problems being treated. In other words, it could offer the community no acceptable excuse for its program of indoctrination.

Even if it were tolerated, the writer believes liberal indoctrination would not be the most satisfactory way to dispel the confusion in beliefs of boys and girls. It would leave the indoctrinated largely dependent upon the indoctrinator for their beliefs. If a person were handed beliefs, liberal or otherwise, to accept without questioning, he would not be establishing the habit of forming his own ideas independently.

As long as those doing the indoctrinating were concerned for the common good, dependence upon them might not lead to serious consequences other than lack of independence in thinking. The writer believes that this consequence alone is quite disastrous enough to warrant the rejection of liberal indoctrination as a method. For those who do not share this sentiment, it may be more convincing to make the point that there could be no certainty that those who
were reactionary, and there probably would be some in spite of school policy, would not at some time replace the liberals as indoctrinators.

Guiding boys and girls to the use of reflective thinking is, therefore, the approach the writer recommends to the problem of helping students to clarify their beliefs about international relations and other vital social problems. By reflective thinking is meant the critical examination of ideas and beliefs to determine whether available evidence warrants their acceptance or rejection. The writer knows that there are other and more elaborate conceptions of the process of reflective thinking. But reflective thinking as defined by Dewey in these words: "Active, persistent, and careful consideration of any beliefs or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends constitutes reflective thought," seems the most useful conception of the process as it applies to the problem of dispelling conflict.

A teacher may discover that a student holds both the belief that the United States has always been fair in its dealings with other countries and the belief that this country did not treat Colombia justly when it encouraged Panama in revolt against Colombia. A first step in guiding the student to dispelling confusion in these beliefs may

---

simply be to call to his attention that he does profess to believe both of them. If the student sees that there is conflict between the beliefs, as he probably will, the teacher may then encourage him to examine the two in the light of evidence.

He may find in his history textbook an account of the Panama revolt much like this one:

..... The people of the little State of Panama were anxious to have the trade that would come to them if the canal went through. So they declared themselves independent of Colombia and offered to sell us the right of way. American marines landed in Panama at once so that Colombia could not force her back into the union; and our government promptly recognized Panama's independence. In February, 1904, the Senate ratified a treaty with the new country of Panama, by which we leased the canal zone, ten miles wide, and paid for it $10,000,000. We also promised to pay a sum of $250,000 a year, and we guaranteed Panama's independence; that is, we promised to keep Colombia from trying to force her back into the old union again. Colombia felt that we had unfairly taken from her part of her territory; and much later, in 1921, we paid $25,000,000 to satisfy her claim, exactly the sum she had first asked.4

The student's reading may convince him that his belief regarding our unfairness to Colombia is warranted. He then may conclude he must reject the belief that the United States has always been fair in its dealings with other countries on the ground that in the case of the Panama revolt

this country was not fair to Colombia.

As he continues to read history, the student, no
doubt, will discover many instances in which the United States
has been fair in its relations with other countries. He may
read of the fair settlement between England and the United
States of the Maine boundary dispute, for example. He then
can quite reasonably hold the belief that the United States
has not always been unfair in its dealings with other coun-
tries, or even that on the whole its record is exceptionally
clean in this respect. But this belief will not conflict
with his judgment that the United States was unfair to
Colombia.

The writer would insist upon the method of reflective
thinking for dispelling confusion in beliefs because it is
the only one she knows which is compatible with democracy.
As has already been pointed out, the assumption that the
common man can make intelligent choices is basic to demo-
cracy. Men cannot make choices which are intelligent if
the beliefs upon which they act are gained and held irra-
tionally. Reflective thinking leads to rational beliefs,
as the example given above illustrates. Indoctrination,
which simply offers beliefs for uncritical acceptance, does
not.

The method of reflective thinking equips students to
continue to dispel their confusion without the aid of the
teacher. Once the habit of reflective thinking has been
firmly established, students can independently examine their beliefs and ideas in the light of any new evidence which comes into their experience. Thus, they are able to go on making intelligent choices after their school years have come to an end.

Reflective thought as a method for dispelling confusion leads to wider participation in the making of decisions on how our society shall be ordered. When indoctrination prevails, decisions are a result of the thinking of a few — those who do the indoctrinating. When reflective thinking is general, some choices may be made by the many.

The writer believes that reflective thinking should be employed to clarify beliefs for yet another reason. Such problems as the equitable distribution of the profits of production, the elimination of racial misunderstanding, and the winning and maintenance of world peace, because of the tensions growing up around them, urgently demand intelligent solution. Consistency is obviously necessary to the intelligent solving of these problems.

The need for guiding students to think reflectively about their conflicting beliefs on international relations in these critical times is all too apparent. The nations that fought so valiantly side by side to "win" the recent war already evidence great distrust of each other. This is particularly true of the two strongest countries in the world, the United States and the Soviet Union. Such actions
as Russia's frequent use of the veto power in the Security Council and the proposal of the President of the United States to give financial aid to Greece and Turkey as a means for combatting the spread of communism have tended to undermine the world's confidence in collective security through the United Nations Organization. Because of distrust and misunderstanding, it is generally recognized that winning the peace will require the utmost in intelligent co-operation among the countries of the world.

The writer's study has indicated that there is much confusion in students' beliefs on international relations in one large urban high school. Since there is no reason to suppose these students are unique in their confusion, the writer doubts whether the boys and girls of this country are being adequately equipped to deal effectively with the problems that are posed by the critical state of international relations.

In this, the beginning of the atomic era, scientists seem to agree, along with Henry Wallace and others, that we must have "One World or none". Unless our young people can go further toward promoting understanding and co-operation among nations than we of this generation have been able to go, the hope for one world seems to the writer to be indeed small. And if these young people come from our schools holding conflicting beliefs on international relations, they can hardly be expected to work effectively and consistently
in the cause of world peace.

The framers of the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization have said

...... that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed; that ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war, ..... 

that a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of government would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous lasting, and sincere support of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

As perhaps the strongest country in the world today, the United States could do much to lead the way to "the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind." But can the United States effectively assume this leadership if the views of its people on international relations are inconsistent? The writer fears that it cannot. She does not claim that dispelling confusion in beliefs on international relations through reflective thinking can guarantee the disarming of the human mind. She is convinced, however, that no such intellectual disarmament can be hopefully anticipated without clearing up our confusions.

-------

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. The factual conclusions of this thesis are as follows:

1. The writer's classroom observations and inquiry into students' beliefs do not indicate any concerted effort on the part of the teachers in the school studied to promote nationalistic attitudes in the students.

2. The students' responses to the list of statements submitted by the writer indicate much confusion in their beliefs on international relations.

3. The writer's classroom observations yielded no evidence indicating that the teachers of this school are making a concerted effort to help students clarify their beliefs.

II. The following conclusions are not wholly warranted on the basis of the writer's study, but are strongly suggested by it:

1. Although some nationalistic teaching was going on in the school studied, no consistent attempt by teachers to promote nationalistic attitudes was discovered, and much liberal
teaching on international relations was witnessed. A study conducted in one school is probably of insufficient scope to warrant general conclusions. There is no reason to believe, however, that this school should yield unique results. It is quite possible that the beliefs of the authors cited in Chapter I that the teaching in our schools is highly nationalistic may no longer be valid. At any rate, the writer's results suggest that their conclusions should not be accepted at face value without further study of the kind of teaching now being done on international relations in our schools.

2. The predominance of liberal attitudes among the boys and girls of the school studied, as revealed in their responses to a list of beliefs on international relations, does not clearly indicate a general trend away from nationalistic attitudes among students. Their liberal responses do suggest, however, that the results obtained from studies in Pennsylvania and Iowa in the late 1920's showing nationalistic student attitudes may no longer be valid.
3. The existence of confusion in beliefs on international relations in one school does not constitute convincing proof that students in other schools are similarly confused. But there is no reason to suppose that the school studied is unique.

III. On the basis of these findings and the writer's philosophical point of view, the following recommendations are made:

1. That the schools, in the absence of other qualified institutions, assume the responsibility for dispelling conflict in the beliefs of students on international relations and other vital social problems; and

2. That in a democracy the schools can work toward this end only by the deliberate promotion of reflective thinking directed toward the systematic examination by students of their own conflicting beliefs.
APPENDIX A

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BELIEFS

In the following statements, mark those you believe to be true with a T and mark the ones you believe to be false with an F. Mark the statements you are undecided about with a U.

1. We ought to worry only about our own country and let the other countries take care of themselves. [ ]

2. We should let foreigners come here and make their homes if they wish. [ ]

3. The safety of our country depends upon compulsory military training. [ ]

4. Immigrant groups have contributed much to the welfare and growth of the United States. [ ]

5. The United States can improve by using some ideas from other countries. [ ]

6. Having a large army and navy is the best way to keep peace. [ ]

7. The United States should keep out of disputes between other nations. [ ]

8. We can figure out a way to prevent wars if we want to. [ ]

9. No matter how poor a nation is, it should not go to war to get the land and resources that it needs. [ ]

10. Our people are better off when we buy lots of goods from other countries. [ ]

11. The United States always has been fair in its dealings with other countries. [ ]

12. This country has a right to make all of its own decisions, and we should not be told what to do by anybody. [ ]

13. The United States should keep the Pacific islands won in the war for naval and air bases. [ ]

14. A strong country should not try to force a weaker country to do anything. [ ]

15. Groups of countries should not form alliances to offset the power of other countries. [ ]
16. Worldwide disarmament would be a good thing.

17. The people of the United States should try to help countries like India and China develop their industry and agriculture.

18. The United States should co-operate with other nations in every way possible to prevent war from breaking out anywhere in the world.

19. Our country can get along best by always sticking to the American way of doing things.

20. There always have been wars, and there always will be wars.

21. We ought not to let too many people from other countries come to the United States.

22. If a country like England cannot support its people on the land it has, it has a right to build up an empire to help to take care of them.

23. In a democracy, young men ought to decide for themselves whether to take military training.

24. We should always try to sell other countries more goods than we buy from them.

25. Since Russia has got so strong, the United States and Great Britain should band together.

26. The United States should not furnish money or supplies to countries that do not agree with our policies toward them.

27. All groups of people have a right to govern themselves as they want to.

28. One thing that has kept our country from getting ahead faster has been the presence of so many foreigners.

29. When we encouraged Panama in her revolt against Colombia, we were not treating Colombia justly.

30. The United Nations Organization ought to have the power to settle disputes between countries.
APPENDIX B

RESULTS OF THE RATING OF STATEMENTS BY THE JURY

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BELIEFS

L - Liberal  C - Conservative  U - Uncertain

1. We ought to worry only about our own country and let the other countries take care of themselves.  _5 C_

2. We should let foreigners come here and make their homes if they wish.  _5 L_

3. The safety of our country depends upon compulsory military training.  _4 C - 1 U_

4. Immigrant groups have contributed much to the welfare and growth of the United States.  _5 L_

5. The United States can improve by using some ideas from other countries.  _5 L_

6. Having a large army and navy is the best way to keep peace.  _4 C - 1 U_

7. The United States should keep out of disputes between other nations.  _4 C - 1 U_

8. We can figure out a way to prevent wars if we want to.  _5 L_

9. No matter how poor a nation is, it should not go to war to get land and resources that it needs.  _5 L_

10. Our people are better off when we buy lots of goods from other countries.  _5 L_

11. The United States always has been fair in its dealings with other countries.  _5 C_

12. This country has a right to make all of its own decisions, and we should not be told what to do by anybody.  _5 C_

13. The United States should keep the Pacific islands won in the war for naval and air bases.  _5 C_

14. A strong country should not try to force a weaker country to do anything.  _5 L_
15. Groups of countries should not form alliances to offset the power of other countries. \(4 \text{ L } - 1 \text{ U}\)

16. Worldwide disarmament would be a good thing. \(4 \text{ L } - 1 \text{ U}\)

17. The people of the United States should try to help countries like India and China develop their industry and agriculture. \(5 \text{ L}\)

18. The United States should cooperate with other nations in every way possible to prevent war from breaking out anywhere in the world. \(5 \text{ L}\)

19. Our country can get along best by always sticking to the American way of doing things. \(4 \text{ C } - 1 \text{ U}\)

20. There always have been wars, and there always will be wars. \(5 \text{ C}\)

21. We ought not to let too many people from other countries come to the United States. \(4 \text{ C } - 1 \text{ U}\)

22. If a country like England cannot support its people on the land it has, it has a right to build up an empire to help to take care of them. \(4 \text{ C } - 1 \text{ U}\)

23. In a democracy, young men ought to decide for themselves whether to take military training. \(2 \text{ L } - 2 \text{ U } - 1 \text{ C}\)

24. We should always try to sell other countries more goods than we buy from them. \(5 \text{ C}\)

25. Since Russia has got so strong, the United States and Great Britain should band together. \(4 \text{ C } - 1 \text{ U}\)

26. The United States should not furnish money or supplies to countries that do not agree with our policies toward them. \(5 \text{ C}\)

27. All groups of people have a right to govern themselves as they want to. \(2 \text{ L } - 1 \text{ U } - 2 \text{ C}\)

28. One thing that has kept our country from getting ahead faster has been the presence of so many foreigners. \(5 \text{ C}\)

29. When we encouraged Panama in her revolt against Colombia, we were not treating Colombia justly. \(5 \text{ L}\)

30. The United Nations Organization ought to have the power to settle disputes between countries. \(5 \text{ L}\)
APPENDIX C

RESULTS OF STUDENT RESPONSES TO THE LISTS OF STATEMENTS
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS BELIEFS

L - Liberal   C - Conservative   U - Uncertain

1. We ought to worry only about our own country and let other countries take care of themselves.  L-140; C-21; U-6

2. We should let foreigners come here and make their homes if they wish.  L-51; C-63; U-53

3. The safety of our country depends upon compulsory military training.  L-83; C-60; U-24

4. Immigrant groups have contributed much to the welfare and growth of the United States.  L-144; C-6; U-17

5. The United States can improve by using some ideas from other countries.  C-147; C-9; U-11

6. Having a large army and navy is the best way to keep peace.  L-121; C-24; U-22

7. The United States should keep out of disputes between other nations.  L-37; C-99; U-31

8. We can figure out a way to prevent wars if we want to.  L-89; C-46; U-32

9. No matter how poor a nation is, it should not go to war to get land and resources that it needs.  L-139; C-13; U-15

10. Our people are better off when we buy lots of goods from other countries.  L-43; C-86; U-38

11. The United States always has been fair in its dealings with other countries.  L-101; C-36; U-28

12. This country has a right to make all of its own decisions, and we should not be told what to do by anybody.  L-44; C-104; U-19

13. The United States should keep the Pacific islands won in the war for naval and air bases.  L-39; C-96; U-32

14. A strong country should not try to force a weaker country to do anything.  C-136; C-17; U-14
15. Groups of countries should not form alliances to offset the power of other countries. C-77; C-60; U-30

16. Worldwide disarmament would be a good thing. L-101; C-41; U-25

17. The people of the United States should try to help countries like India and China develop their industry and agriculture. L-148; C-11; U-8

18. The United States should cooperate with other nations in every way possible to prevent war from breaking out anywhere in the world. L-161; C-3; U-3

19. Our country can get along best by always sticking to the American way of doing things. L-67; C-67; U-33

20. There always have been wars, and there always will be wars. L-45; C-86; U-36

21. We ought not to let too many people from other countries come to the United States. L-13; C-139; U-15

22. If a country like England cannot support its people on the land it has, it has a right to build up an empire to help to take care of them. L-61; C-61; U-45

23. We should always try to sell other countries more goods than we buy from them. L-73; C-69; U-25

24. Since Russia has got so strong, the United States and Great Britain should band together. L-93; C-37; U-37

25. The United States should not furnish money or supplies to countries that do not agree with our policies toward them. L-57; C-76; U-34

26. One thing that has kept our country from getting ahead faster has been the presence of so many foreigners. L-121; C-22; U-24

27. When we encouraged Panama in her revolt against Colombia, we were not treating Colombia justly. L-28; C-23; U-56

28. The United Nations Organization ought to have the power to settle disputes between countries. L-147; C-11; U-9
APPENDIX D

NUMBER OF LIBERAL, CONSERVATIVE, AND UNDECIDED RESPONSES TO THE THIRTEEN PAIRS OF CONFLICTING STATEMENTS

L- Liberal C- Conservative U- Undecided

The United States should keep out of disputes between other nations. L-37; C-99; U-6

The United States should cooperate with other nations in every way possible to prevent war from breaking out anywhere in the world. L-161; C-3; U-8

This country has a right to make all of its own decisions, and we should not be told what to do by anybody. L-44; C-104; U-19

The United Nations organization ought to have the power to settle disputes between countries. L-147; C-11; U-9

A strong country should not try to force a weaker country to do anything. L-136; C-17; U-17

The United States should not furnish money or supplies to countries that do not agree with our policies toward them. L-57; C-76; U-34

We should let foreigners come here and make their homes if they wish. L-51; C-63; U-53

We ought not to let too many people from other countries come to the United States. L-13; C-139; U-15

The United States can improve by using some ideas from other countries. L-147; C-9; U-11

Our country can get along best by always sticking to the American way of doing things. L-67; C-67; U-33
No matter how poor a nation is, it should not go to war to get the land and resources that it needs. L-139; C-13; U-15

If a country like England cannot support its people on the land it has, it has a right to build up an empire to help take care of them. L-61; C-61; U-45

We can figure out a way to prevent wars if we want to. L-29; C-46; U-32

There always have been wars, and there always will be wars. L-45; C-86; U-36

Groups of countries should not form alliances to offset the power of other countries. L-77; C-60; U-30

Since Russia has got so strong, the United States and Great Britain should band together. L-93; C-37; U-37

Our people are better off when we buy lots of goods from other countries. L-45; C-86; U-38

We should always try to sell other countries more goods than we buy from them. L-73; C-69; U-25

Immigrant groups have contributed much to the welfare and growth of the United States. L-144; C-6; U-17

One thing that has kept our country from getting ahead faster has been the presence of so many foreigners. L-121; C-22; U-24

Having a large army and navy is the best way to keep peace. L-121; C-24; U-22

Worldwide disarmament would be a good thing. L-101; C-41; U-25

The United States always has been fair in its dealings with other countries, L-101; C-38; U-28

When we encouraged Panama in her revolt against Colombia, we were not treating Colombia justly. L-88; C-23; U-56
We ought to worry only about our own country and let the other countries take care of themselves.  
L-140; C-21; U-6

The people of the United States should try to help countries like India and China develop their industry and agriculture.  L-148; C-11; U-8
APPENDIX E

THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS INDICATING CONFLICT ON THE SEVEN PAIRS OF
STATEMENTS REGARDING WHICH THERE WAS THE MOST DISCREPANCY
BETWEEN LIBERAL AND CONSERVATIVE RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Believed</th>
<th>Definite belief on one statement - Undecided</th>
<th>Consistent on the other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The United States should keep out of disputes between other nations.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States should cooperate with other nations in every way possible to prevent war from breaking out anywhere in the world.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This country has a right to make all of its own decisions, and we should not be told what to do by anybody.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United Nations Organization ought to have the power to settle disputes between countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A strong country should not try to force a weaker country to do anything.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The United States should not furnish money or supplies to countries that do not agree with our policies toward them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We should let foreigners come here and make their homes if they wish.

34

We ought not to let too many people from other countries come to the United States.

59

The United States can improve by using some ideas from other countries.

59

Our country can get along best by always sticking to the American way of doing things.

59

No matter how poor a nation is, it should not go to war to get the land and resources that it needs.

52

50

65

If a country like England cannot support its people on the land it has, it has a right to build up an empire to help to take care of them.

39

41

87

We can figure out a way to prevent wars if we want to.

There always have been wars, and there always will be wars.
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