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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The attention of contemporary educators was focused squarely on the concept of the structure of knowledge by Jerome Bruner. His artistic report of the work of the 1960 Woods Hole Conference is a landmark in American education. In a decade we have neither exhausted the discussion nor answered the many questions raised by this report. Opinions continue to be disjunctive, defying consensus or crystallization. Perhaps the decade of the 1970's will reveal if Bruner augured a new day. The past decade has not made this clear. But it is apparent that Bruner opened a Pandora's box, perhaps arousing more thoughtful discussion than any single work has engendered in years.

In 1961 Arthur Foshay, then President of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, entitled

his Presidential address "A Modest Proposal for the Improvement of Education." The influence of Bruner, though unspoken, was clear. Foshay proposed that the long-honored focus of educators on the child and the society be broadened to include the "nature of the knowledge." The largest single group of educators in the world, whose primary concern is curriculum matters, was then faced with the challenge of dealing with the claim that every discipline has a basic structure. Around the country, educators began to organize seminars, symposia, and conferences to reflect on the new academic challenge. The Process of Education had set in motion a process that was both refreshing and baffling. And other individual scholars began to write, either making the idea clearer, or more baffling.

Bruner had not defined structure. In 1962 Joseph Schwab published an article in The Educational Record in which he discussed structure within the context of two concepts: substantive and syntactical. Schwab did not directly defend Bruner's ideas, but pointed out that the concept of structure is "twice important" for education: for what is

---


included in the curriculum and how it is taught.\(^4\) This article gave the discussion of structure more substance and made the direction more exact. The same year, Bruner published a book of essays in which he again dealt with structure.\(^5\) Still, the definition of his idea remained murky. The job of clarification was left, by default, to others. Schwab did not explicitly relate his work to the thought of Bruner, but his subsequent articles defined the concept in some detail and thereby sharpened the focus.

During 1964 Schwab gave the keynote address at two seminars whose primary concern was the structure of knowledge.\(^6\) In both instances he further refined the concept of structure. Another component was added to his definition since the 1962 article. What emerged was a model of a structure of

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 197.


knowledge having three kinds of concepts: organizational, substantive, and syntactical. These concepts raise questions about the uniqueness of the subject matter, the knowledge in the discipline, and the methodology utilized by scholars in the discipline. But Bruner was to have more to say, and other scholars were to enter directly into the discussion.

The February 19, 1966, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature carried excerpts from a forthcoming book by Bruner. They were entitled "Education As Social Invention" and dealt with the structure of knowledge in disciplines. He still did not specifically and precisely say how the concept of structure could be utilized in all disciplines. Later in the same year the book was published under the title, Toward A Theory of Instruction. At the time, Bruner was developing a social studies course, "Man: A Course of Study." This latest book relates the concept of structure to this course, which is basically anthropological. The question of whether structure can be related to all disciplines, particularly those whose substance and methodology cannot utilize such procedures as field work and experimentation, was still unanswered. Those who thought the concept

7 Jerome Bruner, "Education As Social Invention," Saturday Review of Literature (February 19, 1966), pp. 70-72, 102, 103.

absurd, or who felt that Bruner was willing to ignore vital disciplines which did not "fit" his concept of structure, made their thoughts public.

One of the most virulent critics has been Mark Krug. Curiously, he has directed his barbs toward Bruner at Harvard rather than his colleague, Schwab, at the University of Chicago. He has not been the only critic, by any means.

There have been some historians, some social scientists, and some educators who have either rejected the idea of structure outright or denied its significance. On the other hand, some scholars have continued to wrestle with the educational possibilities of structure.


One scholar sees the concept of structure as "the best framework of any idea we have seen" to provide a theoretical base for the curriculum. Schwab and Gowin, among those who have dealt with the idea directly, suggest that it ought to be submitted to the disciplines for testing. Others, whose primary interest is curriculum have added the weight of their argument to the proposition that there is a need to test the concept of structure against the existing knowledge in the various subject matter fields.

The one discipline whose subject matter has seemed to defy an isomorphic relationship to a structure of knowledge is history. Schwab says, "The issue concerning the nature of history is a live one, not because we have espoused a single doctrine in the schools but because we have, on the whole, left the whole matter alone." Yet the need to

explicate the nature of historical knowledge is no less than in any other discipline. The present study is a beginning step toward the test of the subject matter of history against the concept of structure. This study focuses on subject matter in selected American history textbooks.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to investigate selected American history textbooks using the Schwab model of a structure of knowledge. Specifically, the study will focus on two questions: Do selected American history textbooks have a structure of knowledge consistent with the Schwab model? Will the textbooks reveal a structure of knowledge if we modify and extend the possibilities of the Schwab model? It should be made clear that the investigator does not assume that the analysis of the textbooks will necessarily explicate whether history has a structure. If textbooks reveal a structure of knowledge, as defined by Schwab, then we have support for the claim of structure in the discipline. But a lack of structure in the textbooks does not necessarily support the denial of the claim that history has a structure.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The nature of the study required a recognition of certain limitations which had to be imposed by the investigator himself. There are three. First, the study is limited
to the analysis of three American history textbooks. More, or fewer, could have been used. The three selected for this investigation were chosen for four principal reasons:

1. All three are widely used in the schools.
2. One is written by professional historians.16
3. One is written by "teacher-historians."17
4. One is written by non-professional historians.18

Second, the three textbooks are analyzed using the Schwab model of the structure of knowledge as the primary heuristic device. Other models could have been used.19

---

16 "Professional" refers to a scholar whose full academic life is devoted to writing or teaching history at the college or university level.

17 "Teacher-historian" indicates a person whose full academic life is devoted to writing or teaching history below the college or university level; in the case of the authors whose book is used in this study, at the secondary school level.

18 "Non-professional historian" refers to a person whose academic life is generally devoted to pursuits other than the study, writing, or teaching of history; for example, administration.

19 "Model" is used throughout this study to refer to a concept which helps us reason about, or gain insight into, a problem. Schwab's model, for purposes of this investigation, is the ideal against which the textbooks are measured. The model, then, serves not only as an ideal but facilitates the investigative process. For an excellent discussion of models see Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964); and May Brodbeck, "Models Meaning, and Theories," in Symposium on Sociological Theory, edited by Llewellyn Gross (New York: Harper & Row, 1959).
appropriate to use this one both because it defines structure more exactly than any other model and because scholars have called for a test of this concept against the disciplines of knowledge. A third limitation of the study is the decision to use the Schwab model as it is modified by this investigator. Another investigator would doubtless modify the model differently.

HYPOTHESES

Since the investigator has chosen to modify, but retain the basic components, of the Schwab model, as the second major part of this investigation, there are six hypotheses. The first three relate to the Schwab model. Numbers four, five, and six relate to the Modified model.

1. Selected high school American history textbooks make explicit the organizational structure of the discipline.

2. Selected high school American history textbooks make explicit the substantive structure of the discipline.

3. Selected high school American history textbooks make explicit the syntactical structure of the discipline.

4. Selected high school American history textbooks make explicit the organizational structure of the disciplines when the components of the Schwab model are modified.

5. Selected high school American history textbooks make explicit the substantive structure of the discipline when the components of the Schwab model are modified.
Selected high school American history textbooks make explicit the syntactical structure of the discipline when the components of the Schwab model are modified.

A REVIEW OF THE SCHWAB MODEL

Schwab discusses his concept of the structure of knowledge in linear form. For purposes of this investigation, a more succinct and manageable form is needed. Schwab's total concept is summarized below. Then questions are asked in an attempt to reveal a structure of the knowledge. Following this, the Schwab model is modified. The three components of the model are retained, but modified. Again, questions are asked intending to reveal a structure of the knowledge.

The Schwab Model

Schwab claims that every discipline has an organizational, substantive, and syntactical structure, as he defines the three concepts. The model outlined below is an attempt to summarize the concepts, as he discusses them in the three articles previously mentioned.

1. Organizational Structure: What is the unique subject matter?

1. Every discipline is related to other disciplines. Thinkers have long attempted to relate the disciplines in various ways. Three examples which might serve as guides are the classical

---

organizations of Plato, Aristotle, and Auguste Comte. These are summarized as follows:

**Platonic:** The disciplines are arranged into what Plato refers to as a "dialectic." At the top are those disciplines which deal with pure reason, in the form of ideas. At the bottom is conjecture, in the form of images or things. In between, in order of ascendancy, are beliefs and understandings.

**Aristotelian:** Three classes of disciplines are discriminated. In order of ascendancy, they are the productive (for example, the natural sciences); the practical (for example, Mathematics); and the theoretical (for example, metaphysics).

**Comtian:** All knowledge is arranged hierarchically. The most complex disciplines are at the top. It is necessary to know the less complex before learning the more complex. Sociology is at the top, therefore, is the most complex.

2. All disciplines are unique.

3. Some disciplines are theoretical and some are practical.

4. Some disciplines are more educative than others.

1.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the disciplines?

---

21 Since Schwab claims that a structure of knowledge is often revealed by asking the telling question, it seems reasonable to ask questions which are related to each component of his model. There is no direct attempt to establish a one-to-one correspondence between the number of the point of definition of each component and the corresponding number of the question asked. For example, question #1 under "Organizational Structure" may not be derived directly from point #1 in the definition of the component. All of the questions, in total, should explicate the relevant component of the model.
3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

11. Substantive Structure: What are the substantive concepts?

1. We cannot select and order data without a frame of reference.

2. We need a guide to what is relevant and irrelevant, important and unimportant.

3. The concepts reflect the validity of the discipline: the representativeness and complexity of the subject matter.

4. The concepts reflect the reliability of the disciplines: the unambiguous nature of the data and whether they clearly point to the referents (events, records, statements).

11.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to the referents they reflect?

4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

111. Syntactical Structure: What are the methodological concepts?

1. Method and content are complementary, not dichotomous.

2. Scholarly verification involves moving from the raw data to the finished product.

3. Scholars must sometimes use bits of evidence when they cannot get conclusive evidence.
4. Scholars must sometimes accept a substitute for conclusive evidence.

III.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations are verified?

2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

The Modified Version of the Schwab Model

The three basic components of the Schwab model are retained, but modified by the investigator. It is hypothesized that the selected textbooks will reveal a particular structure of knowledge when the Modified Version of the model is used. Organization, substance, and syntax are defined in the modification of the model, with the discipline of history specifically in mind, rather than in the more general sense used by Schwab.

1. Organizational Structure: What is the unique subject matter?

1. History is related to the other disciplines, particularly the social sciences, but in no hierarchical way.

2. Written history is an attempt to synthesize what went on in the past to help us see the continuity of life.

3. History has no predetermined organizing theory but treats every period and every event as a unique phenomenon.
1.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

II. Substantive Structure: What are the substantive concepts?

1. History is a series of concepts which are derived from the events, records, and statements of the past.

2. The information in the records and artifacts of the past reflects what was valued by the culture of the time.

3. History involves chronology. This is important, but not primary.

II.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are necessary to the narrative?

2. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

III. Syntactical Structure: What are the methodological concepts?

1. Method and content are complementary, not dichotomous.

2. It is necessary that a historian generalize. But his generalizations reflect his choice of content.
3. The study and writing of history is a disciplined approach to the past, not just the memorization or recording of information.

III.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

METHODOLOGY

The method used in the investigation is content analysis. Both qualitative and quantitative analysis are utilized; however, the emphasis is on qualitative analysis. 22 Quantification is used to demonstrate, quickly and succinctly, the numbers of times that topics appeared in the three textbooks, which corresponded to both the Schwab model and the Modified model. A summary of the methods of analysis follows.

Qualitative Analysis

Each textbook was read cursorily, then critically. Topics of 200-500 words, which lend themselves to the model,

22 Excellent discussions of the two kinds of content analysis are found in Bernard Berelson, Content Analysis in Communication (Glencoe: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1952); and Ole R. Holsti, Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969).
were then selected. There was a deliberate attempt to select topics with an obvious relationship to the model. The selected topics are analyzed to determine if history, as manifested in the selected textbooks, has a structure.

Quantitative Analysis

In order to show the distribution of topics which correspond to the components of both the Schwab model and the Modified Version of the model, a quantitative table, as seen in Figure 1.1, is used. There are two tables for each textbook, one corresponding to the Schwab model and one to the Modified Version of the model. The numbers of topics in each unit which are consistent with the model, as identified by the investigator, are listed. These tables are in Appendix B at the end of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of a Free People

Figure 1.1 Numbers of times topics which were consistent with the components of the Schwab (or Modified) model were found in each unit.

It was recognized from the beginning that content analysis has certain limitations. Some topics are more amenable to analysis than others. Some questions more appropriate than others. In this investigation some topics are more difficult to analyze than others, given the methodology used and the model followed.
Chapter 1 is an introduction to the study. The background of the study introduces the chapter. This is followed by statements of the purpose and limitations of the investigation. Then the hypotheses are stated. Next, the Schwab model of a structure of knowledge is reviewed. This model is the primary heuristic device used and serves as an entrance into the study. Finally, the methodology for content analysis is given.

Chapter II consists of a review of related literature published since 1960. This was the publication date of Jerome Bruner's *The Process of Education*, which initiated the discussion of the educational significance of structure during the decade of the 1960's.

Chapters III and IV provide analyses of the following three high school American history textbooks:


In Chapter III the textbooks are analyzed using the Schwab model.

In Chapter IV the same books are analyzed using the Modified Version of the Schwab model. Each chapter is divided into three sections, one for the analysis of each book. Each section concludes with the findings and conclusions of the investigation. The chapters close with a short summary.

The conclusions of the study, a general summary, and implications for further research are in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II
A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

There is nothing magic about either the year 1960 or *The Process of Education*. Within the context of this study, the year is important because it witnessed the publication of Bruner's now-famous book. The book is important, not because it introduced, miracle-like, a revolutionary idea, but because it focused attention anew on an old idea: that all knowledge can somehow be structure.

Subsequent to Bruner's report of the Woods Hole Conference, American educators have paid considerable attention to the question: Do all disciplines have a basic structure? Many education scholars have entered the discussion, some in a direct way and some in an indirect way. They have not always agreed.

In this chapter, the major literature related to the concept of the structure of knowledge, which has been published since 1960, is reviewed. The first section of the chapter is a chronological review of the writings of those
authors who have addressed themselves directly to the concept of structure. The second section deals with the works of those writers whose primary concern has been something other than structure, but who, indirectly, have addressed themselves to the idea. Some of the writers, whether speaking about structure directly or indirectly, have voiced opposition. At times the opposition has been vehement, even vitriolic. Those works are reviewed also.

LITERATURE DIRECTLY RELATED TO STRUCTURE

Bruner's first book on the concept of the structure of knowledge, *The Process of Education*, indicated his concern with the pedagogical utility of the idea. Early in the book he made this clear:

> Grasping the structure of a subject is understanding it in a way that permits many other things to be related to it meaningfully. To learn structure, in short, is to learn how things are related.  

But the logical projection of the claim that structure will enhance teaching and learning leads us to the disciplines of knowledge. To make the materials "count in their thinking for the rest of their lives" he saw a solution in the teaching of structure:

---

...the answer to this question lies in giving students an understanding of the fundamental structure of whatever subjects we choose to teach.  

While we may view this as a bold claim, especially since Bruner does not define structure, he added magnitude to his argument by saying:

"The continuity of learning that is produced by the...transfer of principles, is dependent upon mastery of the structure of the subject matter..."^1

This mastery, Bruner said, will result in 1) understanding fundamentals more clearly, 2) strengthening the ability of the learner to remember what he has studied, 3) an increase in "transfer of training," and 4) narrowing the gap between elementary and advanced knowledge. 4

Although he had talked about "ideas and principles" as if they are analogous to structure, Bruner did not say which ideas and principles are fundamentals to the various disciplines, nor did he say how we can recognize them. In short, he made claims for the existence of structure and for the teaching of structure without dealing with the question: what is structure? At this point, clarification and extension of the idea were obviously needed.

---

2Ibid., pp. 11-12.
3Ibid., p. 15.
In the winter, 1961, issue of the Harvard Educational Review Bruner published an article which promised to aid the quest for clarity. In fact, it did not. At this point, he turned to the discussion of structure in a psychological context:

One can cite a myriad of findings to indicate that any organization of information that reduces the aggregate complexity of material by inbedding it into a cognitive structure a person has constructed will make that material more accessible for retrieval...

Let me suggest that in general, material that is organized in terms of a person's own interest and cognitive structures is material that has the best chance of being accessible in memory.5

The problem of determining what structure is, then identifying it in the disciplines, was not simplified by this assertion. Bruner was using the term structure again, but what did he mean? Obviously there is a difference between structure that may be implicit in a discipline and a cognitive structure. He had not differentiated between the two. If the concept of structure was an educationally viable one, more help was needed.

Before long other writers had taken up the case, advocating the teaching of the structure of the disciplines. In this case, Sutherland made the application to the teaching of history. He said:

...what history should we teach and how should we teach it? I think it follows, first of all, that the history we teach should introduce the structure of this discipline to the child..... I believe that structure in history is best revealed through the historian's method. Through his attempts to solve simple historical problems, the child should learn the skills of the historian and through using these skills gain an insight into its structure.

But Sutherland, insofar as he had defined structure, had done so in a way different from Bruner. Could the long used historical method be construed as "structure" in Brunerian terms? Joseph Schwab took a more general view.

In 1962 Joseph Schwab began to focus on the concept of structure and its relationship to bodies of knowledge. As he saw it

...the concept of a structure of a discipline is concerned in a highly important sense with truth, not with truth in some vaguely poetic sense, but with answerable, material questions, and the sense in which, the content of a discipline is warranted and meaningful.  

According to Schwab, the educational questions raised by the concept of the structure of knowledge were questions which most educators recognized vaguely, if at all. He saw structure being "twice important to education:"

---


First, they are necessary to teacher and educators: they must be taken into account as we plan curriculum and prepare teaching materials.... Second, they are necessary in some part and degree within the curriculum, as elements of what we teach.

Within this dual context, Schwab made two claims for the significance of structure: 1) "We cannot, with impunity, teach the conclusions of a discipline as if they were about the whole subject matter and were the whole truth about it", and 2) "...the bodies of knowledge would have defensible and valuable meaning to those who learn them had they been learned, not in a context of dogma, but in a context of the conceptions and data that determine their limited meaning and confer their limited validity...". But if structure was to be utilized in these ways it had to be brought under control. The idea was still unmanageable. Schwab made progress in this direction. He partially defined the concept:

The structure of a discipline consists, in part, of the body of imposed conceptions which define the investigated subject matter of that discipline and control its inquiries.

In the same issue of The Educational Record, Earl Johnson published an article on the concept of structure

---

5 ibid.
6 ibid.
7 ibid.
8 ibid., p. 199.
in the social studies. 11 Ironically, Johnson's article did not dovetail with Schwab's conception of what constitutes structure in a discipline. Johnson talked about structure in history in terms of historical generalizations. Although sometimes referred to as structure, this idea is far different from what Bruner and Schwab were discussing. Yet it may be viewed as a significant portend of the disjunctive discussion which was to come. Bruner had more to say.

In a book of essays, in 1962, Bruner focused on the use of structure when he said:

For it is structure, the great conceptual inventions that bring order to the congerie of dis-connected observation, that give meaning to what we may learn and makes possible the opening up of new realms of experience. 12

With almost the same stroke of his pen he contributed further to our bafflement. He said:

Knowledge is a model we construct to give meaning and structure to regularities in experience. The organizing ideas of any body of knowledge are inventions for rendering experience economical and connected. 13


12 Jerome Bruner, On Knowing: Essays For the Left Hand (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 120.

13 Ibid.
By the use of the expressions "inventions" and "we construct" Bruner had revealed his basic concern with cognitive structure. Nevertheless, his total discussion of the concept focused the attention of educators on structure in the disciplines. It seems reasonable to argue that there ought to be an accommodation between the psychological and the logical. But was Bruner keeping these distinctions clear? Schwab talked about structure in a more specific way.

At the 1964 Phi Delta Kappan symposium on education and the structure of knowledge, Schwab further elaborated on structure in all disciplines. This was an extension of his 1962 article, and may well be viewed as a logical extension of Bruner's basic idea in The Process of Education. This time Schwab defined structure three ways: 1) Organizational structure, which is concerned with how disciplines are related; 2) substantive structure, which deals with the uniqueness of the subject matter; and 3) syntactical structure, which deals with the methodology of the discipline. It was in this article that he acknowledged the peculiar problems embedded in the discussion of structure in history. He referred to this issue as a "live one."

Philip Phenix, appearing on the same program with Schwab, read a paper entitled "The Architectonics of Knowledge."

---

By definition, the paper was concerned with structure. The nature of structure was another matter. Phenix began by saying:

> The architectonics of knowledge has to do with the principles of ordering knowledge into systematic categories. Such an endeavor proceeds on the presupposition that knowledge has discernible patterns or structures and that these structures can be organized according to some intelligible master plan.15

Like Bruner, Phenix related the term "principles" to structure. Still the concept was discussed in broad, loosely knit terms. His conclusion was stimulating, if not lucid:

> It does not seem too much to assert that while attention to the structure of the disciplines is surely not a sufficient condition for maximum learning, it is a necessary condition for such learning.16

If structure is necessary to learning a discipline and we cannot identify the structure, obviously we have problems.

In the same year, Schwab read a paper at San Jose State College in which he referred to "natural" divisions within subject matter.17 By inference he equated "natural"

---

15 Philip Phenix, "The Architectonics of Knowledge," in Ibid., p. 44.

16 Ibid., p. 50.

with "structure." But this is a bold claim. If all subject matter has natural internal divisions then it follows that we ought to be able to recognize these divisions. Otherwise, how do we know of their existence? With disciplines which are clearly nomothetic such a division may be apparent. With disciplines that are ideographic, the divisions probably are not clear. Most practicing historians seem to think history is more ideographic than nomothetic.

Michael Scriven, at the same conference, voiced doubt. Scriven claimed that the social sciences will always be incomplete and that it is impossible to generated an all-encompassing theory through which they can all be viewed. Was Scriven rejecting the idea of structure in all social sciences? Was he ignoring the whole idea? Or did he think of structure in other terms?

Hilda Taba thought of structure in different terms. She did not deal directly with Bruner's vague use of the term, nor did she accept Schab's three-pronged model. Rather, she differentiated three levels of knowledge: 1) basic concepts, 2) generalizations, and 3) specific facts. While this way

---
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15Philip Phenix, "The Architectonics of Knowledge," in Ibid., p. 44.
16Ibid., p. 50.
of "structuring" subject matter may be helpful for purposes of pedagogy it did not deal with the claim made by Bruner and Schwab: All disciplines have an implicit, specific structure. Other people dealt with the problem.

One of the many conferences which focused on the discussion of structure was in the State of Oregon. At a 1965 conference, the participants stated:

The curriculum of a subject should be determined by the most fundamental understanding that can be achieved of the underlying principles that give structure to that subject. They did not clarify how this should or could be done. Perhaps this simply points up the intellectual confusion ushered in by the discussion of the concept of the structure of knowledge. The issue remained "a live one."

In all likelihood when Bruner first published The Process of Education there were many skeptics as supporters. In the February 19, 1966, issue of the Saturday Review of Literature he published an article which helped crystalize the two camps. In an attempt to explicate and extend his

---


22 Jerome S. Bruner, "Education As Social Invention," Saturday Review of Literature (February 19, 1966), pp. 70-72, 102, 103.
earlier assertions about structure, Bruner denigrated the study of history, as we now know it, on the grounds that it is becoming too cumbersome. In its place he suggested a study of human behavior. This article was a series of excerpts from a book which he published later in the year.\textsuperscript{22}

In the context of the total book we see that he was referring to human behavior in an anthropological sense. The book was built around his own social studies course, "Man: A Course of Study." Again he reasoned that the "effective power" of any discipline was contingent upon its "particular way of structuring a domain of knowledge." The book leaves us grasping to identify Bruner's central concern. If it was elucidation of his earlier ideas, he still had not answered his critics. One of them, Mark Krug, was quick to respond.

In a critique of Bruner's idea of structure in knowledge Krug asserted

\ldots to build the entire social studies curriculum on the structure theory is fraught with grave dangers.\textsuperscript{23}

He was particularly pointed in his reaction to Bruner's article in the \textit{Saturday Review}. In Krug's judgment Bruner's ideas might be useful for scholars, "but," he said, "the world as it impinges on the minds of the young is exactly

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22}Jerome S. Bruner, \textit{Toward a Theory of Instruction} (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966).
\end{itemize}
the historical world of the specific, of the unique, and of the separate." He concluded that

The elimination of history from the social studies would be an educational and national disaster.²⁴

At a Social Science Education Consortium at Purdue University the subject of structure in the social studies was discussed in 1966. Irving Morrissett opened the conference with the seemingly innocuous assertion that "Structure is the arrangement and interrelationship of parts within a whole."²⁵ Edwin Fenton seemed to support what might have been implied by this statement when he said:

A student who learns facts and generalizations about the past without becoming involved in the process of inquiry -- and most students in American schools do exactly this -- does not study history.

But later in the conference James Shaver contended

...while the concept of the structure of a discipline may well be an appropriate basis for determining what should be taught in a social science course, it is not adequate as the basis for the social studies curriculum.²⁷


²⁶Ibid., p. 51.

²⁷Ibid., p. 123.
It was quite clear that among people in the field of history and the social sciences there was not agreement. Occasionally, some social science education, like Taba, chose to look at the concept of structure in a different light. One was James Womack.

Womack, writing in 1966, made little attempt to deal with the ideas of Schwab, Bruner, or anyone else who had delineated a specific framework within which structure can be viewed. He asserted, "That the social sciences have basic principles or rules is an incontrovertible fact." Then came the following claim:

Generalizations, as principles or rules, comprise the underlying structure for each social science discipline.

while such a view may be useful for the selection of content or for pedagogical purposes, it begged the question raised by Bruner and Schwab, that every discipline has a particular structure. In a sense Womack’s position can be considered neutral. It did not add strength to or diminish the position of either the advocates or the skeptics. He did not get into the "thick of battle." Others did.

---

29 Ibid., p. 2.
One of the others who did was Eugene Gilliom. In an article in *The Social Studies*, Gilliom made the following assertion:

...it is clear that the interpretative nature of history prohibits the identification of a universally acceptable structure.... One must accept the fact that any given set of principles chosen from history necessarily reflects the convictions and prejudices of persons doing the selecting.  

It is true, of course, that history is interpretative and that historians have a frame of reference. But is it necessarily true that these contingencies cannot be accounted for within the concept of a structure of knowledge? Other writers saw promise in the concept.

One of those who saw promise in the Schwabian notion of a structure of knowledge was William T. Lowe. Using the Schwab model as a premise from which to reason, Lowe stated

...structure is a pedagogical concept. A structure, the one held by the teacher, should be used initially to give meaning and organization to what the child learns. This structure should serve as a model and should show the power of a structure to give meaning and substance to what one learns.  

---


Structure, as Lowe saw it, not only has promise for teaching, but is a part of the web and woof of a discipline. He went on to say:

Structure, then, is not only the fundamental ideas of a subject; it is also the internalized way of perceiving the logical relations between those ideas and the means of arriving at them.32

Lowe closed the section of his book dealing with history by calling for additional attention to the concept of structure in the disciplines:

The idea of structure and its associated concepts do, we believe, provide a theoretical base for the curriculum. In addition, in spite of all the ambiguity surrounding the term, it seems to us that structure provides the best framework of any idea we have seen. A structured curriculum or, better, an attempt to structure the curriculum or the social sciences, history, and geography will be a big step forward.33

Lowe is a social science educator. His point of view has been reinforced by other scholars, representing other areas of concern.

Two of the people interested in the concept of structure in the disciplines are D. B. Gowin and Jason Millman. In a late 1969 article they related the concept

32 Ibid., p. 50.
33 Ibid., p. 50.
of structure to the "context for inquiry." Then they defined their terms:

The context for inquiry includes the scene and phenomena of interest, telling questions, principles of evidence, key concepts and conceptual systems, basic assumptions and presuppositions.34

And so the decade of the 1960's closed as it began, with the concept of the structure of knowledge being both advocated and disavowed. Many other scholars had participated in the discussion indirectly, both being influenced by the rhetoric and adding the weight of their influence to one side or the other.

LITERATURE INDIRECTLY RELATED TO STRUCTURE

In 1961 Arthur Foshay spoke as an educator interested in curriculum, not as an historian, social scientist, or curriculum theorist. His proposal, as President of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, was both modest and profound. A part of what he said follows:

So I come to my modest proposal. It is simply this: that we educators take directly into account the nature of organized bodies of knowledge....35


Foshay recognized that "This idea...has very great power...", that it is suggestive not only of how knowledge may be learned, but of how knowledge may be made.

In helping children have what he called a "confrontation with the past" Foshay suggested that the following questions might be asked:

1. What is worth knowing?
2. How can we discover what these events were?
3. What do historians say these events were?
4. How has the period been interpreted by historians?
5. Can you think of other ways?
6. What information could be included that has been omitted?
7. Why was it omitted? Couldn't find it? Didn't fit the historian's interpretation?^{36}

Some of these questions seem to anticipate the work of other scholars who were later to become directly concerned with the concept of structure. In a sense, whether intentional or by coincidence, Foshay was the first in a long list of writers whose work touched on the concept.

Dorsey Baynham, who edited the work of the 1962 Washington conference on the nature of the disciplines, said about history:

^{36}Ibid., pp. 7-8.
The historian should and must be able to teach his students the science of his method, how to find, how to evaluate, and then how to use, evidence.37

Traditionally, these are concerns which are rarely taught in the schools. They are some of the fundamental concerns of those who support the concept of the structure of knowledge in the discipline of history.

Other writers who have acknowledged the impact of the concept of structure on their work are Jonas Soltis, who saw structure offering a context within which some important prior questions may be asked;38 Philip Smith, who used the term "organizers" instead of structure;39 Philip Phenix, who used the expression "representative ideas" in his Realms of Meaning;40 King and Brownell, who asserted that the first consideration in curriculum building must be "a working


definition of the structure of the discipline"; Newmann and Oliver, who claimed they saw little new or promising in the concept; Bob Burton Brown, who voiced the belief that attention to the "nature and structure of knowledge" is one of the three criteria on which curriculum should be built; and John S. Mann, who suggested that if Schwab's model does not prove fruitful, we can create alternative models.

These writers all wrote from a general point of view. None of them wrote as a social scientist or social science educator. But the social scientists did indicate that the decade of the 1960s had made them conscious of the concept of structure.

Even though his work ante-dates the year 1960, it should be pointed out that as early as 1942 the late Alan Griffin, as a graduate student, was concerned with matters which have later become primary in the thought of those concerned with the structure of knowledge. He said:

---


... research in history is necessarily guided by a frame of reference of some kind. The frame of reference will not, indeed, dictate the research worker's findings, but it will in large measure determine what he is to consider worth investigating.  

This concept is related to the concept of structure, as is his claim that, "A careful reading of any high school textbook, carried on in terms of the steady question 'why is this particular incident or episode included?' rarely produces more than a handful of clear-cut answers...." In a way, we can view Griffin as a precursor of the later-day social scientist who has had to wrestle with the relevance of the structure of knowledge.

In 1965, while not directly advocating the use of the concept of structure, William Cartwright argued that we would do well to check the subject matter we teach against other organizational schemes before being satisfied with it. Newman was more pointed. He contended that:

---

45 Alan Griffin, "A Philosophical Approach to the Subject-Matter Preparation of Teachers of History," Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1942, p. 34.

46 Ibid., pp. 20-29.

Appealing to structure as a self-evident ideal is, within the framework of American public education, an insufficient ground on which to justify educational policy.40

Taking his cue from his interpretation of Bruner, Newmann interpreted the concept of structure of knowledge to mean that we "search for the structure of a discipline and then teach it to children." He dissented saying:

It is conceivable that disciplines could evolved rigid structures that would compartmentalize and constrain human choice instead of liberating it or making it more flexible.49

Newmann was not alone in his distrust of the efficacy of the concept. Other writers distrusted the concept for other reasons.

Bernstein suggested that within the social studies the individual approaches of the various disciplines should furnish the structure;50 Massialas and Cox obliquely questioned its value by pointing out that historians do not use it;51 and Oliver and Shaver saw it as having "questionable


49 Ibid., p. 416.


value for general education in the social studies." On the other hand, Edwin Fenton saw promise in the use of the concept of the structure of knowledge. He contended that:

Each discipline has its own peculiar elements.... Hence, although the responsibility to teach skills falls on every teacher, each discipline must work at the problem within its own framework, a framework determined largely by the structure of the discipline itself.

Fenton, educated as an historian, did not always find agreement with his colleagues.

In 1965 Mark Krug again attacked the concept of structure and denied its relationship to history. In 1967 he expanded his article, "History and the Social Sciences: The Narrowing Gap" into a book, History and the Social Sciences. Krug said:

In spite of the optimistic assertions of Bruner and his followers...many of our high school students are not capable of making intelligent judgements on the soundness of works of history.

---


Implicit in Krug's rebuttal was his conviction that if tampered with, history would lose some of its vitality and appeal. He eschewed the concept of structure by saying, "The whole idea is a snare and a delusion." He would have more to say. Meanwhile, others were writing.

Hunt and Metcalf's book on teaching methods in the social studies did not directly reject the idea of structure. They advocated the use of "springboards" (descriptive passages, theoretical ideas, and contradictory statements) to stimulate interest. Indirectly, they refused the idea of structure as a viable alternative. On the other side of the argument, Strong and Rosenfield seemed to support the use of structure. They did not directly focus on the concept but argued for a model, a framework, within which to confront history. This was in 1960.

In 1969 Mark Krug again attacked the Bruner version of the structure of knowledge. This time Krug exuded

56 Ibid., p. 94.


greater confidence than in 1965, 1966, or 1967. Waxing dramatic, he averred that if we should embrace a "structural approach...we shall deserve the outcries of anguish and protest which will be forthcoming from the parents and the community at large." But, he predicted, the truth is that the Bruner idea of structure is a passing fad. It may temporarily enrich the teaching of history, but it won't change historical method. Who knows, Krug may be right? But should we accept this, or any other benediction, without some tests of the idea?

For the most part, historians have not been critical of their own craft. But this has not always been the case. While practicing historians have not supported the claim that history, as a discipline, has a structure, some historian-educators have done so; Edwin Fenton, for example. Some practicing historians have recognized the need to improve the discipline and have made this concern public.

---

60 Ibid., p. 169.
61 Ibid., p. 170.
whether the same scholars will respond to the challenge to investigate the usefulness of the concept of structure to elucidate the nature of the discipline remains an open question. There are areas where investigation is obviously needed.

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

When we look at the work that has been done, it is apparent that much more is needed. There has been little or no actual research to test the claim that history does or does not have a structure. There has been a plethora of discussion, much disagreement, and a sizeable amount of misunderstanding. In every year since 1960 someone has added to the literature some discussion of the concept of the structure of knowledge. Rarely have the discussants talked to each other. At least there is little such discussion in the public domain. Oftentimes they seem to have talked past each other, the result being misunderstanding and rebuttal rather than understanding and progress. A sizeable portion of the confusion seems to harken back to Bruner's initial work in 1960. He never made a clear-cut distinction between cognitive structures and the logical structures in disciplines. This has lead to confusion and disagreement. Further, he never carefully delineated the specific usefulness of structure. It is one matter to teach structure. Newmann,
Krug, and others have decried this. It is quite another matter to use the concept of structure, or a model of structure, to make explicit the nature of the knowledge in a discipline. Our intent needs to be made clear.

Scholars have not yet dealt with the question of whether structure is implicit in the discipline or is created by the scholar. If the structure is implicit in the discipline, we cannot assume that we understand the nature of the knowledge until we identify the structure. If the structure is created by the scholar, then it is entirely reasonable to conclude that we can create more than one structure and still deal with the discipline with intellectual integrity. The quest will then be for a structure, not the structure. There may be many ways to think of structure.

As matters now stand, there is little that can be gained by further discussion. At some point, there needs to be "structured" investigation to answer some of the questions raised by both sides of the controversy. Investigation could begin in a number of places, at a number of levels. This investigator has chosen to begin with American history textbooks and Schwab's model. Such an investigation will not answer the question whether the discipline of history has a structure. Neither will it answer the question whether disciplines have a generic structure or a specific structure. But it will be a beginning. The answers to more penetrating questions may then follow.
CHAPTER III

CONTENT ANALYSIS USING THE SCHWAB MODEL

INTRODUCTION

Joseph Schwab is only one of a number of scholars who have attempted to put flesh on the barebones concept of structure. He has discussed the concept of the structure of a discipline under three categories: organizational structure, substantive structure, and syntactical structure. This investigator has attempted to capture the essence of Schwab's discussion and further refine his ideas into a concise model. By organizational structure Schwab refers to what is unique about individual disciplines and how they are related. Specifically, he says that 1) every discipline is related to every other discipline; 2) all disciplines are unique; 3) some disciplines are practical, while others are theoretica; and 4) some disciplines are more educative than others. By substantive structure Schwab is referring to the concepts and information that constitute the body of knowledge we call a discipline. He defined this component of the model four ways: 1) the frame of reference used by the author or researcher; 2) the guide, within the frame of reference, used
to distinguish the relevant and important from the irrelevant and unimportant; 3) how representative of the discipline the concepts are; and 4) whether the concepts and generalizations point to their referents and the ephemeral quality of the knowledge. Syntactical structure refers to the peculiar methodology each discipline uses to collect, order, and interpret its data. According to Schwab, syntactical structure shows that 1) method and content are complementary, not dichotomous; 2) scholars must move from the raw data to the finished product; 3) scholars must sometimes use bits of evidence; and 4) scholars must occasionally accept a substitute for conclusive evidence.

This chapter analyzes selected topics from three textbooks, using the Schwab model of the structure of knowledge. "Telling questions" are asked in an attempt to reveal the three components of structure in the sense in which Schwab used the concept. Three topics from each book are analyzed under each component of the model. Section I is an analysis of Rise of the American Nation. In Section II History of a Free People is investigated. Section III is an analysis of The Story of America. Each section is followed by a resume of the findings and conclusions. The chapter closes with a concise summary.
SECTION 1: CONTENT ANALYSIS
OF RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION

This book was first published in 1950. For purposes of this investigation, both authors are classified as professional historians. Professor Curti had a long and distinguished career at Columbia University and the University of Wisconsin, where he is now Frederick Jackson Turner Professor of American History, Emeritus. Professor Todd was the long-time editor of Social Education, the publication of the National Council for the Social Studies. Both men have exhibited a keen interest in American public education throughout their careers.

This text was reprinted in 1961, 1964, 1966, and 1969. It is now in its second edition and includes material covering the election of Richard Nixon as the thirty-seventh president of the United States. There is no Introduction or Epilogue. Beginning with chapter one, the reader is immediately initiated into the factual story of the rise of the American nation. The text closes with a challenging statement about the months ahead being a "time of testing."

The first purpose of this investigation is to determine if this textbook has an Organizational structure of knowledge, as defined by Schwab. The analysis follows.
1. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE: WHAT IS THE UNIQUE SUBJECT MATTER?

The three topics selected for analysis, using this component of the model, are taken from the introductory statements preceding two major sections of the book, and from the summary statement following a chapter. The text proper is devoted almost entirely to the presentation and interpretation of factual data. It seemed a reasonable assumption that if topics were to be found which might remotely correspond to the Schwab model they would likely be in introductory or summary statements. This proved to be the case. The first topic is the introductory statement from Part One, "Creating a New Nation."

When Thomas Jefferson was born in 1743 on the frontier of Virginia, the thirteen colonies were part of the British Empire. From New Hampshire south through Georgia, there was a thin line of settlement along the Atlantic coast. The people, nine out of ten of whom were farmers, looked eastward to Great Britain for political leadership.

During his lifetime, Jefferson took a leading part in a far-reaching political revolution. When he died in 1826, the United States was a proudly independent nation, a federal union of 24 states, and the advancing frontier had crossed the Mississippi River.

As late as the 1920's, however, nearly nine out of every ten Americans were still living on farms or in rural areas. The Industrial Revolution that was to transform America from an agricultural to an industrial nation was only beginning when Jefferson was carried to his final resting place.

1.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

The argument might be made that what is gained through the study of history could just as easily be gained through the study of other, less cumbersome disciplines. Jerome Bruner has made this claim. But every state in the country requires the study of American history somewhere in the curriculum. In most curricula, American history is studied at least twice in a twelve year program. The question, Why?, seems in order. Reasons are given which run the gamut, from instilling patriotism to fostering critical thinking. Whatever the reason or rationalization, they all suggest one commonality: there is something unique to be gained from the study of history. Every discipline deals with a peculiar subject matter in a unique way. This is true of history. It is different from any other discipline.

History is the only discipline which, by definition, attempts to synthesize all of man's past experiences into some kind of meaningful composite. Usually these experiences
are then related to both the present and the future. Such a relationship raises some interesting questions: Can we justify the synthesis unless it can stand up under analysis? Can young students be analytical without help? Does the textbook give the needed help?

In the paragraphs quoted is it clear that the authors are attempting to give the student perspective within which he can read and study the succeeding section? If this is the case, should not the reader be told that the points covered are considered pivotal points upon which over a hundred years of history turns? Is the young student, who probably has little orientation in the sophisticated ways of the historian, expected to understand how the scholar works? Can he know that history is not everywhere, always the same? Do we expect him to understand that the historian has certain amounts of latitude? That sometimes he subsumes an entire period of time under the life-work and influence of one individual? Our questions could continue. The question is, what kind of initiation into the discipline of history should students have? The concept of a structure of knowledge is designed to introduce the student to both the findings of detective-like scholarship and the nature of the knowledge. The above topic does not reveal this two-pronged orientation.
2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the disciplines?

In his discussion of three classical organizations of the disciplines, the Platonic, the Aristotelian, and Comtian, Schwab was careful to point out that we ought not to view the problem of classification in terms of right and wrong, but rather in terms of the distinctions used to make the differences clear and the educational problems these distinctions bring into focus. He uses these three models as illustrative. They are neither exhaustive or mutually exclusive. When we look at the discipline of history, as represented in the above passage, we are prone to agree with Schwab that the problem in history is a "live one" indeed.

The paragraphs quoted above point to several events and historical phenomena. On the basis of these the authors make several generalizations; for example, "During his lifetime, Jefferson took a leading part in a far-reaching political revolution." But can we conclude from this that the historical concepts with which the authors are dealing are more closely related to the Platonic notion of ideas or things? Or the Aristotelian idea of productive or theoretical


3 Ibid., p. 23.
knowledge? Or to either the upper or lower limits of the Comtian hierarchy? There is no unambiguous indication. Certainly there is no indication that history fits into any kind of hierarchical arrangement of the discipline.

The authors refer to geographical concepts ("From New Hampshire south through Georgia...")], demographic concepts ("The people, none out of ten whom..."), economic concepts ("The Industrial Revolution that was to..."), sociological concepts ("...the nearly nine out of every ten Americans were still living on farms..."), and concepts from political science ("...Jefferson took a leading part in a far-reaching political revolution."). They do not make explicit the sources of these concepts, nor do they show that the historian must rely upon the findings of other disciplines as a source of information.

If the textbook has a structure of knowledge, isomorphic to the Schwab model, it is not revealed by asking the above "telling" question.

3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

History, as Commager points out, has at least two distinct meaning: 1) the past, and 2) what men have written
about the past. Since what men write about the past varies from writer to writer and age to age, we may conclude that Jacob Burckhardt's definition of history as "what one age finds worthy of note in another" is somehow related to the uses of history. Obviously historians can neither know all of the past nor write all that they do know. Often they are confronted with the need to write more than they can know. We may ask some reasonable questions about the relationship between what the authors have written and the uses they see of history. Do they see history as the one discipline which synthesizes all of the past into one story and thereby gives man perspective? Do they see history as the medium through which the continuity between the past and the present, and perhaps the future, is demonstrated? Do they see history as a vehicle to exhibit the character of a whole people? Or do they see history as serving some other function?

There is a definite link between the paragraphs quoted and the life of Thomas Jefferson. Are we to conclude that the character of Jefferson somehow epitomizes the

---


character of the American people? This is not stated. We do see the continuity of time, but of what importance is this? We are not told. If the authors view perspective as being important, what is its importance? They do not say. All in all, if the uses of history are implicit in these paragraphs they are probably too nebulous and elusive for the average high school student.  

It may be useful, to pursue the question about the difference between the works of historians who write history and historians who write about history. When historians write about history they make explicit the uses of history. Would not the usefulness and meaningfulness of history be increased if statements about history were raised to the level of visibility in history textbooks? If history is for "all the people", as Commager suggests, then historians might well consider revealing the nature of the discipline.

7 In all fairness, it should be pointed out that the answer to this question may not be answered in any given short passage. The question might, therefore, be deemed inappropriate. On the other hand, it seems reasonable to assume that somewhere in the book the authors would have indicated what the uses of history may be. While this may be a function of the teacher, it does not seem out of line to expect the authors to speak to this vital point.


4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

The general question of what knowledge is worth knowing is an old and difficult one. The question of what historical knowledge is worth knowing is also hard to decide. It seems reasonable to assume that the information found in a textbook says something about what the authors consider to be of worth. Even if this assumption is warranted, it does not answer the question, why this information is considered important. If we are to draw conclusions about why the information was included we must do so by inference. There are not direct statements to guide our conclusions.

We may infer that the authors, to a greater or lesser degree, adhere to the theory that history is the story of great men since what is said is subsumed under the character of Thomas Jefferson. Or we may extrapolate further and infer that they are plugging the Horatio Alger myth that says we may all be a Jefferson. Whether these inferences are warranted is another question. The authors must see worth in the particular information they included. Perhaps they assume that certain information will have a particular effect on the student. But it might be more educative if we knew.

We might raise other questions which would explicate both the nature of history and its educative quality when included in textbooks. Are the authors showing us the
benefits which accrue to a people who must struggle to survive? Are they demonstrating the courage manifested in the lives of a people who advance the "frontier across the Mississippi River"? Are they demonstrating the truism that change is a constant and relentless companion of any people? Or, are they striving to instill national pride into young minds? It is apparent that there are underpinning reasons for what is said. Unfortunately, these reasons are not revealed. And we do not see, by asking the question about the worth of the knowledge, that the information in the book has any particular structure.

The second topic analyzed under this component of the model is the summary statement at the end of Chapter 29, "'The Big Change' Begins in American ways of Life." The time period covered is 1900-1920. The subject is industrial growth with its accompanying social and attitudinal changes.

During the years 1900 and 1920 the United States completed the process of passing from a predominately agricultural economy to a predominately industrial economy. By 1920 the United States had achieved the position of being the most productive industrial nation on the face of the earth.

In 1900 Americans were still living in the horse-and-buggy age. It was, however, a dying age. Old ways were rapidly giving way to new. People living during the years between 1900 and 1920 saw the emergence of automobiles, airplanes, radio, motion pictures, the assembly line, and

many other developments destined to transform older ways of living.

But the rapidly increasing productivity of the nation’s economy and the steadily rising standard of living were only the most obvious signs of the New American that was coming into being. Less obvious, but equally significant, were the changes that were beginning to take place in the thinking of many Americans. More and more people were beginning to modify some of the attitudes and practices that they had carried over from the early days of the Industrial Revolution. More and more people were beginning to realize that organized labor had an important role to play in the new industrial economy. Slowly but surely, Americans were beginning to take the first halting steps toward what Frederick Lewis Allen called "the adjustment of capitalism to democratic ends."

In 1920 the American people still had a long, hard road to travel. But although they had no way of knowing it, the road along which they were beginning to move would bring them by mid-century to the highest standard of living the world had ever seen.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

The label "The Big Change" comes from Frederick Lewis Allen's informal social history of the United States, 1900-1950. Although the writers, neither in the above paragraphs nor elsewhere, state that something unique about history is being revealed, it probably is. It is doubtful that any other discipline would attempt to
synthesize the major economic, social, technological, moral, and attitudinal changes for a period of fifty years into a few paragraphs, or even a short book. Perhaps the authors believed that such a function is basic to the discipline of history and therefore need not be stated. If this is true, it seems to also warrant the conclusion that the authors view the study of history as the findings of history, not the undergirding assumptions. We may be enriched by reading the above paragraphs. But we do not know what is unique about history from reading them.

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the disciplines?

We are hard pressed to find any relationship between these paragraphs and any kind of formal organization of the disciplines. Certain economic concepts are discussed (productivity, agriculture); certain social concepts are either made explicit or alluded to ("...Americans were living in the horse-and-buggy-age"); and certain attitudinal changes are pointed out ("...the changes that were beginning to take place in the thinking of many Americans"). In an oblique way, even a political concept is pulled into the discussion ("...the adjustment of capitalism to democratic ends"). But there is no overt attempt to relate these concepts to each other in any hierarchical or causal way.
For instance, the authors do not directly suggest that technological change precedes or causes economic change, which in turn precedes or causes social change, which then precedes or causes attitudinal change, which may be followed by additional social changes, etc. They do not hint that they mean to imply this. We are forced to resort to an active imagination to infer such a conceptual relationship. The best we can do is infer that all of these concepts were involved in what amounted to a "Big Change." To infer more is to take an unwarranted step beyond the evidence.

3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

Two historians, who have written both history and about history, suggest that education be defined as "the transmission of our mental, moral, technical, and aesthetic heritage...for the enlargement of man's understanding, control, embellishment, and enjoyment of life."\(^{11}\) This may not be the only definition of education, nor the only use that we make of history. But it is a viable, provocative definition. It was made by the Durants, in a short, single volume about history, after they had spend years writing a multi-volume history of Western man. The question we raise

is, why could not the two be combined? Is it not possible, and educationally desirable, to make clear in the writing of history what the uses of history may be?

In writing the above paragraphs the authors obviously believed that it was important to summarize what was important in the first two decades of American history. We may conclude that in order to appreciate and adequately understand "The Big Change" we must also understand "the big picture." This could be most educative for young students. It probably is too much to expect that they will grasp such subtle nuances as those suggested by the above paragraphs by themselves.

The above question is intended as a "telling question." It was asked in an attempt to reveal an organizational structure of knowledge in the textbook. Such has not been the case. Either the textbook has no structure, or the Schwab model is inappropriate to reveal a structure.

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

Change is implicit in the history of man. It is important that we be aware of this phenomenon if we are to adjust intelligently and react in ways that are positive and help us grow. But we should raise some questions about change as it is handled in the paragraphs under analysis.
Are the authors implying that the old must always give way to the new? Is this a truism or a theory, or neither? If it is a theory, can we conclude that history is governed by certain theoretical underpinnings? Do these underpinnings allow us to predict? (Is the statement, "In 1920 the American people still had a long, hard road to travel" a prediction, or a statement of fact, grounded solely on retrospect?) It is obviously worthwhile to know that change is relentless. This does not imply progress. It does not imply a particular direction. These points are important, particularly if they are misunderstood. The constancy of metamorphosis is one thing. The impact of this metamorphosis is something else. Both the difference and the significance of each ought to be made explicit.

History may have theoretical value. It may teach us practical lessons and give us practical direction. Both claims are often made. The paragraphs under consideration do not make either position clear for us. These paragraphs represent chosen facts, interpreted in the light of the authors' own backgrounds, values, and interests. Are we to accept their worth based on these criteria? Or, are there other reasons why we study history? Are there reasons for studying history which we share in common?

The third topic analyzed under the Organizational Structure of the discipline is taken from the introductory

The material in this 32 page section covers the period from just prior to the 1960 election to the inauguration of President Nixon.

An excerpt from the introduction follows:

In one sense, Vietnam was part of a larger issue confronting Americans. The larger issue could be reduced to a clear and direct question: was the United States overcommitted? In other words, had the United States assumed more responsibilities around the world than it could meet, even with all its wealth and power?

The questions in regard to America's role as a world power could not be separated from the nation's domestic goals and policies. Looming ever larger in people's minds was this question: was United States involvement in foreign affairs diverting the nation's attention and its large but still limited resources, from crucial domestic issues? An increasingly grave challenge to the American dream, indeed a mockery of that dream, was the paradox of widespread poverty in the most affluent society on the face of the earth.

Other issues, some closely related, were equally challenging -- the still unsatisfied demand by Negroes for an end to discrimination and for full equality of opportunity, the crises of America's cities, the rising rate of delinquency and crime, the revolt of youth, and the increasingly serious problem of pollution and misuse of land, water, and air. With the quality of American life deteriorating, the nation was indeed faced with "a time for testing."

---

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

In an old but relevant essay, John Herman Randall, Jr. and George Haines IV make the point that history is unique in its methodology. No other discipline relies wholly upon the inductive method, without hypotheses or controlling principles. This is another way of saying that the historian strives for a holistic view of life. Though implicit, this unique function of history is seen in the first sentence of the above paragraphs: "...Vietnam was part of a larger issue confronting American." The authors then go on to summarize some of those issues -- overcommitment, moral responsibility, domestic strife, delinquency, racial unrest, the quality of life -- and meld them into a total picture which they caption, "A time of testing." No other discipline does this. But the unique quality of history is not made explicit. We are prone to agree with Bolster, an historian, that if historians are sincere in their

concern about the role of history in the school curriculum they must "think and write more carefully about both its nature and its social utility." 14

History does have unique qualities. It can fulfill both a theoretical and practical role in the curriculum. It can be peculiarly educative. But there is a question whether this happens if the student is exposed only to the findings and interpretations of historical scholarship. The quest for uniqueness in the quoted paragraphs does not yield an organizational structure, as defined by Schwab.

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the disciplines?

Schwab may be right when he asserts that, for the most part, we have tended to treat all disciplines as if they are theoretical. 15 This means, for examples, that we have unconsciously related all disciplines to the highest order in the Aristotelian hierarchy of the organization of knowledge. There is the question whether the authors were concerned with any formal organization of the disciplines


when they wrote their book. In all likelihood they relied on the tradition of the discipline. If historians implicitly relate the discipline to a formal organization of knowledge it is probably more by accident than design. This seems to be the case here.

In the above paragraphs, the authors drew concepts from the disciplines of political science, economics, sociology, ecology, and philosophy. But there is no evidence that they attempted to relate these concepts to any organization of knowledge. Neither did they relate the concepts to each other in any hierarchical way. The most that seems to have happened was an attempt to synthesize the major happenings of significance into a meaningful mosaic. The argument might well be made that it would be artificial to attempt to relate all disciplines to one of the classical organizations of knowledge. The point is well taken. But if we define organizational structure in terms of the relationship of disciplines to each other, then the relationship must be seen or the structure cannot be alleged to exist. In this case there is no clear evidence that history is related to any other discipline in any particular way.

3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?
Herbert Muller tells the story of an American woman who paid a small sum to visit the Hagia Sophia in Istanbul. After the tour she demanded repayment of her tour fee, alleging that she had seen nothing but a grotesque old building. As she reasoned, she had been cheated. Muller's point was to emphasize that we Americans see so little in the past. Perhaps this is because we have never been taught the uses of the past. Most history textbooks do not clearly reveal the uses of history. In the paragraphs under consideration, this is true. Perhaps the authors believe the uses of history are implicit in the subject matter.

We can raise some questions about the authors' purposes in this topic. Are they suggesting a guide to direct us during the "time of testing"? Are they simply trying to enrich the lives of the students? Are they trying to give perspective by having the students weigh the consequences of current affluence against earlier periods of less affluence? (The following sentence might suggest this: "An increasingly grave challenge to the American dream, indeed a mockery of that dream, was the paradox of widespread poverty in the most affluent society on the fact of the earth.") To answer these questions we have to extrapolate rather liberally on

what is said. We teach history for some reason. Obviously we believe it accomplishes a peculiar, educative goal. Would it not be more educative if these uses were revealed?

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

We are faced with the problem of teasing out of what is said why the authors think it is worth knowing. When they talk about "the quality of American life deteriorating" are they suggesting that the knowledge of why it is deteriorating will furnish us with both a guide and motivation to stop the deterioration? Such a claim might be made. The authors do not treat the question, even though it seems to be extremely important to the claim that history is an important discipline to be included in the curriculum. Or, are they suggesting that the knowledge of what has happened in the recent past will assist us in making proper decisions about how to order our lives to meet the time of testing? This would cast history into a somewhat uneasy philosophical role, but perhaps a legitimate one. If history is indeed intended to help us order our lives, such a function may be legitimate, even noble. Would not it be better if we were told? This is one more example of the hard-to-explain dichotomy that exists between writing history and writing about history. The two ought not be dichotomous. Our query
of the above topic, in an attempt to make explicit why the knowledge is of worth, is not very fruitful.

11. SUBSTANTIVE STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCEPTS?

The topics chosen for analysis, in our attempt to reveal the substantive structure in the textbook, were taken from three separate sections of the book: chapter two of the introductory section, the beginning statements in chapter 14, and the summary at the end of chapter 37. The first topic is from chapter two, "The British Colonies Grow Strong." The time period covered is 1620-1750 and the specific sections are entitled "The Mayflower Compact" and "Plymouth is settled."

The first job the Pilgrims tackled was that of organizing a new government. The London Company...had given the Pilgrims a grant of land south of the Hudson River. But storms had blown them off their course, with the result that in November the Pilgrims found themselves off New England, where they had no legal right to land and settle. Nor did they have any plans for governing the Colony once they landed.

And so, while the crew furled the sails, the Pilgrim leaders gathered in the cabin. There, after much deliberation, they wrote and signed what we now call the Mayflower Compact. In this compact, or agreement, they promised "all due submission and obedience" to the laws, that they themselves would pass.

The Mayflower Compact was not a plan of government. Nor did it commit the Pilgrims to a democratic way of life. Nevertheless, this short document marked an important step along the road to self-government in the New world.

By the time the Pilgrims finished signing the compact, it was too late in the day to lower a boat and row ashore. The next day was Sunday. Restraining their impatience to set foot on land, the Pilgrims remained on board the ship and devoted the day to prayer and worship. Early Monday they landed at what is now Provincetown, Massachusetts.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?

There are five separate sections in the book. The introduction, from which the above paragraphs are taken, is composed of five chapters and covers the period 1450-1760. The subject matter of this section is a concise chronological interpretation of the period. This is the authors' introduction to the story of the rise of the American nation. Following this there are four sections, revolving around the life and work of Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and Americans living today, respectively. Following chapter 42 there is a sixth section composed of an historical atlas, a chronological table, an index, acknowledgments, and a 32-page section dealing with events in the late 1960's. As
this type organization may suggest, the coeraage deals primarily with political events. Even though the authors do not state their frame of reference, we infer that it is concerned basically with politics as the core of the nation's history. Within the framework, the story is mainly but not exclusively, chronological. There are a total of 42 chapters, 31 of which are descriptive, chronological accounts of what is thought to have happened. The other eleven are analytical. In these chapters the authors attempt to deductively demonstrate the "Changing Ways of American Life." This may be their guide to what is relevant and irrelevant, important and unimportant. They do not say so, but it seems a reasonable conclusion.

The chapter from which the topic under consideration was taken is from one of the 31 chronological chapters. The major section under which "The Mayflower Compact" and "Plymouth is settled" are subsumed is "New England is settled by Pilgrims and Puritans." Indirectly, the authors' political frame of reference is emphasized by the information included. It relates almost entirely to political affairs. A distinction between the terms "Puritan" and "Pilgrim" is not made. Another term, "Separatist", is introduced in the discussion without clarification as to usage. It seems that these kinds of concerns were of secondary importance to the
authors. Their frame of reference and guide necessarily put the accent on political concerns. Though unspoken, we cannot conclude that the authors' frame of reference is missing. It is buried in the discussion and is only revealed by probing. It is quite apparent that structure and frame of reference are secondary to presentation of the information.

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

The time period covered is clear. The significance of the Mayflower Compact, or the Plymouth Colony is not clear. Did the Compact remain effective for the entire 130 years? If so, was it effective through all the colonies? Who enforced it? Was the Plymouth settlement characteristic of the way colonies in general were settled? These seem to be important questions which might shed light on the complexities and scope of the coverage. We are left to draw our own conclusions. But we might also note that the events covered may be more complex as subject matter than they were as events in the context in which they happened.

We are given a glimpse of the complexity of the subject matter when reference is made to the difficulties involved in setting up a government. The authors point out that the Pilgrims had no plan for governing themselves. Yet there is no indication as to whether the Mayflower Compact
was accepted without debate, by unanimous consent, or in the face of persistent opposition. Beginning with the sentence, "by the time the Pilgrims finished signing..." there follows a somewhat detailed account of what transpired immediately subsequent to the signing. There is no indication as to whether this is "filled in" by the authors, using historical imagination, or refers to some contemporary source. Students need to know about such matters as historical imagination if they are to understand the nature of historical knowledge. Schwab defines substantive structure partially in terms of the ability of a discipline to exhibit the scope and complexity of the information included. The historical information in this text does not exhibit these two qualities. Even with coaxing we are hard pressed to identify these characteristics.

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to the referents they reflect?

"Referent" is used here to refer to a past event, a record, or statement, about a past event. In the topics quoted, the London Company grant to the Pilgrims is referred to, but the grant itself is not quoted or shown. In an insert at the top of page 30 there is an excerpt from the Mayflower Compact. No specific link is made between what is excerpted and the textual discussion, although such a linkage would not have been difficult. It would have been helpful
if the discussion had then gone on to point out how an historian uses referents as a basis for the formation of concepts and generalizations. The historian's use of referents cannot be clearly seen from these paragraphs. Neither is his use of data. Other concerns appear more important.

The Mayflower Compact, it is clear from the text, was not a plan of government. But it is said to be an important step in that direction. The authors might have told us what way the acceptance of this document represented a step toward self-government. The use of data here is less than unambiguous. Even though the referents are cited we still are unclear as to their impact.

The source for the last two paragraphs, which refer to the days immediately subsequent to the signing of the Compact, is unclear. From where does the information come? The imagination of the historian? Or, are they drawing on some work such as Bradford's Historie of Plymouth Plantation? The latter seems a likely candidate, but we are not told. The information and discussion in the quoted paragraphs does not facilitate insight into the structure of the discipline. But it may show something of the ephemeral quality of the knowledge.
4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

Undoubtedly textbook writers have a difficult task. How do you "cover the material" and still make a readable narrative? How do you interpret in a simplistic way without either doing violence to the data or offending the reader by talking down to him? Textbook writers are harassed by these and similar questions. But such questions have a common quality. They tend to deal with the ordering and interpretation of the findings of scholars. In important prior consideration might well be the nature of the process itself. It ought to be obvious that what goes into an historical work is largely determined by the predilections and orientation of the author. Data themselves can be used in numerous ways, often depending upon the creativity or purposes of the author.

The subject matter under discussion here is obviously ephemeral. Why must we, to cite one example, view the Mayflower Compact as a step in the direction of self-government in this nation? Why cannot we just as reasonably interpret this Compact as a desperate attempt on the part of one group of religious fanatics to control each other in a highly unstable situation? Maybe they just simply did not trust one another. To some, such an interpretation may be objectionable, or even ludicrous. But who is to say that
Historians of the future may not view these events in this way? At least, this points up the potentially ephemeral quality of all historical data. History is not just the facts, but the facts interpreted. Students ought to see this in history as it is written.

The following paragraphs, which compose the second topic analyzed using the second component of the Schwab model, are the initial statements in chapter 14, "The Northern States Build New Industries." This is one of the eleven analytical chapters in the book. The time period is from the 1820's to the 1860's.

By the 1840's the Industrial Revolution was moving steadily ahead in the United States. "I visited the...factory establishment at Waltham, within a few miles of Boston," Harriet Martineau, an English traveler, wrote of a trip she made in 1834-35. "Five hundred persons were employed at the time of my visit."

The Waltham textile plant was one of the largest in the country, but there were many others, most of them only a few years old. The mills and factories, simple structures of wood or stone or brick, stood on the banks of swift-flowing rivers and streams, from which they secured their power. Nearby were the small houses of the workers and the larger houses of the owners.

---

10 Ibid., p. 279.
Factories and the towns that were springing up around them were becoming an increasingly important part of American life by the 1840's, particularly in the northeastern states. They were the visible evidence of the changes that were slowly beginning to alter life in the Northeast and that would, in time, affect the entire Nation.

In her travels the English visitor also saw other signs of change -- the new roads, new canals, and new railroads that were connecting the growing towns with one another and with the surrounding countryside, and that were reaching across the Appalachians to the farms and towns in the growing western regions. The rapidly developing transportation system and the new mills and factories were part of the Industrial Revolution that was beginning to transform the United States from an agricultural to an industrial nation.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?

Schwab maintains that we must be aware of our conceptual framework if we are going to intelligently select, order and interpret our data. In research terms, this may appear a truism. Even so, it is an important one. Todd and Curti most assuredly have a frame of reference. It is, first of all, that of the historian, who views his methodology as induction. Beyond this, they are concerned

\[\text{Schwab, Op. Cit., p. 9.}\]
primarily with political/economic rise of the American nation. Unfortunately, they do not make this predisposition explicit.

The above paragraphs, which introduce an analytical chapter, are concerned exclusively with the industrial and economic development in the young nation. This growth had a tremendous impact on the future nation's economic and political stature. Within this framework, there is no obvious clue to what guided the authors in the selection of information. This fact has a direct bearing on the treatment given the complexity and scope of the subject matter.

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

The search for structure in history books can be an elusive endeavor indeed. Schwab has posited a structure. This investigator has attempted to distill that structure into workable form. To define concepts like "complexity" and "scope" with consistency, then utilize these concepts as heuristic probes to identify complexity and scope in the subject matter can be a perplexing task. This is particularly the case when dealing with subject matter which many have alleged to have no structure. But to clarify whether we can delineate complexity and scope as a part of the structure in
History textbooks may be a significant step in dealing with the problem of whether the discipline of history has a structure.

Chronologically, the scope is clear. Northern industrialism between the 1820's and the 1860's is the subject matter. But can you adequately deal with such complex developments in summary form? Probably so. Much that may be important must be sacrificed in the process. The reader would doubtless have a better initiation into the study of history if such problems were made explicit. They are not, even though subtle references are made to complexity. In one paragraph the authors say, "Factories and the towns that were springing up...were evidence of the changes that were slowly beginning to alter life in the Northeast..." They do not say what some of the changes were, even though they suggest a cause-and-effect relationship. The difficulties involved in making decisions about how to handle multiple cause-and-effect relationships are many and profound. Unless the student is shown these clearly and concisely he is apt to be little more than a passive receptor of the findings of scholars. A more fertile understanding of why history is important will likely escape him. We cannot claim that these paragraphs reveal a substantive structure of knowledge. At least this question fails to reveal this characteristic of the knowledge.
3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to the referents they reflect?

The first sentence in the topic being analyzed is a conclusion. The Industrial Revolution, we are told, was "moving steadily ahead in the United States" in the 1840's. The referent on which this conclusion rests is a statement made by Harriet Martineau. According to Miss Martineau, when she visited a Waltham, Massachusetts factory in 1834-35 "Five hundred persons were employed." This is the sole referent revealed in the four paragraphs included. We might raise a question about the accuracy of the correspondence between the referent and the conclusion. If we knew something about the numbers of people employed in Waltham factories in, say 1820, and then in 1850, we would have a more viable context within which to either accept or reject the conclusion. Referents need to be more than available; they ought also to be isomorphic to the concept, generalization, or conclusion to which they give birth. If Miss Martineau had shown evidence that year after year, decade after decade, the numbers of people employed in Waltham had increased, her conclusion would be more isomorphic to the referent. There is a difference between conclusions being unwarranted and being ephemeral. In view of the referents used the above conclusion seems unwarranted. And unless it is warranted by pointing to its referent, a
generalization or conclusion cannot qualify as structure as defined by Schwab.

4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

At one point in his discussion of structure, Schwab focuses on the value of showing the changing, or ephemeral, nature of the subject matter. Unless this happens, he argues, students will become passive receptors of information rather than active learners who are able to transform the subject matter as well as be transformed by it. This claim seems true enough in some areas of learning. But is it true in history? There is a long-standing myth among students that history is what it is and will always be. Perhaps this is a direct result of the nineteenth century Ranke school of historiography which emphasized telling it "as it actually happened." Fortunately, this idea is no longer honored among most practicing historians. Unfortunately, the reverse side of this concept — that historical knowledge changes, like knowledge in other areas — is not always made clear. Then there is the often tacit but apparently widespread view that history can be used arbitrarily, to support any position

\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. 10.

\(^{21}\)The influence of Leopold Von Ranke on 20th century historiography is widely acknowledged. For an excellent, concise discussion of Ranke see The Varieties of History, edited by Fritz Stein (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), pp. 54-62.
at all. Such a view is often couched in prefactory expression, "But history proves..."

An example of an unutilized opportunity to show the ephemeral quality of the knowledge is found in the above topic. In paragraphs three and four the authors refer to factories, and industrialization as if this was the force that transformed America in general and the Northeast in particular. We might raise some questions. Has this always been viewed as a cause and effect relationship? Might there not have been other factors working which wrought equally as significant changes? Maybe even the changes we have long attributed to the effects of industrialization? Could not the reverse have been true? Could not other factors have caused industrialization? Will historians in 50 years likely see the relationships stated here in the same way they are stated? Will the interpretation of the importance of industrialization change, as did the interpretation Beard placed on the Constitution? These are a lot of questions. They tend to be confusing. Each one ought to be weighed carefully. We might find we can create a structure, as Bruner has suggested, which will greatly facilitate teaching and learning. There seem to be possibilities in this instance, even though in its present form we cannot claim that the above question exposes a substantive structure of the knowledge.
The third topic analyzed in this section is taken from the summary of chapter 37, "The Great Experiment Goes on Trial." The time period is 1936-40. The specific subject matter is the domestic difficulty confronting America during the years of depression.

By 1936 the New Deal program faced a large and growing body of opposition, some of which came from within the Democratic Party itself. Despite this opposition President Franklin D. Roosevelt was re-elected by an even larger majority than he had won in 1932.

In his inaugural address the President admitted that the New Deal had not yet accomplished many of its objectives. As he said, the New Deal had not yet reached "the promised land."

The major New Deal reforms during Roosevelt's second administration were designed to improve the lot of the wage earner and the farmer and to improve better housing for middle-income and lower-income families. These and other measures were extremely unpopular with large numbers of Americans.

As the years passed, opposition to the New Deal program began to mount. Many critics felt that the government was interfering too much with the long-established rights of free enterprise and, in so doing, was threatening individualism and democracy.

By the end of 1930, the opposition had become so strong that President Roosevelt decided to postpone other far-reaching reforms that he had been considering. Indeed, during 1939, 1940, and 1941 the

administration began to suspend the activities of several of the agencies created by the New Deal.

Another reason for the President's decision to postpone the reform program was his growing concern over international affairs. This concern, as you will see, was well founded.

11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?

In 1960 Albert Alexander asserted in an article in *Social Education* that American history textbooks suffered from an uncritical approach, and a failure to reveal the philosophy of the author.\textsuperscript{23} In 1969 he wrote a sequel to the first article but reported there had been little change, little improvement.\textsuperscript{24} The present textbook may reflect some, but not all of the deficiencies listed by Alexander.

The authors' frame of reference, as seen in the above paragraphs, and throughout the text, is political/economic. These are the threads that hold the entire


\textsuperscript{24}Albert Alexander, "Does the American History Textbook Still Wear a Gray Flannel Cover?" *Social Education*, Volume 33, Number 3 (March 1969), pp. 300-305, 324.
narrative together. The guide for the selection of the subject matter is a combination of chronological description and analysis. Even so, there is little critical analysis of what happened in a particular time, or of how other historians have interpreted the same events. There is no direct attempt to inform the reader of the writers' points of view. They seem to prefer a chronological description of what happened to an analysis of why or how it happened. This would qualify as an example of the structure of knowledge only in an oblique way. The authors did not spell out their frame of reference.

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

Hanvey argues that textbooks cannot provide for "real student inquiry" and ought not be expected to.\(^{25}\) When we look for the representativeness and complexity of the subject matter we must admit that Hanvey has an argument, even if we do not totally agree. We know that the New Deal was confronted with many more domestic problems than those which had direct political implications. Yet political events are the only ones referred to in the quoted paragraphs. Perhaps the complexity of reporting and interpreting the events of the 1930's precludes a more representative coverage.

within the covers of a textbook. But the more incisive question might be: Has a different approach to historiography been seriously considered by textbook writers? Would not it have been educational for the young student to learn that sometimes subject matter is so comprehensive and complex that a textbook cannot possibly deal with it all effectively? The alternative to making such statements is to leave out certain areas of coverage and oversimplify complex issues and events.

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to the referents they reflect?

An obvious example of an instance where a referent is raised to visibility is in the second paragraph. The authors point to President Roosevelt's 1936 Inaugural Address and its relationship to New Deal achievements. In the next paragraph indirect reference is made to New Deal legislation and the quest for domestic stability during the 1930's. In neither case are the referents tied directly to the generalizations and concepts which follow. If the reader is to see the relationship, and the implicit intellectual bridges which must be built by the historian or student, he must exercise considerable imagination and academic sophistication. This is probably more than can be reasonably expected of relatively inexperienced high school students. The possibility of connecting the referent with the appropriate
concept or generalization exists. As the text is written, the connection is not made.

4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

One of the charges Alexander has brought against American history textbooks is that there is little evidence of the authors' own inquiry. In the paragraphs being considered, this charge seems warranted, even though the authors are two reputable historians. It is glaringly obvious that nothing is said about the many interpretations, the widespread controversy, and the many changing points of view that have swirled around the whole New Deal era and the way it has been treated by historians. A golden opportunity to demonstrate the changing interpretations of historical events is passed by. Perhaps this is because the authors are more in agreement with the Hanvey position than that of Schwab. Perhaps their view is that textbooks ought not attempt to show the process of the scholar, but just his findings. At any rate, the changing nature of historical knowledge might have been directly demonstrated. It was not.

III. SYNTACTICAL STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPTS?

The topics analyzed below are taken from the textual discussion of the sectional strife which preceded the Civil
war, the discussion of the conquering of the Last Frontier, and the discussion of America's entry into World War II.

The first topic discussed is from chapter 16, "Sectional Strife Becomes Acute." The paragraphs which follow are from the section "The North and the South Move Steadily toward War." The specific focus is "The Dred Scott Decision." The authors' discussion follows.

On March 6, 1857, two days after President Buchanan took the oath of office, the Supreme Court handed down an explosive decision.

The decision involved Dred Scott, a slave whose owner had taken him from Mississippi into Illinois, a free state, and into Minnesota Territory, which was free under the terms of the Missouri Compromise. His owner then took him back into Missouri. A few years later, a group of anti-slavery people brought the Dred Scott case into court, claiming that since Scott had lived in a free state and in free territory he was a free man. The case went through two lower courts, one of which decided for Scott, the other against. Eventually, the case reached the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court ruled that residence in a free territory and free state did not give Dred Scott his right to freedom. It declared that Scott (and therefore all slaves or their descendants) was not a citizen of the United States or of the State of Missouri. Therefore, he had no right to sue in either a state or a federal court.

Had the Supreme Court stopped at this point, the Dred Scott case probably would have gone almost unnoticed by the general public. But the Supreme Court, by a vote of six to three, with Chief Justice Roger B. Taney voting with the majority, went on to rule that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional because Congress had no power to exclude slavery from the Territories. The Court based this decision on the Fifth Amendment, which prohibited Congress from depriving any person of "...property, without due process of law."

The Dred Scott decision, the first since the famous case of Marbury v. Madison in 1803 in which the Supreme Court had declared an Act of Congress unconstitutional, was decidedly unpopular with many Northerners. According to the Dred Scott decision, the New Republican Party's major plank in the platform -- the exclusion of slavery from the territories -- was unconstitutional.

The anti-slavery forces in the Northern states were severely jolted by the Dred Scott decision. If the Supreme Court continued to hold the position that it had taken, only an amendment to the Constitution could keep slavery out of the Territories. But an amendment had to be ratified by three fourths of all the states. In view of the number of existing southern states, such a majority was out of the question. Moreover, in electing the Democratic candidate Buchanan, the majority of the states in 1856 had apparently approved the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which alone had barred the extension of slavery into Territories north of the famous 36° 30' line.

Anti-slavery men determined to gain strength and win the election of 1860.

111.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations were verified?
It is significant that the conceptual framework which governed the selection, organization, and interpretation of the data related almost entirely to the legal questions involved. The authors do not discuss, or even allude to, the basic human tragedies, or the questions of morality, which surrounded the decision. The conclusions and generalizations deduced were all political.

These conclusions and generalizations are based on evidence which is, for the most part, either implicit in the discussion or pointed to indirectly. It would have been helpful had the authors said something like the following: "Because we have the above information, we reach the following conclusion"; or, "Since we have the following circumstances, which would be true in similar cases anywhere, we feel safe in making the following generalization." No such statements are made. On the contrary, one conclusion is stated for which no evidence is presented. The opening sentence in paragraph four says, "Had the Supreme Court stopped at this point, the Dred Scott case probably would have gone almost unnoticed by the general public." The conclusion may be warranted, but we do not know why. The conclusion points to the Supreme Court's decision to deny Dred Scott freedom. Then the Court went further and declared the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional. But we can think of other
eventualities which could have provoked a public furor. Suppose those individuals who brought the suit on behalf of Dred Scott had carried the case to the public in a widespread, grass-roots appeal? If the authors know why their conclusion is sound then we ought to be told. As it is, we must conclude that through asking this question we fail to reveal a syntactical structure of knowledge in these paragraphs.

2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

Textbooks have been widely analyzed and soundly attacked. Some have alleged that they contain naked propaganda rather than a careful demonstration of scholarship.  

27There is a rather large literature on textbooks. This study in no way attempts to be definitive of that literature. In addition to those cited other places in this study, some recent articles dealing with history textbooks are, James P. Shaver, "Reflective Thinking, Values, and Social Studies Textbooks," School Review, Volume 73, Number 3 (Summer 1965), pp. 226-257; Bruce R. Joyce, "Please Stop Beating the Textbook!" School Review, Volume 74, Number 3 (Autumn 1966), pp. 319-322; James P. Shaver, "The Evaluation of Textbooks: A Continuous Responsibility," School Review, Volume 74, Number 3 (Autumn 1966), pp. 323-331; and James P. Shaver, "Diversity, Violence, and Religion: Textbooks in a Pluralistic Society," School Review, Volume 75, Number 3 (Autumn 1967), pp. 311-326.

McPhie, for one, claims that the problem lies as much in the misuse of textbooks as in the poor quality of the product. Some of these allegations may be overly harsh. Some may be true of only certain books. Some may be true of all textbooks. Some are true of the book being investigated. For one thing, it does not reveal the difference between primary and secondary evidence. The authors refer to the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution and to the Supreme Court case Marbury v. Madison, 1803, as well as the Dred Scott decision. They do not say if they are dealing with primary or secondary evidence. And there is no indication about the source of information from which the background explanation for the case is drawn. This information may not be propaganda, as Noah, Prince, and Riggs have charged. Probably it is not. But we might query McPhie as to whether the most competent teacher could use this topic to demonstrate how types of evidence differ. And we might query the authors as to their seeming uninterest in presenting more than the results of historical scholarship.

3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

By implication, the last paragraph in the quoted topic says that the Dred Scott decision was the factor which caused anti-slavery men to determine to win the Presidency in 1860. In view of all that has been written about the causes of the Civil War, and the profound ramifications emanating from the 1860 election, it seems unbelievably simplistic to suggest the Dred Scott decision had such an impact. Perhaps this is not the intent of the authors. The point is, as far as this analysis is concerned that when scholars move from raw data to conclusions or generalizations all of the evidence ought to be mustered. Then the transition from data to conclusion ought to be clear. If the student cannot see the metamorphosis, particularly when single causation is implied, he learns nothing about the nature of history.

Another example where a conclusion appears to be drawn lacking sufficient evidence is the following statement: "If the Supreme Court continued to hold the position that it had taken, only an amendment to the Constitution could keep slavery out of the territories." Perhaps so. But were other alternatives pursued by the anti-slavery forces? If so, should not the reader be told? If not, should he not be told? The nature of historical knowledge found in textbooks would be clearer to students if more than the fruits of
research were presented. Nowhere do we find statements like the following: "Since we did not have adequate information, we were forced to make the following conclusions." Or, "There is no direct evidence to support or deny this conclusion. There is a long-standing tradition. In the absence of conclusive evidence either way we have chosen to follow the tradition." Such an approach might be helpful to both students and teachers; however, it is not found in the above topic. Therefore, we must conclude that this "telling question" does not unveil a syntactical structure of knowledge.

The second topic analyzed looking for a syntactical structure is taken from chapter 22, "Americans Conquer 'The Last Frontier'." The section from which the following paragraphs come is about miners and mining discoveries. The specific subject is the early mining communities.

During and after the war Between the States, mining communities sprang up literally overnight in these and other areas of the west. Miners, prospectors, and gold-crazed people from all parts of America were among the original "settlers" in territory that is now eastern Washington and Oregon, western Montana, Idaho, New Mexico, and Arizona.

Life in mining camps has been described vividly in The Luck of Roaring Camp by Bret Harte and in Roughing It by Mark Twain. From these and other...
contemporary accounts we form a picture of wild, lawless communities of tents, rough board shacks, and smoke-filled saloons strung along a muddy street.

Each mining camp passed through several distinct stages of development. At first, every man was a law unto himself, relying for his safety upon his fists or the guns in his holsters. Then the more respectable citizens began to organize their own private police force, often called vigilantes...in an effort to maintain order. Soon they built schools and churches -- crude shacks, perhaps, but important steps toward civilized living. With the schools and churches came organized local government. Then came the appeal to Congress for recognition as an organized Territory of the United States, and eventually the adoption of a constitution and admission to the Union as a State.

Today the mountain regions, the valleys, and the high plateaus of the west are dotted with abandoned mining communities -- ghost towns, as they are called. The abandoned mine shafts and the sagging, windowless cabins remain as mute testimony to the fact that the prospector and the miner once pioneered on this vast frontier.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations are verified?

Asking this question of this topic does not reveal evidence of a structure of knowledge as represented in the Schwab model. There is no explicit demonstration of how
conclusions and generalizations are formed. Yet conclusions are drawn and generalizations are made. In the minds and research data of the authors the evidence doubtless existed. In this case they did not see fit to make it public. Although they refer to two works of literature -- one by Bret Harte and the other by Mark Twain -- they do not state or imply that these works represent data that is imperative to the interpretations in the textbook. The distance between what is left unsaid and this component of the Schwab model may be explained as a difference in interest. Schwab was interested in the structure of knowledge in disciplines. The authors of this text were interested in summarizing the findings of a tremendous amount of historical research data summarizing in textbook form. The two interests do not appear to be compatible. But such a judgement may be premature. This question does not expose a syntactical structure of knowledge in this topic in the textbook. But it perhaps can. More investigation is needed.

2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

The authors draw on The Luck of Roaring Camp by Bret Harte and Roughing It by Mark Twain to illustrate what life was like in a mining camp. The obvious question this raises, in view of the "telling question" we are asking is, Do they
intend these two books as primary or secondary sources? They do not say. From the context we may conclude that they are using these two works as primary evidence. If this is true, it seems reasonable to ask some additional questions. How accurate is the representation of mining camps as seen through the eyes of Harte, who tended to idealize the west? How seriously can we take a work of fiction which sometimes distorts reality for the sake of effect? Perhaps the authors, being professional historians, could have mustered more unambiguous data to support their conclusions. Or perhaps they were writing for the sake of effect. Whatever their reasons, we can logically claim that, in the case of the high school student, it would be more educative to know than not to know. In this example, the raw data may be as good as the finished product. Perhaps better. If the authors' purposes had coincided with those of Schwab, they would probably have written these paragraphs differently.

3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

Since the authors only reveal the sources of evidence occasionally, and then often in an indirect way, it is not surprising that they do not show us the amount of evidence necessary to move from raw data to a stable conclusion or generalization. In the last two paragraphs quoted above
they posit six stages through which "each mining camp passed." but they offer no evidence to support this, either in the form of prior research or examples. we do not question but that the authors went through a meticulous, rigorous process of academic sifting before they generated these six stages. This amounts to a generalization which has significant importance, both for the study of the frontier and the growth of the student. Unfortunately, the opportunity to open this door of understanding is passed by.

The third series of paragraphs investigated using the syntactical component of the model are the two topics, "The attack on Pearl Harbor," and "The United States declares war," taken from chapter 3c, "The Nation moves from isolationism into war."\(^{31}\) The time period covered by this chapter is 1932-1941.

On Sunday morning, December 7, 1941 -- even before Japan's reply had been delivered to the American government -- carrier-borne Japanese planes roared down without warning upon the United States fleet in the great American naval and air base at Pearl Harbor, in Hawaii. Taken unaware, the Americans lost almost all of their planes and eight battleships and suffered the partial destruction of several other naval units. More than 2,000 civilians, soldiers, and sailors were killed, and almost 2,000 more were wounded. The same day the Japanese also attacked Wake, Midway, Guam, the Philippine Islands, and other American bases.

\(^{31}\) _ibid._, p. 715.
Americans were shocked beyond words as the radio announced what had happened on the morning of December 7, 1941. The United States was not prepared for such an unprovoked attack. And with almost complete unanimity, the American people supported President Roosevelt the next day when he asked Congress for a declaration of war against Japan. The Senate declared war unanimously; the House, with only one dissenting vote. Great Britain and the governments-in-exile that had fled their countries when Hitler conquered them also immediately declared war against Japan. Three days later, on December 11, Germany and Italy declared that a state of war with the United States existed, whereupon Congress declared war upon these two countries.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations are verified?

One of the authors' conclusions in the above paragraphs is, "Americans were shocked beyond words as the radio announced what had happened on the morning of December 7, 1941." The rationale for this conclusion is the preceding paragraph: the attack was a surprise, more than 2000 Americans died and another 2000 were wounded, many planes and ships were damaged or destroyed. But the reader must make the connection between the rationale and the conclusion. The authors do not. The conclusion must be reached on the basis of the rationale. To draw conclusions in this way presupposes a cause and effect relationship. Such an
assumption may be neither valid nor true. Some Americans may not have been shocked. Or some Americans may have been shocked for reasons other than those presented. If the verification of the conclusion is not the data given in the preceding paragraph, then we are faced with no supporting evidence. The assumption may be that the general knowledge of these events is so widespread that no verification is needed. But this is a big assumption. The students for whom the book is intended -- 16 year olds -- were not born for a dozen years following 1941. The point may be that the intention of the authors was to present what happened, not how they decided to put it into the textbook, or the form they decided to use. At any rate, asking the above question does not reveal a structure of knowledge in this topic.

2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

In one sense, the easiest history to write may be of a period through which one has lived. Data, both written and remembered, is abundant and the interpretation can be supplemented with many shades and nuances of meaning. In another sense, the factors which tend to enrich the writing of such history may mitigate against its reliability. Then we have a good argument for the use of primary source material.
The authors may have relied on primary evidence. We have no way of knowing. When they talk about the action of Congress, they do not say if they went to the Congressional Record, to contemporary newspapers, printed speeches, relied on memory, or used some other source. Their statements about the actions of the Congress are entirely descriptive. Still they are grounded in some type of data. This data, and its nature, are not revealed. The student is left with the findings of historical scholarship. He is not exposed to the nature of the data. If this part of the book has a structure of knowledge, in the Schwabian sense, it is not made clear by asking the above question.

3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

When the authors conclude that Americans were not prepared for an unprovoked attack they allude to the dialogue between the two Nations immediately prior to the December 7, 1941 attack. The "average" American probably was unprepared, but there is some question as to whether all average Americans were unprepared or surprised. Do the authors adequately demonstrate that shock ran throughout the country? There are no examples given of how people reacted. Were they angry with the Japanese because of the attack? Were they frightened for their lives? Were they just generally frustrated? Was the average American aware
of the Japanese-American negotiations? Did he view this as hypocrisy? These may be difficult questions to answer. But again, they may not be. To use such questions to probe beneath the surface findings and conclusions of the authors might be fruitful if we are interested in whether the historical knowledge found in *Rise of the American Nation* has a structure. In its present form we cannot claim that it does.

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

In view of the foregoing analysis it would be easy to make a flat denial of the hypotheses that selected American history textbooks make explicit a structure of knowledge, as defined by Schwab. This, in fact, must be the verdict. But there is more to the whole matter than what is implied by a failure to find support for the hypotheses.

When the analysis is followed carefully it is seen that in several places the potential exists for creating a structure of knowledge, given the Schwab meaning of structure of knowledge. This is more obvious when searching for substantive and syntactical structure than organizational structure. The differences between what the Schwab model says ought to exist and what was found may often be explained in terms of point of view. Practicing historians, as the literature reveals, have not shown an active or intense
interest in the concept of a structure of knowledge. It stands to reason that they will concern themselves with presenting the results of historical probing. This is the inductive tradition in historiography which still guides the scholarship of most historians. Those few historians who have shown a disposition to break with this tradition have followed methodologies other than that suggested by the concept of the structure of a discipline.\(^{32}\)

Where possibility for the structure of knowledge exists in the subject matter of this book it is usually embedded deeply, reflected indirectly, or in such a subtle manner that the average high school student cannot be reasonably expected to see it. But it should be remembered that teachers are not schooled in the concept of a structure of knowledge either. Most teachers were educated in the tradition which defines history as facts. Perhaps we ought to start with the nature of the knowledge, as well as with the teacher. But before making extensive or firm recommendations we will investigate more textbooks.

\(^{32}\)An example of such an historian is H. Stuart Hughes at Harvard who has advocated the uses of the techniques of psychoanalysis as a means of "confronting the past." See his \textit{History As Art and As Science} (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).
Henry Bragdon taught history and social studies at Brooks School, Andover, Massachusetts, and at Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, New Hampshire for many years. He has also served as an Examiner in American History and Social Studies for the College Entrance Examination Board and has held offices in several professional organizations. Although retired, he remains active in the field of social studies.

The late Samuel P. McCutchen was a long-time professor of Education and Social Studies at New York University. He also served as a Social Studies Department Chairman and a high school principal both in the state of Mississippi and St. Louis, Missouri. For purposes of this investigation both men are referred to as "teacher-historians."

*History of a Free People* was first published in 1954. Since that time it has become a popular textbook and is widely used in American high schools. The edition used in this investigation, published in 1969, contains 706 pages of narrative text, in addition to a Prologue and an Epilogue. In the Prologue the authors define 16 themes which they claim have run from Colonial times to the present. In the Epilogue these same themes are re-examined in terms of the
American Society of 1969. There is no direct attempt to orient the student into the ways of the historian.

1. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE: WHAT IS THE UNIQUE SUBJECT MATTER?

The three topics examined under this component are taken from an extra-textual statement following chapter one, and introductory statement at the beginning of part 4, and from a portion of the text of chapter 32. The statement from page 30, "To The Student," follows:

The activities at the end of each chapter and of each part are to help you direct, organize, and retain your learning. They are also designed to lead you on to further exploration.

Different classes and different individuals will use these suggested activities in different ways, but the important thing if you want to enjoy history and do well in it is to learn to study actively. When you are asked to compare something with something else, for instance, think of both similarities and differences. Also, try to make your own comparisons and connections. Since a textbook by its nature must point out only the principal landmarks and must sometimes oversimplify complex events, treat it critically. Don't hesitate to question the text or to look for places where it omits information. (all italics)

In this chapter the purposes of each section are explained, so that you may know how to make more intelligent use of them.

---

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

The above statement was not included in the body of the narrative. The text proper is concerned with presenting the facts of the story. But this statement is an indication that the authors realize the need for the student to understand what he is studying more fully than the narrative itself provides. The end-of-chapter activities, they point out, "are to help you direct, organize, and retain your learning." The meaning of the term learning, as used here, is not clear. Chapter one, "The Heritage of the Colonial Period," began with a section on the Age of Discovery and ended with a discussion of Benjamin Franklin. What the reader is supposed to learn must be implicit in the narrative. Nothing is said about what is uniquely educative about the study of history. Yet we know something about what one of the authors thinks is educative about history.

In another place, Bragdon indirectly reflects on the peculiar value of history as a discipline. He asserts "that too many teachers concentrate on picayune facts." He does not indicate what is unique about history or how history can be educative. We can infer that he believes history should

---

be taught for some purpose beyond the learning of the information. In neither the text nor elsewhere does he unequivocally state what he thinks is unique about history. Such a statement would have been educative. As it is, we cannot claim we have raised to the level of visibility and organizational structure of the knowledge by asking the above question. Maybe asking another question will be more fruitful.

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the disciplines?

At one point in the preceding topic the authors make the conditional statement, "but the important thing if you want to enjoy history and do well in it is to learn to study actively." This provokes the following questions: is the purpose of history for enjoyment or to "do well"? Is enjoyment theoretical, practical, or productive? What constitutes doing well? How is enjoyment in the study of history related, for example, to enjoyment in the study of poetry? Physics? Syntax? Is it necessary to engage in some prerequisite study before one can enjoy or do well in history? To answer these questions based on the above statements requires creativity, imagination, and a willingness to extrapolate liberally on the basis of little evidence. The most obvious conclusion we can draw is that too little
is said about the nature of history as a discipline for us to attempt to relate it to any organization of the disciplines. It may be that history is related closely enough to sociology that we can put it somewhere near the top of the Comtian hierarchy. For purposes of this study such a conjecture is academic. The authors do not say enough about the relationship of history to other disciplines for us to make any definite conclusions about whether history, as seen in this textbook, has an organizational structure.

3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

When the authors talk about enjoyment, it is not clear if they mean we "enjoy history" simply because we enjoy studying those disciplines in which we "do well" or if they mean that one of the uses of history may be amusement. Perhaps they mean neither, at least in sense in which we are asking this question. But amusement may be a use of history. This embraces the synthetic function. The sum of man's experiences are at least tragic, comical, thought-provoking, senseless, complicated, simple, human, inhuman, dreary, stimulating, exhilarating, and boring. There is some credence in the claim that "truth is stranger than fiction." But this is not the same as to claim that the above paragraphs exhibit a structure of knowledge, in Schwab's terms. Probably few historians would claim amusement as a major use of history.
At another point the authors tell the student how to compare "something with something else." This could have led into a discussion of the study of history as a means of gaining perspective on our world. But it did not. They do not say why it is important to compare and contrast. There are probably reasons we can imagine. If we do so we are going beyond what is said. A more accurate guess would be that the authors wanted the student to compare and contrast in order to better understand the relationship to each other of the facts they presented. Such a purpose is not unrelated to the attempt to gain perspective and understanding. But it is not sufficient for us to conclude that an organizational structure of knowledge has been revealed.

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

There may be a sense in which one could argue that to know, in any sense, is better than not to know. If we project such a claim, it leads us to deny the importance of discriminatory knowing. It can lead to the absurdity of claiming that all knowledge has some, or equal, worth for everyone. Such a claim undermines clarity of thought. Yet textbook information is often presented this way.

The authors do make the point that "a textbook by its nature must point out only the principal landmarks and
must sometimes oversimplify complex events." We infer that
landmarks are important, but can only conjecture as to why.
Is it because landmarks lead to somewhere else of greater
importance? Because landmarks illuminate the periods of
time in such a way that our understanding is enhanced rapidly?
Because landmarks serve as focal points in the completion
of our synthesis? Perhaps. But these reasons, or others,
are not made clear and concise. To infer an organizational
structure of knowledge based on this topic would be un-
warranted.

The second topic examined using the above component
of the Schwab model is taken from the page opposite the
beginning of Part 4, "Division and Reunion." The following
paragraphs are entitled "An American Tragedy." They serve
as an introduction to Part 4.

In 1961 the nation began a four-year
"celebration" of the Civil War. Whole
battles were re-enacted, with men in antique
uniforms banging away at each other with
blank cartridges, like some huge game of
cops and robbers. It seems strange, thus
celebration, because that long, hard-fought
war was a terrible tragedy. The losses
were much higher relative to the population
of the country than in any war the United
States ever fought with a foreign foe.
Hundreds of thousands of young men were
killed or wounded or allowed to rot in
prison camps. To be sure, the Negroes of

---

the South received the priceless gift of freedom, but one must wonder if it could not have been achieved at less cost in blood, treasure, and bitter feelings.

Compromises and temporary truces for a time prevented the slavery issue from exploding. But in the end the flames of controversy between North and South were rekindled by the movement known as "manifest destiny," and in 1861 the country plunged into war.

On the eve of the Civil War, the parties ceased to serve the important function of clamping down controversies before they endangered the Union. Both parties, Whigs and Democrats, broke apart. You can see the result in the map of the presidential election of 1860, on p. 341. Essentially, Southerners were demanding the right to take slaves into areas totally unsuited to slavery, and the Republicans were insisting that slavery be forbidden in areas where climate and soil made its existence impossible.

Some historians say that the Civil War was brought on by a "blundering generation" of politicians too shortsighted or unskilled to arrange a compromise that would have saved the Union without bloodshed. Others suggest that the war was an "irrepressible conflict," or even a divine punishment for the terrible wrong of slavery. Or was it perhaps an inevitable consequence of rivalry between the industrial interests of the North and the planter interests of the South? Was it caused by Northern invasion of Southern rights, as the Confederate leaders claimed? Would it have been better to allow the seceding states to "depart in peace"?

We did not know how the tragedy would have been averted, but we can at least be thankful that there were elements that relieved the gloom: the songs, such as "Dixie" and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic"; the cheerful heroism of the defenders
of Vicksburg; the magnanimity of Grant and the dignity of Lee in the surrender at Appomattox Court House; the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, who hated slavery and disunion, but who never hated his fellow Americans fighting for the "lost cause" of the Confederacy.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

There is always the latent question, is the uniqueness of a discipline implicit or must it be made explicit? If we can generalize from what historians do, then we are prone to answer, The uniqueness is implicit. By definition, history is the study of the past. That is how we use the term. But etymologically, history means to inquire. Somehow, through time and usage, we have come to think of history as the study of what scholars say happened in the past. This may be a most unfortunate evolution. While it is important that some discipline give a holistic view of man's past, it is equally important that students learn to probe the past in an attempt to gain their own perspective and develop insight. Insight may be thought of as the simultaneous understanding of both the "big picture" and its many component parts and the constant interaction between the two. Only by confronting the past, in an attempt to plumb the depths of its secrets, can insight be developed. It is
reasonable to claim that a study of history ought to reveal this quality and thereby set it apart as a peculiar study. In order for this to happen, students need direction, guidance, help. Oftentimes in an author's obsession with "what actually happened" other important concerns are sacrificed. This seems to be the case here. The above paragraphs are not unimportant. But they obviously were not written to expose the organizational structure of the discipline.

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the disciplines?

There is no direct indication that the authors attempted to relate the above statements to any formal organization of knowledge. There may be some indication that they were interested in the creation of some kind of taxonomy or model which would succinctly explain the Civil War. Essentially, they dealt with some of the "landmarks" which led to open hostility. If the suggestion of such a taxonomy is in fact what they had in mind, then we conclude that they are relating history to the theoretical disciplines, rather than the practical. But to draw such a conclusion requires some imagination. In view of what is both said and not said, it is perhaps more accurate to conclude that they had no purpose other than to give the student an overview of the Civil War and its antecedents. In doing so they invoked the use of concepts and
generalizations from demography, sociology, political science, economics, religion, philosophy, and geography. The sources of these concepts are not revealed. No structure is indicated, even though the potential for an organizational structure may exist.

3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

Does history have generalizable uses, or does every student make his own personal application? The question is an old one indeed. It is equally difficult. Nevertheless, the study of history is a part of the curriculum of nearly all schools. There must be an explanation. By our actions we seem to insist that the study of history has peculiar educative value. We then write textbooks in an attempt to condense between covers what is supposedly the salient knowledge which students should know. But why should they know this? Of what use is it? Some historians and philosophers of history have spoken to such questions. Yet the textbooks we use do not explicitly reveal these uses. The distinction between writers of history and writers about history remains.

Implicitly the authors may have said something about the uses of history. The first paragraph quoted above related two periods, one hundred years apart. Is this intended to give us confidence? Perhaps. In the fourth
paragraph they briefly discuss the disagreement which has persisted among historians about the Civil War. Are we to see the complexities and unresolved questions which are a part of the human condition? It seems undeniable that the authors view the study of history as peculiarly educative. But we cannot conclude that they attempted to reveal an organizational structure. If they had, the uses of history probably would have been made obvious.

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they include is worth knowing?

Oftentimes we succumb to the temptation to see causality where there is none, or to oversimplify causality when in fact it may be quite complex. Perhaps no academicians is more susceptible to such a temptation than the historian. Students need to see that historical causation ought not be treated lightly. Causality is very much involved in the authors' statement, "But in the end the flames of controversy between North and South were rekindled by the movement known as 'manifest destiny,' and in 1861 the country plunged into war." This would have been an opportunity, had the authors' purpose been to reveal a structure of knowledge, to demonstrate the important concept of causality. As it is, the authors were content with what they consider a statement of fact. If causality is seen it will depend upon the insight of the student or the skill of the teacher. It is
doubtless worthwhile to know that the westward movement fanned the coals that burst into the flames of Civil War. But a second, equally significant lesson could have been taught also: the nature of historical inquiry.

Perhaps the authors were trying to tell us something important about the American character. This is a subject that has occupied commentators on the American scene since Tocqueville's *Democracy in America.* In spite of disunion, inhuman attitudes, and inhumane war, the nation survived. There is a sense in which we can speak of triumph of the American character. This collateral lesson appears to be embedded in the web and woof of Civil War history. But in this topic, the authors do not choose to comment on this vital theme. The Schwab model, or a similar model, designed to uncover signs of structure in knowledge, was obviously not considered by the authors. Perhaps it ought not have been. We can conclude that history, as seen in this portion of the textbook, has no implicit structure as described by Schwab.

Part V of *History of a Free People* is entitled "Cold War." Chapter 32, from which the following paragraphs were taken, is entitled "New Frontiers." It begins with the

*First published in 1832, this work remains one of the most perceptive analyses of life in America and the nature of democracy ever written.*
Kennedy administration and concludes with a summary of the 1960 election and the early days of the Nixon administration. The following topic, from this chapter, is "The Age of Anxiety."^5

The distressing events of 1960 reveal why the recent past has been called the age of anxiety. With the coming of mass media, men have no place to hide. Every disaster penetrates their living rooms, whether it be Soviet tanks in Prague or Washington in flames. Everywhere there is a sense of the times being out of joint.

The Harper's weekly editorial on page 700 may help dispel the notion that the past was rosy. Yet surely this country is on trial as never before. The Cold War is a struggle that pits two socio-economic systems against each other. Every rise in the American crime rate, every example of internal strife, and every failure to cope with insisten problems is a defeat. Every achievement is improving race relations, reducing poverty, raising educational standards, promoting scientific achievement, and creating respect for law is also a kind of victory in foreign affairs.

The quotation beginning this chapter comes from a speech delivered by John F. Kennedy the day before he was killed. It suggests surely that men must not run away from difficulties. Better to think of this as an age that opens new frontiers. The great New Frontier is not outer space, but mankind itself. As the Daniel Boones and nameless women in sunbonnets faced the rigors and terrors of the physical frontier, so their successors must face the challenges of the present.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

Referring to the structure of a discipline as a conceptual framework for inquiry, Schwab suggests that we are enabled to better teach what we know. If every discipline has its own conceptual framework for both inquiry and research it follows that every discipline must be unique. Bragdon and McCutchen allude to the uniqueness of history in the above paragraphs, but they do not state that history is unique, or pointedly show how. One unique aspect of history is its holistic view, coupled with an emphasis on chronology. This feature of the discipline is referred to, but not made explicit, when the authors compare the views expressed a century apart in Harper's Magazine. No other discipline makes this same approach. No other discipline produces the same concepts or focuses on the same phenomena in the same way.

Sometimes we gain insight into our own problems and perhaps also into the human condition by comparing and contrasting periods. In the last paragraph quoted above the authors compare the vicissitudes faced by the present generation with those faced by Daniel Boone and the sunbonnet clad women of the early American frontier. We will not
belabor the aptness or inaptness of the comparison. We can say that no other discipline would likely treat such comparisons in the same way.

By asking the above "telling question" we can reveal a fragment of a structure of knowledge. The finding is probably coincidence. It may make no difference. The authors make no mention of such an intent.

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the discipline?

Running throughout the above paragraphs is the tacit challenge "to know." This is seen in the topic title, "The Age of Anxiety," and such statement as the assertion that "their successors must face the challenges of the present." If the emphasis the authors place on history is "to know," rather than "to make" or "to do," then we may conclude that they are relating history to the theoretical level of the Aristotelian hierarchy of knowledge. Or, when they talk about modern American man in sociological terms we may conclude that they are suggesting a relationship to the highest level of Comtian organization. What they did was summarize the state of current American society and foreign affairs, drawing on concepts and insights from other disciplines to do so. There was not attempt to reveal the sources from
which the concepts came or to relate the total picture to any kind of organization of knowledge. The potential for doing both may be present in this section of the book. The authors obviously did not write with the concept of a structure of knowledge consciously in mind.

3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

Even though some historians have emphatically denied that it has practical or predictive value, there is apparently more to the use of history than aesthetic appreciation.

In the first paragraph quoted above, Bragdon and McCutcheon observe that "Everywhere there is a sense of the times being out of joint." We might raise the question, is the study of why they are out of joint, or how they got out of joint, going to help the current or next generation get them back into joint? Since they wrote the book for some purpose, and since they make statement like this, rather than dwell on history as an art form, we must conclude that they see some practical use in the study of history. They did not say what it was.

The quotation from Harper's magazine referred to in the first paragraph in this topic summarizes the maladies

---

6 For one commentary on the uses of history, see Henry Steele Commager, *The Nature and the Study of History* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles Merrill Books, Inc., 1965) p. 73.
besetting America in 1957. One of these was "Russia hangs as usual like a cloud, dark and silent upon the horizon of Europe..." Do the authors see the study of history revealing to us that Russia has been an enemy of both Western Europe and America for over a century? Surely this must not be their purpose. Yet they must have some reason for including such a quotation. Could it be their conviction that political enemies are always present, whether in the form of Russia or in some other form? Are they pointing out, though indirectly, that a people must be reflective and resilient in order to remain viable and vibrant. We can only conjecture.

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

Chapter 32 begins with a quotation from John Kennedy beckoning the American people to face the challenges and hard times that the remainder of this century will probably bring. The authors suggest that Kennedy was pleading "that men must not run away from difficulties." Is this why what is included in this book is worthwhile? Why the above paragraphs are important? They continued by saying that we "Better...think of this as an age that opens new frontiers...mankind itself." Here they saying that American man must realize that even though defeats
in the Cold War have and will come, we must always bounce back or lose our vitality? Must we adopt an attitude that consistently sees an opportunity for growth, for good, for the betterment of mankind residing in every problem, in every challenge? This seems to be the case. If it is, have the authors given us information that will both challenge and help us see more clearly how to convert the need into action? There is no statement which says, "These are the challenges facing America as it closes out the decade of the 1960's. These challenges indicate that the above information can be of valuable use...." It might have been helpful to write this way if the authors wanted to reveal the nature of the knowledge as well as the findings of scholars working in the discipline.

II. SUBSTANTIVE STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCEPTS?

The following topics were chosen because they come as near being isomorphic to the model as any topics which could be found. The first topic is from Chapter 1, "The Heritage of the Colonial Period." The second topic is a short essay opposite the first page of Part 3, "The Nation and the Sections." The third topic is from an inset at the end of Part 7.
Chapter X is a summary of early America. The authors attempt to cover all major phases of the development of the New Nation, from the Age of Discovery to the time just prior to the Revolutionary War. The following topic from Chapter X is "Crevecoeur on American Life."  

By the eighteenth century the people of the thirteen colonies were beginning to call themselves "Americans" and to think of themselves as a breed apart, free of the constraints and corruptions of Europe. This view was sometimes confirmed by the observations of visitors to these shores. The most notable of these was a young French nobleman, Michael Guilloume Jean de Crevecoeur, who came here in 1759 and eventually bought a farm of his own. In 1782 he published a book on life in America, entitled Letters From an American Farmer. When a European came to America, he wrote, "a modern society offers itself to his contemplation." Here are no great lords with everything and a horde of common people with nothing. Here are no kings, no courts, no luxuries, and -- no poverty. Instead, "a people of cultivators" work for themselves; all can afford enough food, "a dry and comfortable habitation," and clothes of "neat homespun." "The American, this new man," as Crevecoeur called him, might have an English grandfather, a Dutch wife, and a French daughter-in-law. "Here individuals of all nations are melted into a new race of men," wrote Crevecoeur, "whose labor and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world."

11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?

7Dragon, McClatchen, op. cit., p. 19.
The book, consisting of 32 chapters, is divided into nine chronological periods. There is a Prologue and an Epilogue. The Epilogue is followed by a glossary, an appendix consisting of several tables showing presidential terms of office and prominent people in government, and a series of nine important American documents. The Constitution is included in the body of the text. Although to expect chronological balance in a textbook may be neither reasonable nor feasible the quantitative emphasis on more recent events does raise questions about why this is so.

Essentially, the coverage is political. Like most textbooks, this is not entirely so. There is an attempt to pull in other, relevant material. The book is replete with insets. Many of these give a thumbnail sketch of both well-known and obscure individuals, of significant legislation, and unusual events. But the thrust of the text is political. This may be referred to as the authors' frame of reference. Within this frame of reference, 10 themes are listed which it is claimed run throughout American history. These are first reviewed in the Prologue. The same themes are summarized in the Epilogue. These themes may be referred to as the guidelines followed by the authors to determine what was relevant and irrelevant, important and unimportant. Neither the frame of reference nor the
guidelines are identified as such. The topic "Crevecoeur on American Life" points to theme number 2, "widespread participation in politics."

To identify a frame of reference and guidelines through careful analysis is one matter. To find them clearly and intentionally shown by the author is something else. There are not statements which say, in effect, "The authors began this study with the following points of view," or "Because of our backgrounds, training, and inclinations we have chosen to emphasize various themes in the history of the American people." We must conclude that the organization of the book shows the frame of reference of the authors only if we examine it closely.

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

The scope of history textbooks is usually rather obvious. It deals with the representativeness of the coverage. If the title doesn't reveal this, the Table of Contents does. What is more often not as clear is the emphasis or thrust of the work. In the present work the authors cover the story of America from the Age of Discovery to the early months of the Nixon administration. The above topic is an attempt to look at 19th century American life through the eyes of one man. Even so, both Crevecoeur and Bragdon/McCutchen attempt to be holistic in approach. The
excerpts from *Letters from an American Farmer* bear on the political, social, and economic life of an American.

The complexity of the subject matter is more difficult to determine. There is the implication that it is difficult to define "The American, this new man." But the authors do not stipulate that the entire period has been widely interpreted by different authors. Neither is there direct indication about the importance of the period in the total picture. If these questions reveal a substantive structure of knowledge, they are able to do so only dimly. In fact, we would have to modify the question. The complexity and scope are not "clearly presented."

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to the referents they reflect?

The outstanding concept in the above discussion is "American." The authors chose to use the concept in the sense in which Crevecoeur defined an American. This fact is clear. No attempt is made to question the concept, "American," or define him in other terms or through different eyes. Tragdon and McClatchen seem to be content with the peculiar qualities of the "new man" as delineated by Crevecoeur. We might question their conclusion that Crevecoeur was "The most notable" foreign visitor to elaborate on the American character. That is only one judgement.
Guidelines are identified as such. The topic "Crevecoeur on American Life" points to theme number 2, "widespread participation in politics."

To identify a frame of reference and guidelines through careful analysis is one matter. To find them clearly and intentionally shown by the author is something else. There are not statements which say, in effect, "The authors began this study with the following points of view," or "because of our backgrounds, training, and inclinations we have chosen to emphasize various themes in the history of the American people." We must conclude that the organization of the book shows the frame of reference of the authors only if we examine it closely.

... Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

The scope of history textbooks is usually rather obvious. It deals with the representativeness of the coverage. If the title doesn't reveal this, the Table of Contents does. What is more often not as clear is the emphasis or thrust of the work. In the present work the authors cover the story of America from the Age of Discovery to the early months of the Nixon administration. The above topic is an attempt to look at 20th century American life through the eyes of one man. Even so, both Crevecoeur and Bradford/Catechum attempt to be holistic in approach. The
By implication, the authors tell us that the qualities Crevecoeur saw in the American were generally true. Since other foreign observers have spoken to this point — Tocqueville, Martineau, Lord Bryce, to name but a few — it seems reasonable to ask, would not the implied generalization have carried more impact had it been made explicit, and a number of other referents cited and perhaps compared? As it is, we can say that the referent is reflected. We must question if, in its present form, it is sufficiently clear to justify the conclusion that it reflects a substantive structure of knowledge?

4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

All viable knowledge tends to change over time, either through the discovery of new information or a change in interpretation. We might ask, Have all historians reflected "The American, this new man" in the same light in which he is shown by Bragdon and McCutchen? Do all current historians agree with this treatment of the "new man" and life in early America? A look at other textbooks would produce the answers to these questions. We suspect both would be negative. But the more important question would seem to be, Should not students be shown how knowledge changes and the influences which cause it to change? Otherwise, we will tend, willy-nilly, to teach knowledge
in a dogmatic fashion. Students will miss vital lessons in inquiry and reflection which ought to be a part of the study of history. Although we attempted to select topics which correspond to the Schwab model, the above question is not productive of revelation of a substantive structure of knowledge.

The second topic analyzed in quest of a substantive structure of knowledge is taken from the beginning of Part 3, "The Nations and the Sections." The topic is entitled, "history as Fable" and serves as an introduction to the authors' discussion of the period from about 1615 to the reform movements of the 1640's and 1650's. 

History, it has often been remarked, is but a fable agreed upon. In American history, a generally accepted part of the fable has been that 1615 marked a turning point. But what, it may be asked, was so special about the year 1615? Did Americans suddenly and collectively turn their backs on Europe? Were they ever in fact "free of foreign entanglements"? Were they not still part of an Atlantic community being drawn ever closer together as steamships replaced sailing ships, as wheat from the Dakotas and pork from Indiana began to feed Liverpool and London, and as an ever-increasing flood of European immigrants poured into American ports?

And yet the fable that a great change had started in 1615 was itself a fact. Americans thought they were isolated from Europe, indeed, the congratulated themselves upon it. The millions of immigrants

seeking a new life in America often strengthened American isolationism because they sought to escape from their past. It took two world wars in the twentieth century to shock Americans out of the belief that with the close of the Napoleonic Wars the United States had no further need to concern itself with European politics.

Or consider the myth that men make history while women wash the dishes. History books have so consistently left half the human race out of account that Henry Adams remarked, "History is useful to the historian by teaching him his ignorance of women."

The very word "pioneer" conjures up the picture of a man in coonskin cap and leather jacket armed with a rifle. But as you trace the march of the frontier from the Appalachians to the Pacific, remember that there were women pioneers too. Left to himself, the man on the frontier often went savage -- witness his treatment of the Indians. It was the women who turned cabins into homesteads, planted flowers outside the doors, and put curtains in the windows. It was usually the mother and school teachers who transmitted to the next generation the heritage of the past.

It was, nevertheless, a man's world insofar as men could make it so. By law, the husband legally ruled the wife. Rigid taboos dictated women's clothing and freedom of action. Small wonder, then, that some brave women demanded equal rights with men and started a revolution that continues to the present (see p. 204). The embattled feminists who met at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848 appealed to the principles and used the phrases of 1776. Thus, each generation must find new uses for the Declaration of Independence, or it too could become a fable.
11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?

This question was answered in the analysis of the initial topic using this component of the model. Even though to answer the question we must consider more than a selected topic it seems worthwhile to both reflect on the overall organization of the book and then reflect on a specific passage.

Chapter 9, which immediately follows the above topic, is entitled "Forces for Union and Disunion." It contains seven major topics. All seven deal with political, or political-economic, issues. If the topic, "History As Fable," is meant to introduce Part 3, of which chapter 9 is the first chapter, we might raise some questions about the seeming incompatibility between the introductory statements and the text proper. Why did not the authors include in the text the statements which are in the introduction? Or why did they not have a section on the nature of historical knowledge or historiography at the beginning of the book? Or a page at the beginning of each major section? Carr's contention that history which does not meet the needs of reader is worthless, seems a truism. It is a big assumption ___________________

that "pure history" -- what happened -- with little attention to the "why's" and "how's" will be congruent with the needs of young minds. To obliquely indicate something about the nature of history is better than no indication at all. But to assume that such an indirect approach is adequate may be still to miss the mark. Even if the frame of reference is political, one of the guidelines could deal with the nature of knowledge. Of the ten themes listed in the Prologue none speak to the nature of the knowledge. This topic points up, indirectly, the authors' frame of reference. For the relatively unsophisticated high school student it is probably missed.

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

We might conclude that at least one of the authors' purposes was to focus on significant areas which are often left out of American history books. Is a work which leaves out "half the human race" representative of the subject matter with which the discipline claims to deal? What they say about women could also be said about other groups, particularly the Negro American. It seems unfortunate that the authors do not explain that one of the vital concerns facing every historian is the question of what to include. How many students have studies "textbook history" without realizing that at best they were getting a sampling of the
story of man" in another place, Bragdon has indicated his realization of some of the serious restrictions facing a textbook writer. Those concerns may not include trying to expose a structure of knowledge in a textbook. But the knowledge included might be more teachable if this were the case.

While there is no frontal attack on the question of complexity, there are indications that the subject matter is difficult to properly manipulate, synthesize, and interpret. Perhaps a good example of this is the concluding sentence in the above topic: "Thus each generation must find new uses for the Declaration of Independence, or it could become a fable." Most Americans probably would claim that the Declaration of Independence is a reality, not a fable. What is meant by fable? If the authors are suggesting an irrelevant relic of the past, then the statement has some meaning for us. The implication appears clear: history that is not related to a person's life and times is not history, but a fable. Can we claim that we teach history in schools if we only teach the oftentimes tired, dreary,

irrelevant tidbits that have been passed on from generation to generation: what would Voltaire call this.\footnote{The remark, "History is a fable agreed upon," or something similar, is usually attributed to the 18th century French intellectual, Voltaire. See The Varieties of History, edited by Fritz Stein (New York: Meridian Books, 1956) pp. 35-45.}

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to the referents they reflect?

The authors' basic concern seems to be the need to focus on history and its meaning for each generation. In a sense, the topic quoted above can be thought of as history-in-reverse. Rather than an attempt to link the conclusion or generalization with its referent for support, they have linked the two to show that referents sometimes give rise to myths of fables. In 1815 America had just concluded a war with England and in Europe the dangerous era of Napoleon had ended with the Corsican's banishment from the mainland. The fable of isolationism was the begotten. It took the wars of the 20th century to shatter this fable in the thinking of most Americans. Ironically, the referents which gave rise to the fable were in the form of wars, and the referents which dispelled the fable were also wars.

The women's rights movement in America has also battled the foe of fable. Yet the fight which women are
still carrying on dates back to the same century in which women were helping male pioneers push the country westward. The male-centered fables have tended to cut women, as a vital force, out of American history. The referents declare that she has been significantly and courageously involved. We can conclude that the above topic does reflect the referents. Although the reflection may not be as clear or pointed as we, or Schwab, might wish, it is nonetheless there.

4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

Voltaire may not have been correct. For purposes of this discussion, his remark that history is "a fable agreed upon" brings into focus a concern of vital importance. History does change. From Heraclitus to the present this has been recognized. Whether this knowledge is properly conveyed to students is another matter. Is the gap between what this topic said and the narrative too great?

The above topic calls our attention to the facts that the history of a free people has sometimes been distorted by leaving out the role of women, or by picturing

---

12 Legend says that Heraclitus, to demonstrate change, put his foot into a moving stream and removed it several times, all the while standing in one place. He then reasoned that in no two instances was it the same stream. See Herbert M. Muller, The Uses of the Past (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 373.
all frontiersmen as paragons of virtue. In this way the topic reveals that historical knowledge is ephemeral. If we can "create this part of structure of knowledge by closer attention to the nature of knowledge," could we create "a" structure of knowledge? We will investigate further.

The next topic to be examined using the substantive component of the Schwab model is not a part of the narrative portion of the text. This topic is included as an inset at the close of Part 7. It is a review of the recurrent themes which the authors suggest run throughout American history. 13

Recurring ideas, concepts, or "themes" run through most of American history and help to give it its unique character. Most of these are either explicit or implicit in each of the nine parts into which this text is divided. It is useful, however, to select particular themes for illustration, emphasis, and study at the end of each Part.

As the title of this Part suggests, the United States in 1917 embarked on a crusade "to make the world safe for democracy," and then decided that the world could get along with very little assistance from her. Here is a case, then, where theme number 10, "world-wide responsibility," was accepted and then neglected. Questions must arise:

1. Why the sudden abandonment of the traditional isolation, and why the equally sudden return to it?

---

2. How far was that tragic figure, Woodrow Wilson, responsible for both changes of mood?

For a brief discussion of these immensely difficult problems see May, From Imperialism to Isolationism, 1890-1919. For a more extensive treatment see Bailey, A Diplomatic History of the American People, and Smith, The Great Departure.

A striking feature of the period of World War I and after was the fact that women both gained the vote and rid themselves of a variety of taboos inhibiting their freedom of action. This social revolution in manners and morals is described in Frederick Allen, Only Yesterday. Women surely gained more freedom. Were they really better off?

11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?

Part 7 is entitled "Crusade and Disillusion." Subsumed under this theme are three chapters, "The First World War," "Normalcy," and "Crash." These topics are representative of the political-economic coverage given throughout most of the text. Either implicitly or explicitly, as the authors point out, the theme, "worldwide responsibility" seemed to guide them in the selection of content. At no time, in the narrative or in the many insets, did the authors say that political history formed the core around which other subject matter was arranged. When suggesting the 10
themes which serve as threads to tie the whole story together they did not point out that other themes could have been selected, had their frame of reference been different. We can tease out of the above paragraphs a frame of reference that is congruent to the frame of reference seen in other places. But the exposition of the frame of reference requires close analysis and perhaps some imagination. This raises the question whether high school students, even with assistance, can identify and see the significance of the authors' frame of reference.

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

To say that human affairs are complex is to resort to the cliche. But a cliche may be nonetheless true. Paul Nash has argued that one of the purposes of the study of history ought to be the exposure of the uniqueness of individuals and the complexities of living. The United States entered World War I "to make the world safe for democracy" and then withdrew into herself, as the authors point out, because of the points of view of the individuals involved in making decision. These varying attitudes became complicated in the confused social and political milieu during and following the war. The authors focus on the

complexities of the resulting situation when they ask the
two questions 1) why the vacillation between isolationism
and involvement? and 2) what portion of the responsibility
must be borne by woodrow wilson? These are not easy
questions. But students need to be confronted with such
questions. Wrestling with these kinds of historical
problems may result both in learning the content and the
nature of the discipline.

In the last paragraph quoted above the authors
indicate that the coverage in Part 7 is broader than
political and economic affairs. And indeed chapter 24,
"Normalcy," although primarily concerned with political-
economic matters, does have two short sections dealing
with social history. One section is called "The Golden
Twenties," and the other "New Directions". Yet in the
instances cited which seem to have some correspondence to
the Schwab model, it must be realized that neither the
complexity nor scope of the subject matter is "clearly
presented."

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to
the referents they reflect?

In summing up the political themes discussed in both
Part 7 and the above paragraphs, the authors list several
book titles. In discussing the American entrance into the
war and her subsequent refusal to actively participate in the post-war peace-keeping organization, they do not point directly to such referents as the League of Nations. This topic is obviously included as an additional attempt to elucidate the history of a free people. In one sense they may be successful. In the sense that they elucidate the nature of the knowledge by exposing a structure of knowledge, they are less than successful. But inappropriateness of the terms "successful" and "less than successful" are involved with the question of purpose. This topic was seemingly intended to further clarify the historical findings the historian presented in this book. The nature of the knowledge is rarely referred to.

In the last paragraph the changing American moral code, 1925 vintage, is alluded to. A popular history of this change is *Only Yesterday*. The authors do not make such statements as, "Besides the political freedoms women gained through legislation, they made social intrusions into areas formerly thought of as all male. Some of these intrusions, along with his interpretation of their significance and effects, are found in *Only Yesterday* by Frederick Lewis Allen." Maybe such statements would tell the student something vitally important about the discipline of history, as well as initiating him into the study of
"what actually happened." This quality of the content is not exposed, however, by asking the above question.

4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

Only Yesterday was Frederick Lewis Allen's informal discussion of American manners and morals in the 1920's. In the last two sentences quoted above the authors point to this "revolution", as Allen presents it, then raise two salient points: 1) "women surely gained more freedom." 2) "were they really better off?" A response to the question might well depend on the times in which one lived and the point of view instilled by those times. Did most women in the 1930's think women were better off? Is there any way we could know? Suppose we could know, would most women today agree with their 1930 sisters? By such a projection of thought, students might be helped to see that knowledge is everywhere the same but everywhere different. A lot of factors must be considered: the times, the writers, and the purposes for writing, to name but a few. Although the reader is not told in this topic that the changing quality of the subject matter can be observed, such a possibility exists. This does not constitute a structure. But the potential is there. Maybe Bruner's point bears close examination: knowledge is a model which we create.
III. SYNTACTICAL STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPTS?

The three topics investigated using this component of the model are from Part 5, "The Emergence of Modern America," Part 6, "New Horizons," and the Epilogue. None of the topics conform wholly to the model. They were chosen because they seem to have some correspondence to syntactical structure. The first one examined is taken from chapter 16, "The Opening of the Trans-Mississippi West." The following section of the chapter is entitled, "The Literature of the Sod House Frontier."15

The struggle of the farmers with the Plains produced a literature quote unlike that of the Wild West. Cowboys and miners were usually young men; their lives were adventurous; they were on the move. But the homesteader took on responsibilities difficult to shed; he often pledged himself to a bank, invested in tools and land, and started to raise a family. When misfortune hit, he had to weather it out. It is natural to find, therefore, that the literature of the Plains was realistic, sometimes bitter. This can be seen in the stories of Hamlin Garland, who was born on a Wisconsin farm in 1860. Garland's family moved west three times during his boyhood. In books such as Main-Travelled Roads and A Son of the Middle Border, he told "a tale of toil that's never done." Although describing moments of joy such as harvest time, or of beauty, as when the spring touched the Plains, Garland refused to say that

"butter was always golden and biscuits invariably light and flaky." "I will not lie," he wrote, "even to be a patriot. A proper proportion of the sweat, flies, heat, dirt, and drudgery shall go in."

A principal source of settlers for the northern portion of the Great Plains was Scandinavia. So many settlers came to the wheat country that by 1890 four hundred Minnesota towns bore Scandinavian names. Letters written to relatives back home described the wonders of the New Land. "Here it is not asked," wrote one, "what or who was your father, but the question is, what are you." Another wrote of the pleasure of eating white bread every day and pork three times a week. Still another remarked that here was a country where there were no thieves or beggars. But they told of troubles too: Indian raids, prairie fires, locust-like drifts of snow. Such troubles provide the subject of the greatest novel of the Great Plains, O. I. Rolvaag's Giants in the Earth, written in Norwegian. It describes the heroic efforts of Per Hansa and his wife Beret to establish a farm in South Dakota. They eventually triumph, but the human cost is terrible: Beret goes slowly mad, and Per dies in a blizzard.

111.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalization are verified?

At this point we might do well to remind ourselves of Schwab's claim of the relationship between the substantive concepts and the methodology of a discipline: substantive knowledge is dependent upon the conceptual framework employed.
This principle can be seen in the above topic. The topic actually deals with selected literature of the sod house frontier rather than the literature.

In the first paragraph the authors make generalizations about cowboys, miners, and homesteaders: cowboys and miners were usually young and adventurous; homesteaders assumed weightier responsibilities. In neither instance is the evidence to support either generalization made explicit. One could claim that the nature of textbook writing precludes the constant revelation of the sources on which conclusions and generalizations are premised. This is true if one is primarily interested in the presentation of the conclusions of historical scholarship. But if one is interested in the nature of historical knowledge, and believes that through attention to the concept of the structure of knowledge this can be revealed, then he might write differently. Then such statements as the following might appear: "If we can believe the literature of the Wild West, cowboys and miners were younger men and led exciting, carefree lives. The literature of the Great Plains shows a far different kind of life for the homesteader. In both cases we are dependent upon what people have said about life in these areas. You should be aware that this may not give a completely realistic picture. It
is the best that we have." In later paragraphs such an approach is implied, but not stated. Asking the above questions demonstrates the potential for the creation of a structure of knowledge. As it is written, we cannot claim that a Schwabian structure of knowledge exists.

2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

Primary evidence is generally understood to be that evidence produced by eye-witnesses or someone who lived through a particular experience. Secondary evidence is usually understood to be the interpretation of what happened by someone who was not there. In the above topic the authors do not make these distinctions. If the student understands the basic differences between primary and secondary evidence, he may conclude that both the works of Garland and Rolvaag are to be considered primary. But this is not clear. We do not know whether Rolvaag experienced the frontier as he wrote about it or whether he based his story on the experiences and stories of others. As it is written the student may well get an excellent "feel" for life on the frontier. This is to leave unanswered the question being considered here. Whenever we aspire to reveal more than "what may have happened" we must convert our historiography to accommodate our new aspirations. Since
this conversion is not made, we must conclude that Bradon and McCutchen had aspirations which were different from what they may have been had they been interested in a structure of knowledge.

3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

In addition to the generalizations about cowboys, farmers, and homesteaders there are others, such as the ones about the bitterness revealed in the literature of the Great Plains and the source of Great Plains immigrants. The only direct evidence referred to are the writings of Garland and Kolvaag. There are no qualifying statements to help the student understand that all the evidence desired is sometimes not available, but that historians still must reach conclusions and make generalizations to fill out the narrative. Neither are there statements which demonstrate that insufficient evidence is better than none, but ought to be used cautiously. Or that sometimes an historian has the opposite problem: he is overwhelmed with evidence, which may be conflicting, and he must make a judgement as to what he will use and how he will use it. Such referents as novels and essays about the frontier may be necessary to a definitive understanding of what life was like. But we can
hardly claim this is sufficient evidence on which to base hard conclusions. And as the above topic is written there is not sufficient evidence for us to conclude that it demonstrates a structure of knowledge.

The following topic is from chapter 20, "The Progressive Movement." The time is the turn of the century. "The Muckrakers" is the section from which these paragraphs come. Only a part of the total topic is included.

Some muckrakers were novelists who put their criticisms of existing conditions into fictional form. In The Octopus, Frank Norris told how railroads lorded it over wheat farmers in a rich western valley. Coniston and Mr. Crewe's Career by Winston Churchill (the American novelist) described political corruption in New England. Booth Tarkington's The Gentleman from Indiana recounted an honest man's struggle with a political boss and with organized crime.

The pure food and meat inspection laws passed in 1906 during Theodore Roosevelt's administration demonstrated the effectiveness of the muckrakers. Articles in The Ladies' Home Journal and Collier's Weekly revealed that so-called patent medicines were generally useless and sometimes contained dangerous drugs. The American Medical Association joined the crusade against such preparations, as well as against the adulteration of food by preservative chemicals. Federal regulation was opposed by some senators who declared it unconstitutional to interfere with the "liberty" of a citizen

---

\(^{16}\) Ibid., pp. 529-530.
Nevertheless, a combination of presidential pressure and widespread demand proved irresistible, and the Pure Food and Drug Law was enacted. A similar law was inspired by the best-selling novel The Jungle, by Upton Sinclair, which portrayed horribly unsanitary conditions in slaughterhouses. When Roosevelt learned that many of Sinclair's charges were true, he became, as Mark Sullivan has written, "all act." He overwhelmed opposition to federal inspection of meat by threatening to publish the most sensational findings of a committee which had secretly investigated the abuses. Within a short time Congress passed a Meat Inspection Act.

111.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations are verified?

James Lomack claims that generalizations constitute the structure of a discipline; that they serve as a guide for the selection of content, and by definition point to the appropriate referents. 17 This is not the way structure is viewed by Schwab. But Schwab and Lomack do share common opinions about structure. Both express the belief that conclusions and generalizations must be verified and that this is done by pointing to the applicable referent.

In the above paragraphs a number of conclusions and generalizations are expressed. The first sentence, for example, states that some muckrakers were novelists. Then appropriate book titles are listed as referents. Later in the topic the authors conclude that "a combination of presidential pressure and widespread demand proved irresistible, and the Pure Food and Drug Law was enacted." Thus the works of the muckrakers and subsequent legislation are causally connected. It seems reasonable to ask, why was not some evidence offered in direct support of this linkage? After all, when scholars move from raw data to a conclusion or generalization the reader is apt to become lost unless he is shown the logical movement from one step to the other. Niswack claims that an "understanding" necessitates the exposure of the referent. Schwab would doubtless make the same argument. In this instance a structure of knowledge is not revealed. With certain minimal but basic changes in thrust it might.

2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

Perhaps one of the big questions relative to textbook writing is, what am I trying to achieve with the reader?

10 ibid., p. 41.
This may be one of those questions which a textbook writer cannot avoid answering. To fail to ask it and write anyway is to answer the unasked question. It follows, then, that Bragdon and McCutchen decided they were trying to initiate the young reader into an understanding of "what actually happened." The "how's" and "what-if's" were largely left unattended. Such a conclusion is to denigrate neither the authors nor the product but rather to furnish a rationale which may explain why the problem of primary and secondary evidence is not discussed.

Several contemporary authors are referenced. Apparently the authors intended reference to the works of these authors to serve as primary evidence. We might ask, were these authors writing about what they experienced and saw or about what they heard or were told? Is this accurate reporting, or are the accounts fictionalized and perhaps distorted? The student ought to be alerted to the relatively unstable nature of such evidence. As the topic is written we do not know how seriously to take the conclusions. We cannot be certain of the reliability of the referents. The movement from raw data to finished product leaves something to be desired, if we are interested in the exposition of a particular structure of knowledge.
3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

Probably few historians -- perhaps none -- have ever written with sufficient evidence to support every conclusion which had to be drawn or every generalization which had to be made. The nature of the historian’s job requires him to write even when this is the case. The story must go on. Yet few historians reveal when this is the case. This is a bold, but provocative, generalization. Perhaps the limitations of this investigation do not warrant it. Nevertheless, the topic under discussion demonstrates this assertion.

At one point the authors say, "The pure food and meat inspection laws passed in 1906 during Theodore Roosevelt's administration demonstrated the effectiveness of the muckracker." Based on the evidence presented in the narrative, we might say that this conclusion demonstrates the drawing of an historical conclusion based on insufficient evidence. This is not to say the conclusion is unwarranted. The evidence in which it is grounded simply appears to be hidden. Is the youthful student to assume that whatever muckraker novelists wrote into works of fiction is sufficient evidence on which to ground sweeping conclusions and generalizations? Such evidence may be necessary, but hardly
sufficient. Could not other evidence be mustered: congressional debate, reports of investigating committees, newspaper accounts, etc.? Even if not directly cited, could not the student be made cognizant of the fact that other, sufficient, evidence exists which could cause the conclusions to be warranted?

The last topic examined in the quest for syntactical structure is taken from the Epilogue. In the Prologue the authors posited 10 themes which they suggested run throughout American history. In the Epilogue these themes were again examined to summarize how each was seen in the American story. Theme #2 is "wide participation in politics." Theme #6 is "belief in education and widespread educational opportunity." These two themes are quoted below.

Wide participation in politics. Today the belief that the people of the United States can run their own affairs is challenged. Some local governments are so inefficient or corrupt that they frustrate the popular will. In local elections it is often difficult to determine what the popular will is, since many voters are apathetic and

19 A structure of knowledge is less likely to be found in a summary of this nature than in the text proper or in a more particularized summary. The purpose of this investigation is not to prove that a structure of knowledge does not exist in history textbooks or to criticize the way the books are written. It seems reasonable, then, to investigate all major areas of the books.

stay away from the polls. At the national level the Cold War presents the constant danger that matters of national importance will be decided without public debate, or even in secret. There is, however, widespread political discussion of most major problems, foreign and domestic. Elections are vigorously contested. The caliber of men going to politics has seldom, if ever, been higher. Within the past decade the formerly disfranchised Negroes of the South have entered actively into politics, and in the North, blacks have been chosen for high political office. There is no visible danger that democratic processes will be replaced by another system of government.

Belief in education and widespread educational opportunity. As academic education becomes an increasing necessity for employment in a society that has less use for unskilled labor, the number of years of formal schooling has increased. Today the majority of American boys and girls finish high school, and, if present trends continue, the majority will soon go on to college. But the quality and accessibility of education vary widely, according to institution, locality, and relative wealth.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations are verified?

These two themes essentially amount to a series of generalizations and conclusions. Evidently, the authors assume that the entire book serves as evidence to support these statements. They do not say this. The statement, "Today the belief that the people of the United States can run their own affairs is challenged," demonstrate a
generalization without supporting evidence. The authors could have added, "as we say in our discussion of..." They did not. It seems reasonable to expect that even in a summary such as this the themes ought to either be referred to when they are seen in the body of the text, or the summary ought to refer to the appropriate place in the text from which it is derived. Neither technique is used, even though the student is told at the beginning of the book to look for these themes.

In both the themes summarized above the authors seem to be presenting a paradox: on the one hand they say government is challenged and education is increasing; on the other hand, the point is made that democratic processes are now being seriously challenged and the quality of education varies widely due to various factors. Yet they nowhere introduce the concept of paradox or seeming contradiction as an underlying factor in the study of history. Perhaps they should have, if they were going to focus on the concept in the summary.

All of this is to say that the examination of the "themes" which allegedly weave their way through the American story fails to expose a structure of knowledge. Yet the potential for the creation of a structure may be present.
2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

There is no indication that the authors in any way intend to distinguish between primary and secondary evidence in the above paragraphs. The implicit assumption seems to be that the generalizations and conclusions included rest squarely on the discussion in the body of the text. If such an assumption is intended, it ought to be stated. This would mean that the conclusions and generalizations are based on the authors' interpretation of the history of the American people. In turn, this would mean that the foregoing are grounded in secondary evidence -- that is, the interpretation of Braden and McCutchen. If the above conclusions could be drawn without the book as supporting evidence, then they are presented wholly without grounding. It would follow then, that support in the form of evidence would need to be garnered; unless, of course, the conclusions and generalizations can stand alone, which is unlikely.

3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

Although not included in the topics quoted for analysis here, when the authors summarized their examination of the ten themes they guardedly concluded that all ten are still relevant in American society today. We do not know why or how they are relevant. Unless, of course, the entire
book is the evidence. This is probably a reasonable assumption. But it leaves some unanswered questions. Can high school students identify such nebulous concepts as political participation and educational opportunity as they read a text which chronologically presents "one damn thing after another"? Would it not be more educative to reflect, in one of several possible ways, the evidence to which the summation points? One swallow does not make a spring, and one educated black man does not make "educational opportunity" for all. Nor does legislation on the books, guaranteeing the legal right to vote, or to be educated, equate with the opportunity to do so. The themes may run throughout American history, but the scope and depth of their influence is not apparent. Not as they are stated.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

For the most part, the preceding analyses have ended with the conclusion that a structure of knowledge, as posited by Schwab, does not exist in the History of a Free People. The intent is not to be negative, but to state as openly as possible what results from asking certain probing questions.

There may be cause for optimism on the part of those who advocate the concept of a structure of knowledge. The potential for the creation of a structure, by rewriting textbooks with specific concern for the nature of the knowledge, may exist.

It may also be in order to say that if a structure of knowledge either exists, or can be created, it need not necessarily be reflected in a rigid, dogmatic way in textbooks. But it might be a pedagogically fruitful way to focus on the nature of the knowledge, as textbooks reflect that knowledge. Obviously more investigation is needed. We cannot yet generalize on the basis of the current investigation. But we have more evidence on which to proceed than we had before. Hopefully, further investigation will enable us to draw sharper, better defined conclusions. This in turn should lead to additional research.

SECTION III: CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE STORY OF AMERICA

This edition of the book was published in 1965. The authors are all public school administrators or teachers.

\[22\] The charge that this would be the result of the utilization of the concepts of structure has been made by various writers. See, as one example, Fred M. Newmann, "The Analysis of Public Controversy: New Focus on Social Studies," The School Review, Volume 73, Number 4 (Winter 1965), pp. 410-434.
For purposes of this investigation they are referred to as "non-professional" historians. The senior author is Harold H. Liblit, Superintendent of Schools in Columbus, Ohio. Fred H. King is Director of Instruction for the Rochester, Minnesota public schools. James Garlow teaches history in Oakland, California. And Milton Finkelstein is an Assistant Principal at Inwood Junior High School in New York City.

The present edition was published in 1965. It contains 672 pages, divided into eight units. Unit one reviews the basic Constitutional guarantees found in the Bill of Rights and a brief geographical overview. Units two through eight are chronological, beginning with the Age of Discovery and ending with the early days of the Johnson administration. Chapter three, "Guardian of Freedom," summarizes the foundation stones on which freedom in America is believed to rest.

This section of the chapter is an investigation of The Story of America, using the Schwab model of the structure of knowledge as the hermeneutic tool. Three topics are analyzed under each component of the model. A deliberate effort was made to select topics which were isomorphic to the Schwab model. The first component of the model is organizational structure.
The topics investigated in a search for organizational structure are taken from the initial chapter in Unit Three, the summary at the close of Unit Five, and the last chronological chapter in the text, chapter 29. The first series of paragraphs are the introductory statements from chapter 5, "The Struggle for a Continent." The topic, entitled "An Important Chapter," follows:

England and France fought four wars in America between 1669 and 1763. These wars slowed the growth of the English colonies toward the Appalachians. They also helped bring on the freedom of our land from England.

The first three wars began in Europe. They then spread to the colonies in America. It is known as the French and Indian War. England won this hard struggle. Now England alone would rule in North America!

Why were these wars so important?
(1) Since the English won, life in our land has followed English ideas, not French ones. (2) The wars cost the English a great deal. They then changed the way they treated their colonies. They felt they could make the colonies pay the cost of the wars. (3) The people of the colonies soon grew angry. They fought to be free. (4) After a long war, they became free and independent.

---

The study of these wars will help you understand why we broke away from England.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

John Herman Randall, Jr. claims there is a sense in which all disciplines are rooted in history. Conversely, history sheds light on all subject matter in a peculiar way. It is quite possible to know the history of a subject and still not understand the subject. Looked at the other way around, the argument could be made that we do not fully understand anything until we know something of its history. There is a sense in which we can be educated with or without knowing history. But there is something peculiarly educative about the study of history.

When one studies history, he studies not everything, during all time. Rather, he studies with a particular temporal and spatial focus. The lead sentence in the topic quoted above focuses on four French and English wars, in

---

America, between 1609 and 1703. Although the authors do not say so, within this focus is the study of military strategies and tactics, economic policies, political machinations, and social systems. If we studied any one of these areas, separately we could do so without necessarily studying history. Or we could study the history of each of them without necessarily studying its relationship to any one of the others. But when we put them all together and study how each interacted with the other within a specific temporal/spatial focus, we call this history. It is a unique way of studying and can be peculiarly educative. No other discipline makes this approach. But these aspects of history as an area of study are not revealed in the above selection. They may be implicit in what is written. They are not made explicit.

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the disciplines?

It might be possible to support the claim that most subject matter in American schools is treated as theoretical. This may often be done unconsciously. He then

expect students to deal with subject matter in an abstract way, without understanding the nature of what is being studied. Such an approach, while widespread, demands an ability to synthesize and a degree of sophistication which the simple variable of maturity may preclude many high school students having. Such may be true of the above topic.

If we can use the classical organizations of knowledge to help us make clear-cut distinctions about the educative role and function of various disciplines our understanding of our own purposes may be enhanced. But if we take a "flat surface" approach to disciplines, which sees them all alike, we do a disservice to both teaching and learning. The authors of this text did not deal with the question of the relationship of history to other disciplines. Their concern was with the presentation of the facts and not with what is the purpose of history as a part of the school curriculum. Hunt and Metcalf, among other, have claimed that unless knowledge is related to the purposes and needs of the individual we cannot claim it is knowledge in the sense that it is personally educative. If we do not indicate what the role of history is in the curriculum we ought not be surprised if

---

our students fail to relate to it personally. One of the functions of the concept of a structure of a discipline may be to unveil what is peculiarly educative about the discipline. Even though we have not succeeded in accomplishing that unveiling, perhaps the asking of another question will do so.

3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

The above topic is pregnant with possibilities for teaching history. Scholars who eschew the claim that history has controlling laws, and therefore can be used as a basis for prediction, are reticent to state what the uses of history may be. Such a predilection, coupled with the practical constraints facing a textbook writer, may be sufficient reason to "stick to the fact." Yet it is difficult to escape the gnawing suspicion that textbooks could be more educative if textbook writers could escape the influence of 19th century historism. Is the above topic, which is an introduction to a chapter on revolution and war, intended to initiate the reader into the richness of his heritage and the peculiarly "American" characteristics of America? Is it intended to show him that a people must struggle to be free? Or that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty"? Or that there are times when revolt and war are justified by the circumstances? These may not all
be viable, or even moral, reasons for teaching history. But obviously the authors believe history as uses. These uses may range from the practical to the most complex and theoretical. They may include the most base acts of man to his most noble. They may tell us something about the animal in man or about his loftiest endeavors. The question, as far as the purposes of this investigation is concerned, is, why would it not be educationally efficacious to raise these uses of history to the level of student visibility? If we strove to create a structure of knowledge in history would this happen? The question is only indirectly related to this study. But it might lead to a fruitful investigation of the nature of historical knowledge. As the above selection is written, it does not exhibit an organizational structure of knowledge.

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

The authors themselves raise the question, "Why were these wars so important?" They then list four reasons: our heritage is more English than French; the wars represented a turning point in the English attitude toward the colonies; the colonies were angered; and the stage was set for the revolution. In a sense, this list represents a taxonomy. We could argue that each reason increased the likelihood that a peculiar American nation would be born.
But this does not answer the question as to why such information is worth knowing. Will knowing it enrich our lives? Will it have some kind of effect on the way we order our lives, now or in the future? Will it give us a deeper understanding of the nature of our institutions? It is one thing to say that all knowledge is important. The importance, and therefore the worth to the individual, may depend on the use to which the information is put. It is quote something else to say that all knowledge ought to be taught. The worth of knowledge will vary with the need of each individual. If there is such a thing as "textbook knowledge" which all students ought to know, then we ought to pay especial attention to the question of why information is worth knowing. Even some writers of the American history textbooks voice such a contention. It may be true that Croce is right to assert that when we study history "what the poet said happens." Still, every student may neither appreciate nor need the same kind of "poetry."

The second topic investigated in the quest for organizational structure is from the summary of Unit Five, "A Great Crisis." The time is the years immediately preceding and during the Civil War. Respectively, the two sections included are, "The Jackson Years" and "A Civil War."
Our country had many problems between 1820 and 1860. The people of the three sections, West, South, and North, wanted different laws. In 1829 Andrew Jackson, our first President to come from the common people, brought new ideas with him. For the next twelve years, Jackson's ideas were to lead his country.

Jackson gave many government jobs to his political friends. This began what we call the "spoils system." He hated the Indians, and forced many of them to move west of the Mississippi. He ended the strong national bank, and did much to help "pet banks" in the states. These banks lent money to men who bought and sold land in the West. This meant that not enough bank money was left for other needs. Many people were against Jackson's ideas; some of them formed the Whig party and tried to defeat him in the election of 1836.

A four-year civil war began soon after a number of Southern states left the Union and formed a confederacy. Their soldiers fired on and took Fort Sumter. President Lincoln had sworn to preserve the Union. He called for 75,000 volunteers to protect federal property. The civil war that followed cost our country billions of dollars and took more than 600,000 lives.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?

If we were building a curriculum and wanted to include all the major areas of knowledge, we might begin by making
a list: the sciences, literature, the arts, philosophy, music, the social sciences, and so forth. Would it be necessary to include history as a separate discipline? Depending on our point of view, we might answer either yes or no. It would be possible to study the history of each discipline in conjunction with the study of the concepts within the discipline. For many years this approach was followed. It is significant in American education that the first university history professorship was in 1679. It may be even more significant that subsequent to this date, history as a field of study in America flourished and grew prodigiously. Apparently those making curriculum and related decision believed that the study of history was uniquely educative. We often refer to it as the synthesizing discipline. If it is, should not this function be made explicit?

The lead sentence in the above topic bears on the national problems between 1620 and 1660, a tremendous coverage. It suggests that if problems existed in any area they are subject to review by the student of history. No other discipline attempts such a monumental task. In this sense history is peculiarly educative. It is concerned both with all of man’s doings and the order in which they occurred.

---

It is peculiar, if we are concerned with the student learning something of the nature of the knowledge, that the above topic does not allude to the educative role of the study of history. Structure, in the sense in which Schwab defined it, is not revealed.

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classical organizations of the discipline?

In his discussion of the uniqueness of disciplines, Schwab discusses only the Platonic, Aristotelian, and Comtian organizations of knowledge. All three are hierarchically arranged, with the more theoretical and complex disciplines at the top. Such an arrangement can be misleading, if we assume that a hierarchy may suggest: that those disciplines at the top of the hierarchy are more difficult and less practical. John Dewey, among others, has suggested that such a dichotomy is both misleading and mis-educative. History may be especially vulnerable to misconceptions when viewed in relationship to such an arrangement.

---


While the above topics do not directly relate history to any organization of the disciplines, they do draw from other disciplines to construct a synthesis and "round out" the narrative. A number of political and economic concepts are discussed: spoils system, preservation of the Union, national banks, and federal property, to name but a few. If we should attempt to relate this fragment of textbook history to one of the three organizations Schwab discussed, where in the hierarchy would we put it? Can we assume that all the disciplines whose concepts are included would be at the same place in the arrangement? Probably not. But if so, where would we put history, which has no concepts of its own (unless it is chronology) but uses the concepts of other disciplines? The problems are apparent. It is also apparent that we have not conjured up or identified a particular organizational structure of knowledge. Perhaps asking additional questions will be more fruitful.

3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

"Why study history?" is one of the old, unflattering questions with which teachers of history are still confronted. Lurking subtly beneath the surface is an indictment of what history has long been thought to be and how it has been taught. Questions about why and how have been reserved to the "professional" historian or the philosopher of history.
Even people who "major" in history at colleges and universities usually do not seriously deal with these questions until they reach the advanced year of college, or graduate school. The study of history is usually thought of as learning the facts. And we cannot think about the nature of the disciplines, or its uses, until we know the facts. At the same time, we require students to study history from elementary school on. It may not be out of order to suggest that this study would be enhanced if students were helped and encouraged to think about the uses of history.

In the topics under consideration we are not told what use we may make of our study. An implicit suggestion may be that we need to know why the Civil War began. But we do not know why we ought to know why. Does it in any way relate to how we order our intellectual, moral, or everyday lives? Can we better understand the problems of today's world if we understand its antecedents? Or, could the authors be suggesting that to know the past means that we can know the present and predict the future? Or is history an art or literary form? If so, why not dispense with so many facts and return to writing history in the style of Thucydides? Or perhaps the study of history has many other advantages and uses? Since it places a strong emphasis on synthesis perhaps it is the most educative of
all studies. "Oh, history. What a lot of rot," said the girl in Willa Cather's *Moving Finger*. Must students en masse continue to say so? Would teaching the structure of a discipline eliminate this dilemma? If a discipline has no structure, in its present form, can we create one? Perhaps. If so, this must be done if we want a structure of knowledge reflected in the above topics.

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

It is a fallacy to assume that all that is known must be taught. Such would be an impossible task. It would also be an exercise in futility, frustration, and morale destruction. To possess information, concepts, generalizations is one thing. To have this knowledge under control so that it is meaningful and therefore worth something is another matter indeed. What is it about the pre-Civil War and Civil War period that is worth our knowing? Is it knowledge of Jackson's heritage? The magnitude of his personality? The cost of the war? This information is given. Does knowing this in any way clarify our understanding of the past, or help us value more precisely, or live more empathetically,

---

10 This story is recounted by Philip Jordan in "The Usefulness of Useless Knowledge," *The Historian*, Volume XXII, Number 3 (May 1960), p. 244.
in the present? By knowing this will we somehow build a better country, a better world, a better future? Or do we understand more perfectly the awfulness of war, eschew it like no other people, and therefore become more peaceful, or more probing in our search for solutions to problems which preclude the threat of war? There are a myriad of facts and concepts about Jackson, the ante-bellum South, the horrors of the Civil War which one might learn. But why? What makes them worth knowing? The authors do not say. Yet they present selected facts, concepts, conclusions, generalizations. We infer they think these are important. They just do not say why. We will look at additional topics. Perhaps these will be more productive.

The topic below is entitled "Problems after the war." It comes from chapter 29, "Problems at Home." This is the last chronological chapter in the book and the middle chapter is Unit 0, "America in a Changing World."

By the end of World War II, our country was a leader in world affairs. World problems became our problems. Each year we have seen our power grow, and have had to do more and more all over the world.

What was to be done with the captured leaders of the Axis Powers? These men had taken away human rights, had killed people without cause, and had started the most terrible war in history. We worked together with our allies and the new governments in Europe. A number of "war crime" trials were held in Nuremberg, Germany, and other places between 1945 and 1950. In these trials Nazi leaders were charged with the murder of thousands of Jews and other groups of people. Many of these men were found guilty and sent to prison. Some were hanged. Some were set free. It was hoped that these trials would help all nations understand that our world would never again allow the kind of crimes of which the Nazis had been guilty.

Some of the Nazi leaders had escaped. One of these was a man named Adolf Eichmann. He had been in charge of finding Jews and getting them to the camps where they were killed. He found a place to hide in Argentina. In 1960 Israeli agents found him there. They secretly forced him to return to Israel with them. The Israeli government tried him for his part in killing six million Jews. The court found Eichmann guilty of crimes against the Jewish people and "against humanity". He was hanged.

Many of our new problems were caused by the cold war and the Communist plan to rule the world. Bit by bit our people came to understand that they would have to lead the free world as it tried to build world peace. Let us now see what we, through our presidents and Congress, have done since World War II to help solve some of these problems.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Is the uniqueness of history as a discipline revealed?
The title, "Problems after the war," is broad enough to cover every area of life. Included is a rather limited number of problems. Some are political, some economic, some sociological, and some philosophical and moral. Yet the topic is not a study of any of these in particular. It is an attempt to relate all of these problems in such a way that the reader gets an impression of the many, complex problems facing the nation following 1945. This is a peculiar function of the discipline of history. We might claim that the study of history ought also to direct us to probe beneath the surface to answer the questions of cause and motivation. Such probing would help us reflect on problems, in the context of time, in a way that would be uniquely enlightening. As it is written, the information is simply presented in a synthetic, but descriptive, way. It is not particularly provocative in terms of underlying themes or the nature of the discipline. But it might have been. Perhaps asking another question will be helpful.

2. Is there evidence that the authors attempt to relate history to one of the classification organizations of the disciplines?

Essentially, the topic under consideration is descriptive, not analytic. There is little attempt to probe beyond the facts to solve some of the problems which might be raised by the question. What are "human rights"? Whose
morality is to be followed? Are there standards for human conduct which transcend all barriers? What was at stake in the Eichmann case? At Nuremberg? Should the American reasons for opposing Communism be the reasons invoked by other nations?

How the authors view the information presented, in relation to other disciplines, is not made explicit. Presumably, they were attempting to give an overview. This is basic to the historian's purpose. But they did not probe. If they wanted us to see the need to think objectively about such matters as war and the role of man in history, then we could assume they might be relating what they said to the Platonic organization. If they were trying to get us to think in metaphysical terms or in terms of ideals, we might assume they were following the Aritotelian organization. If they were attempting to impress upon the reader the complexity of human interaction, we might judge that they were opting for the Comtian organization. The truth is, there was no apparent attempt to relate these paragraphs to any formal organization of knowledge. We assume the authors think that history is peculiarly educative. Why they think so is not stated. How the information found in this book can be used to "confront the past" is not addressed. How, if this topic represents a structure of knowledge is not revealed.
3. Do the authors say what they believe the uses of history to be?

In relation to the total topic, a considerable amount of space is devoted to the discussion of "man's inhumanity to man." Out of four paragraphs, the two longest ones deal with war criminals in general and Adolf Eichmann in particular. The authors, who seemed to eschew the mass executions of the Nazis, presumed to explain the Nuremberg adjudications on the basis that they were necessary to teach all people that "our world would never again allow the kind of crimes of which the Nazis had been guilty." We might raise some questions: was this the officially stated purpose of the trials? Is it the interpretation of the authors? Are the authors indirectly saying that the study of history teaches us loftier standards of morality and thereby improves the quality of life? Are they suggesting that the knowledge of how war crimes were handled will be better? These or other reasons may have prompted the writing. It is axiomatic that they believe history has uses. What those uses are is not said. We can only conjecture. But beyond conjecture, we can claim that the young student needs to know why he is studying what he is studying. There is a large body of research, not cited here, which demonstrates the nonsense of nonsense learning. Perhaps if the
authors addressed themselves to the nature of the knowledge, by attempting to exhibit a structure of knowledge, learning would be both more sensible and more meaningful.

4. Do the authors indicate why the information they included is worth knowing?

There is a long tradition in western culture which says that knowledge will liberate us from ignorance and thereby improve the quality of life. It is widely believed that a "liberal arts" education makes a well-rounded person. There are some basic assumptions underpinning these claims which we will not deal with in this investigation. But we will deal with the question of history, as exhibited in this topic, and its relationship to the liberal arts. If history is attached to the liberal arts tradition, and if what is written in history textbooks is supposed to represent a part of the discipline of history, how does what is said in this topic liberate? Or for what other reasons is it worth knowing? Does the knowledge that Eichmann was apprehended and hanged improve our lives? We are not told anything about the standards of law or morality which dictated this decision. Does the notion that the Communists have vowed to rule the world help us to better deal with communism? The plethora of disjunctive opinion and argument involved in this entire controversy is not alluded to. We could also be told facts about early statesmen who suffered from gout, or heroes
whose private lives were immoral. But why is this information worth knowing? Much of it is unimportant and irrelevant. Considering the limited space and words allotted textbook authors, it seems reasonable to assume that what they have written is important to their overall purposes. It might be tremendously educative to make this explicit. Such is not the case here.

II. SUBSTANTIVE STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCEPTS?

The three topics discussed under this component all come from the narrative portion of the text. The first one is from chapter 4, "Europeans Build Colonies in America." This is one of two chapters in Unit Two, "Exploration and Colonization." The following section is entitled "The Connecticut Colony (1633-1636)." 12

The Puritan leaders of Massachusetts were very strict men. They ran the colony as if it were part of their church. Some of the people there did not like this. They made plans to leave. Soon some had moved out of the Bay Colony's lands. Some left for reasons of religion. Others left to find a place with better soil, or some place where they could make a better living.

The land which is now Connecticut had been settled by the Dutch. In 1633 they built a fort where Hartford is today. That year a man from Massachusetts went along the valley of the Connecticut River. He

12 ibid., p. 77.
brought back a good report. During the next three years some Plymouth and Bay Colony families moved south. They began the towns of Windsor, Wethersfield, and Hartford.

Thomas Hooker led the largest of these groups. He had been the minister of a church near Boston. He spoke well and has been called the "Son of Thunder." He told his people that a colony should be ruled by a group elected by all. This is the idea you carry out today in your own school. It was a new idea in Boston 300 years ago! Hooker even said that all citizens should be allowed to vote whether they were church members or not. Hoocker's group left Boston rather than stay where they felt they were not really free.

By 1636 there were 300 people in the towns of Connecticut. In 1639 they joined their towns to make a new colony which they named Connecticut. Now people could follow Hooker's ideas. They wrote some of them into their plan of government. They called it the Fundamental Order of Connecticut. This was the first time that English colonists wrote out a Constitution, or a full set of rules, for their government.

What made these rules different? They said that the people were the ones who ruled (not the king). Laws would be made by a group chosen by the people of the towns. A governor and judges would be elected. All men had equal rights, whether or not they were church members.

11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?
We do not find an explicit indication of a frame of reference either in this topic or in the overall organization of the book. Chapter one is a general introduction revolving around the guarantees of personal freedom in the Bill of Rights. Chapter two is a geographical orientation to the North American Continent. Chapter 30, "Guardian of Freedom," is an attempt to synthesize the story of America and focus on what it means to be free and what the retention of freedom requires. The 27 chapters in between are devoted almost exclusively to a chronological description of what happened. There are no clear statements which say, "This is the way we view the story of America and this is what we think it means for young Americans today." Occasionally the narrative is interspersed with statements designed to focus the reader's attention on the concepts of democracy and freedom. Such a statement is found in the above topic: "He told his people that a colony should be ruled by a group elected by all. This is the idea you carry out today in your own school. It was a new idea in Boston 300 years ago!" These statements are usually accented by use of the exclamation point. We might conclude that the authors' purpose was to instill patriotism. But this does not say much about their frame of reference or what guided the selection of content. Can we assume that there is some philosophical relationship between building patriotism and the mild rebellion of Thomas
Hooker? Perhaps. Just what this relationship might be is probably too nebulous for the young student. The emphasis is obviously on "Courage" and not the nature of knowledge. There is no direct attempt to reveal the predisposition of the historian or the constraints placed on him by the nature of his task.

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

In research and statistical terms "validity" is used to express how well something does what it is designed to do. Schwab uses this term to talk about disciplines. He means to reflect on whether the subject matter is representative of the discipline and if its complex nature is revealed. Insofar as the above topic deals with the founding of Connecticut, we can conclude that it has validity. The major section under which this topic is subsumed is "The English Colonies in America." Connecticut was an English colony. This does not answer some basic questions, however: Should students be expected to perceive the complexity and scope of what is written? When validity is not made explicit are students inadvertently misled into assuming that all that "actually happened" is recorded? Do students understand that written history is selected facts, molded into a story whose thrust is largely determined by the authors? These are serious questions. They point up the complexity of both the historian's craft and the task one faces when
attempting to reflect the integrity of a discipline in a
textbook. As long as factual coverage, served up in
descriptive fashion, remains the central concern we are apt
to see little change from what is traditionally found in
textbooks.  

Structure, to echo William Lowe, may offer a
feasible, efficacious alternative, even though it is not
reflected in this topic.

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point
to the referents they reflect?

The initial sentence in this topic points to a
referent: "The Puritan leaders of Massachusetts were very
strict men." But the referent is not revealed. Clearly,
we cannot make such generalizations without grounding them
in reliable sources. Yet here is an example of a generali­
zation which we must accept or reject without evidence.
The emphasis seems to be on following the "story" rather
than reflecting on the concepts.

The entire topic is jammed with facts. There are
seven distinct facts stated in the first paragraph. The

13 This point is discussed by Harry S. Broudy in The
Scho
talists and the Public School, Bode Memorial Lectures
(Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State
University, 1963).

14 William T. Lowe, Structure and the Social Studies
reason for the use of these particular facts is left unsaid. Yet there are several queries we might make: Are all the facts important or are they given to support the generalization? Considering that they are all different facts, most of which seem to be the result of the generalization rather than the cause ("Some people there did not like this,") we must conclude that the generalization must rest on another premise. But what that premise is we do not know. Could it be the Mayflower Compact? Bradford's history? Had inquiry and reflection been basic to the authors' purposes perhaps these questions would be addressed. The one referent to which reference is directly made is the Fundamental Orders of Connecticut. But all we know about this is that it represented the first written constitution in the English colonies. Nothing is said about its European antecedents or how it fits.

Another opportunity to reflect the nature of history and historical inquiry which is brushed then passed by, is the reference to the joining of the towns into "a new colony which they named Connecticut." This seems an obvious opportunity to reveal how events of lasting importance often happen. What is the relationship between "Connecticut" and the concept "to join"? What is important for students to know? Is it the information or how to query the information for meaning and insight? We cannot reasonably claim that a
factual, descriptive hodge-podge of information, molded into a narrative, represents a "confrontation with the past." The use of the concept of structure might help. But first let us ask more "telling questions."

4. is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

Schwab has reasoned that conclusions and generalizations ought to focus on the appropriate referents because this will reveal the ephemeral quality of the knowledge.¹⁵ Even when referents are cited and the information appears unambiguous, the problem of how to order and interpret the facts remains. These processes, almost by definition, make the knowledge ephemeral. Because history is ex post facto we cannot assume that it does not or will not change. When viewed in this manner, we also see that the assumption that history is "covering the facts" is misleading and miseducative. The facts may not change (although in some instances they do and in many cases they are added to and thereby changed), but the interpretation changes.¹⁶ The way different historians in different periods relate the facts to each other and to the times changes.


¹⁶ An example of historical interpretation changing after new facts were discovered is the work of Schliemann in Greece. See Robert Payne, The Gold of Troy (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1959).
None of these points are suggested by the above topic. If anything, we might infer that the authors were striving to instill love of country and the appreciation of democracy. Although this use of knowledge is not infrequent, it does raise some questions about the purpose of studying history in a democracy. Beyond that, it raises the question of collateral learning. Besides the facts, what should students learn? The concluding sentence in this topic indirectly points to peripheral learning, learning about the nature of the knowledge, which is left unattended. Is it true, as the authors assert in this sentence, that "All men had equal right"? Is this a bland generalization? When probed, would the generalization betray many exceptions, based on birthright, office, economics, beliefs, and other factors? The documents which issued from Hooker's endeavors may have only paid lip-service to equality. The authors' interpretation might change if we would query the facts more closely. The concept of structure might furnish a framework within which such a query could be made. We will investigate additional topics to see.

The following topic is entitled, "Middle Class Life." It comes from Chapter 23, "Life in America Since 1850." In sweeping fashion, the authors review many of the innovations

of everyday life, entertainment, and the arts which have made their advent within the last 100 years. "Middle Class Life" follows.

How did the people in our middle class live? Some of them had enough money to do some of the things the rich were doing. They went to horse shows and the opera, and even traveled to Europe. But most of them could not afford these things. They chose to spend their money in such ways as educating their children. They worked hard and saved enough money to send their sons to college, and sometimes their daughters as well.

Middle class people lived in all of our states. They built comfortable homes, many in the way people then built in Europe. We can still find such houses in most of our towns and cities. Large churchlike windows were popular. The houses had many decorations on the outside. Most of these homes had well-kept lawns, and gardens with flowers and shrubs. They had large porches, on which the family might read the papers or visit with their friends. Porch swings could be seen on most streets. These were homes for good, easy living.

In the 1890's most city houses used gas lights. In the country and in the small towns people still used kerosene lamps. Most towns and cities had running water, and perhaps bathrooms in some of the private homes. The kitchen stoves burned wood and coal; a woman who prepared a meal had to tend the stove with care.

By 1900 many new ideas had come into use to improve the way people lived. Edison's electric light bulb helped change the inside of more and more homes. Gas stoves took the place of the old kitchen stoves. With the ice box, food could be kept fresh. Every housewife came to depend on the regular visits of the ice wagon. Many more homes had plumbing and their own hot water as city water systems were improved. Some people had telephones.
Canned and packaged goods were found in most kitchens. As you read in Chapter 10, the telephone was soon to be followed by the radio and then by TV. All of these new ideas led to life as we know it in our country today.

11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS?

1. Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?

The chapter from which this topic is excerpted has the curious distinction of being the initial chapter in a unit dealing with America's foreign involvements subsequent to 1950. The remaining four chapters in the unit are related to foreign affairs. This raises a rather obvious question: Do the authors somehow link how America lived with foreign relations? Quite clearly such a connection can be made, but we are hard pressed to find it revealed in this topic. We read about the technological improvements enjoyed by the middle class, but are told nothing about the increased stresses these benefits brought. In a sense, the authors have idealized middle class living. If our earlier claim is correct, that one of the purposes of the book is to instill patriotism, then we must conclude that the fostering of middle class standards must be viewed by the authors as somehow consonant with patriotism. If this is not the authors' point of view, then we are at a loss to tease out
of the above paragraphs what their frame of reference may be. They do not carefully delineate this for the student. To have done so would have been educative. It would have communicated the idea that history is both what happened and how historians choose to write it.

2. Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?

"Life in American Since 1850" has several sections. One of them, "Life in Cities and Towns," is the section under which the topic quoted above is subsumed. The accent is on middle-class domestic life. Specifically, the accent is on how the quality of life was improved by technological improvements. Yet we suspect that there was more to middle class life than increased ease. Life was, and is, more complex than these paragraphs reveal. Nothing is said about the question of middle class morality. Was it improved or exacerbated by the new technology? What about "Babbittry"? Were Americans being ushered into an era where phoniness and facades were to become widespread, if not expected? Nothing is said about what percentage of the people were middle class. We are only told that "middle class people lived in all of our states." What effect did the enjoyment of the advantages of technology have on middle class attitudes toward the poor? Toward minorities?
Toward each other? These are questions which need to be raised. To describe in cursory fashion a small portion of life in American, of middle-class life, is to say little. It is neither representative of the discipline of history (it is not a broad enough synthesis) nor does it focus squarely on the complexity of the subject matter.

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to the referents they reflect?

In describing what they call the "Context for Inquiry," D. B. Gowin and J. Strzepeh list "the scene, the phenomena of interest, the basic assumptions and presuppositions, the telling questions, and the principle of evidence." The "Principle of Evidence" is then described as "what is to count as relevant evidence and what is to be rejected." No violence is done to Schwab's model of a structure of knowledge if we parallel Gowin and Strzepeh's "Principle of Evidence" with what Schwab calls a referent. In the case under consideration, the Principle of Evidence provokes the question, what is an acceptable referent for the concepts and generalizations stated? No referents are directly cited. None are dearly pointed to. In one place the authors said,

"By 1900 many new ideas had come into use to improve the way people lived." The best we can do in support of such a statement is to point to the antecedents, in the form of inventive acts, of the various technological improvements referenced. But the authors do not do this. It seems we can infer that the reader is expected either to know what the antecedents were, or that they were unimportant. Neither explanation is satisfying. It might not be amiss to suggest that the authors were more concerned with the "story" of America than with creating a "context for inquiry."

4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

The authors were reviewing middle class life in America through middle class eyes. The concluding sentence in the topic quoted above would suggest some ethnocentrism: "All of these new ideas led to life as we know it in our country today." But who is the antecedent of "we"? Middle class people? Other authors, from other backgrounds, might view this aspect of America's story far differently. The majority may honor and live by middle class standards, because it can afford to. Yet there is a vital segment of the population which does not. Or, we might ask further, would a Tocqueville or a Lord Bryce write the same topic with the same interpretation, with the same thrust? Can
the authors claim reliability? Schwab defines reliability in a discipline as a reflection of the unambiguous nature of the knowledge, as well as clearly indicating the referents. The interpretation of the above information may not be deliberately unfair or misleading. No such allegation is intended. But unless the historian unveils his frame of reference, his referents, and the complexity of his subject matter he stands to be criticized for assuming a dogmatic rather than a tentative position. Even if the facts did not change, the interpretation would. These points are not shown in this topic. We benefit by the story, but not by learning what is peculiar about the subject matter.

"An Uneasy Peace" is the title of chapter 25. This is the initial chapter in Unit Eight, "America in a Changing World." Section four of this chapter deals with the Cold War in Asia. The following topics from this section are "Life in Asia" and "Communist (Red) China." We have seen how we tried to improve the way people lived in Europe and the Americas. Our country worked with others to end poverty. We knew that communist ideas would not spread so easily when people lived better.


The people of Asia were among the poorest in the world. Few of their governments were democratic. Many parts of Asia were still controlled by European nations. Few people in most countries had ever been to school. For such reasons, it was easy for the Communists to get many people in Asia on their side after World War II.

We can imagine what the Communists said. To some they promised, "Let us help you! Follow us, and we will drive out these men from Europe who rule you." To others they cried, "Follow us, and we will drive out these rich men in your lands who give you no rights." The people in some countries in Asia listened to such words. They let the Communists take power. One of these countries was China....

The Chinese Communists, with Russian help had built a strong army. By 1949 they had defeated the Chinese government led by Chiang Kai-shek. Chian, a large part of his armies, and the leaders of his government escaped to the island of Formosa, off the coast of China. Chiang's group is called the Nationalist Chinese. They still claim to be true government of China. The United States agreed with them, and has protected Formosa.

Mao Tse-tung became China's dictator. He has said that Formosa belongs to Red China. Our ships stand between him and the island; this has made him and his followers hate the United States.

Mao is ready to spread Communism by force. He has said that war with the capitalist countries must come. Kruschev and most Russian leaders would like to spread their ideas without war. This difference has at times seemed to push the Russian and Chinese Communists far apart.
11.1. **QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:**

1. *Does the organization of the book show the authors' frame of reference?*

   A close reading of *The Story of America* reveals a missionary attitude in the authors. Democracy, particularly American democracy, is presented as the ideal way of life. This attitude can be seen in the above topic. Poverty, to focus on one example, is viewed in terms of technology. If you have technology you can produce material goods and therefore you are rich. If you lack this you are "among the poorest in the world." In a subtle, but impressive way, democracy is also associated with wealth and progress. Communism is associated with poverty and backwardness. There may be a sense in which all of this is true. The question is, is this the way textbooks ought to be written? Is the purpose in studying history to indoctrinate or to facilitate inquiry and reflection? Is it being true to the historian's calling to assume a political posture, fail to make this posture explicit, then write as if you had? This seems a harsh indictment, but based on this topic, it seems correct. We will ask more questions to probe further.

2. *Is the complexity and scope of the subject matter clearly presented?*
The historian has a responsibility to describe what his facts tell him and interpret them in the most objective manner possible. Even then it is difficult, if not impossible, to eliminate subjectivity. The strength of any system or any belief ought to allow it to stand on its own merits. Likewise, the weaknesses of any system ought not be allowed to completely obscure its strengths. Is it representative of life in Asia to report the illiteracy, the poverty, the propensity toward communism? Is that the sum of life in Asia? What about intellectual and cultural life? What about the Western responsibility for conditions which have bred poverty and illiteracy? Why do these conditions breed communism? Is it revealing of the complexity of a discipline to superficially describe such conditions, then conclude, "For such reasons, it was easy for the Communists to get many people in Asia on their side after World War II"? Ought not the student at least be told that the view being presented is one? That it has obvious shortcomings? That at most it is intended as a stimulus or springboard to confront the past, probe its depths, and come to some kind of personal conclusion? Is not this the study...

---


of history? Is it "history" to represent life under communism as all drugery? To represent Mao as "China's dictator" with no qualifying stipulations? When we have scholarship of this quality masquerading as history, we may have a viable argument for using the concept of a structure of knowledge as a context for inquiry.

3. Do the concepts and generalizations point to the referents they reflect?

Historical imagination ought to be clearly revealed for what it is. So should any other device or technique used to fill out a narrative. At least this will give the reader the prerogative of deciding for himself if he wants to accept what is written, reject it, or probe further. This bears on what Schwab calls the reliability of the discipline. To make a discipline reliable he called for raising the referents on which the concepts and generalizations are based to the level of visibility. This raises some questions about the topic under consideration: Why do the authors "imagine" what the communists may have said to Asian peoples? Is there no documentary evidence available? Do all the available sources reflect the Communists in the role of the aggressor? At one point the authors said, "We knew that communist ideas would not spread so easily when people lived better." How did they know? Are there no redeeming qualities in communism? Is it a scheme of
government and a way of life people choose only in desperation? Do all people want to live under the American style of democracy? Is it factually supportable that the Chinese "let the communists take power"? What is the "true government of China"? All these questions raise the single question, "where is the evidence? In what are these conclusions and generalizations grounded? Can textbook history claim to be true to the mother discipline when such gaping holes are allowed to appear as incontrovertible truth? In this sense, this topic has no particular substantive structure. But an additional question about the quality of knowledge may be enlightening.

4. Is the ephemeral quality of the subject matter shown?

Some revealing questions might be, would a Communist historian write this topic in the same way it is written here? Would a politically disinterested historian write it the same? Another American historian? Will any historian in 25 years write it the same? It is probably reasonable to assume that we can correctly answer no to all of the above questions. The thrust of such questioning is to emphasize the changing nature of knowledge. The same questions might receive the same answers if asked about any current history. The significant point is not that knowledge changes, but that the ephemeral quality ought to be brought into focus.
indoctrination will not keep a people free. Glossed over history that traffics in cheap flattery will not keep a people free. Abelard taught us the worth of doubt long ago. It leads to inquiry. And only inquiry will lead us to truth. Utilization of the concept of a structure of knowledge may furnish a means for inquiry. But it is not exhibited in this topic.

III. SYNTACTICAL STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPTS?

In this part of the chapter we will analyze three topics looking for syntactical structure. All three are from the narrative portion of the book. The first one is from Unit Four, "Growth of the New Nation." The chapter is entitled, "The United States Doubles Its Size." The topic is "We Buy Louisiana."

The French Minister was with Livingston one evening. All at once he asked Livingston what he would give for the whole of Louisiana! Livingston was a little deaf. He wasn't sure he had heard correctly but he replied that he was interested. The Frenchman told him to think it over and make an offer.

---


Monroe arrived at about that time. The two men met with the French. Napoleon's price was about $15,000,000. The Americans did not have the power to spend so much. However, they felt it was a small price to pay for enough land to double the size of the United States. They decided to act before Napoleon changed his mind. On April 30, 1803, they signed a treaty. Louisiana would no be part of the United States.

Jefferson was shocked at what they had done. He did not believe our Constitution gave the government the power to buy territory. We would have to amend it to allow such a treaty. But then, the French might change their minds if he were to wait. He sent the treaty to the Senate. The Senators were also shocked but they knew how important the treaty would be. They listened to those who wanted the treaty. Then they heard those who were against the treaty. When they voted, the approved the treaty.

It was not clear just how far north the new lands went. What was the boundary to be between our country and Canada? It was not until 1816 that England and the United States agreed to this question. They made the forty-ninth parallel the dividing line between Canada and our country.

iii.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations are verified?

Recorded history is a story. In spite of the fact that there may be some justification for the assertion that "History smiles at all attempts to force its flow into
theoretical patterns or logical grooves," the historian is confronted with the demand that he order his facts into some kind of gesalt and give them some kind of interpretation. Otherwise his venture becomes just more recordkeeping. He becomes a chronicler, not an historian. Yet if filling out the narrative is his sole, or even primary concern, serious questions are raised about the educative value of the study of history. The truth is, he must walk the narrow path between telling an interesting story and constantly helping the reader "confront the past" in such a way that he inquires; plumbs the depths of the material. This is particularly true of the textbook writer.

Some scholars have suggested that there is a built-in absurdity in teaching students the structure of a discipline. Built into this charge is, it seems, a fundamental misunderstanding. Learning the structure of a discipline need not be directed toward making academic scholars out of the general population. It can involve valuable education for all. Everyone is a participant in history. To understand

---


26 For example, see Fred H. Newmann, "The Analysis of Public Controversy: New Focus on Social Studies," The School Review, Volume 73, Number 4 (Winter 1965), pp. 410-434.
how scholars move from raw data to the finished product need not necessarily be aimed toward the making of historians.

The initial sentence in the above topic, as one example, focuses on a conversation between Livingston and a French minister. The "story" is emphasized. But the student does not know if he is reading "fact" or historical imagination. He may be fascinated, but there is the question whether he is being educated beyond learning the story. Anyone can tell a story. History ought to be grounded in fact. Whenever conclusive facts are not available and a reasonable judgement must be made, this ought to be made explicit. It might be argued that for the student to see the intertwining of method and content may be more educative than simply learning the story. The concept of a structure of a discipline might facilitate such learning. But it is not present in this topic.

2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

An abiding dilemma of the historian is the twin problem of too few facts and too many facts. Of the two, too few facts probably offers the greater challenge. This is another way of saying that the historian usually suffers from a paucity of primary sources. In such a situation he must rely on secondary sources or make the most accurate
judgement he can, based on whatever evidence he has.
which ever route he chooses, the reader ought to know. To
conceal this can be both miseducative for the student and
lead the historian into error.

In this topic we are told that the American diplo-
mats "felt it was a small price to pay for enough land to
double the size of the United States." How do they authors
know how they "felt"? They either have written testimony
from the hands of the diplomats themselves, someone using
other sources has come to this considered judgement, they
were using the careless opinion of others, or this is
simply how they "felt" the diplomats felt. But as it is
written, the student does not know. This may be an instance
where the historian is required, by virtue of too few facts,
to resort to less than reliable evidence. Why must this be
kept hidden from the student? This historian's dilemma
would not be diminished, but the student would learn that
history is more than a story.

3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a
generalization or reach a conclusion made
apparent?

Some historians recognize their need to generalize
and have tried to clarify this controversial issue for
themselves and their colleagues. Sometimes conclusions which are drawn, on the basis of evidence presented, have implicit within them the seeds of a generalization. Such may be the case with the topic quoted above. The authors stress that both President Jefferson and the Senate were shocked when they learned that Livingston and Monroe had negotiated a treaty for the purchase of the Louisiana territory. This claim leaves unanswered a number of questions. Was Jefferson shocked at the boldness of the diplomats? Or was it just because he thought it to be unconstitutional? And why was the Senate shocked? Are there speeches in the Congressional Record which express senatorial shock? Are there letters, pages, or diaries of senators which express shock? In short, how do the authors know there was both presidential and senatorial shock? These are firm conclusions which ought to be grounded in evidence. Perhaps they are, but is so it is not revealed. How abundant and convincing is it? Were there other, unsaid reasons, for shock? Would any president or senator, confronted with a similar act express shock? Had consideration been given to conveying something of the nature of the knowledge, these, and similar, questions might have been addressed.

The following topic is from the chapter covering the traumatic events immediately subsequent to the death of Lincoln and the formal end of the hostilities that concluded the Civil War. The two sections included are "Johnson's Plan" and "Congress and Johnson."^26

Andrew Johnson became President when Lincoln died. He wanted to follow Lincoln's plan for handling the states of the South. He asked the people of these states to set up loyal governments again and to choose officers. He invited them to send representatives to both houses of Congress as soon as they had done two things. (1) They had to refuse to pay any Confederate debts. (2) They had to vote for the Thirteenth Amendment, which abolished slavery in the United States. By December all of the states had done these two things. Southern congressmen arrived in Washington ready for duty....

Most of the Northern congressmen were Republicans; most of those who had arrived from the South were Democrats. Some of these had been Southern leaders during the war. Our Constitution says that each house of Congress can decide whether its members are fit persons. Both houses refused to seat the men who had been sent by the Southern states.

Who had the right to allow the Southern states to come back into the Union? Johnson thought he did. Congress said that it alone had this power. It refused to accept the state government that had been set up under the Johnson plan. The men who led Congress were soon in a bitter fight with Johnson.

---

In 1868 Congress voted to impeach him. Johnson was the only President ever tried for impeachment. He escaped being removed from office by one vote, but his power was gone.

III.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations are verified?

The authors draw two basic conclusions about President Johnson and Congress: He "wanted to follow Lincoln's plan," and Johnson and Congress differed over who had the right to allow the Southern states to return to the Union. In neither case is there any indication of the evidence on which these conclusions are based. Why would Johnson, a Tennessean by birth, follow Lincoln's plan? Did the Congress suspect his motives were sympathetic toward the South? Or would they likely have reacted in a similar manner to any President? On what did Johnson base his belief in Presidential power: The Constitution? Precedent? Lincoln's pattern? These are questions which might have given the student insight into the nature of history and the historian's craft. It is quite apparent that the exploration of these areas were not basic to the purposes of the authors. To have focused on such questions, within the context of the story, need not have detracted from the flow of the narrative. As it is, we cannot claim that we have revealed a structure of knowledge.
2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

Gilliom, among others, has claimed that the nature of history "prohibits the identification of a universally acceptable structure.... One must accept the fact that any given set of principles chosen from history necessarily reflects the convictions and prejudices of persons doing the selecting."29 On the face of it, such a claim seems abundantly clear. But is it? The purpose of this study is to neither defend nor attack the advocates of structure. But a part of the structure of a discipline, according to Schwab, is the demonstration of how the scholar goes from raw data to the finished product. Does the nature of historiography preclude such a revelation? Cannot the historian retain his own frame of reference and still make his methodology apparent? To say that he cannot is to continue the dichotomy between content and method, with content definitely being the important focus. It may also help continue the "dull and boring" epithet which has attached itself, parasite-like, to schoolroom, textbook history.

In this topic the authors state, "Both houses refused to seat the men who had been sent by the Southern states." On what is this statement based? Did Congress refuse to seat all of them? Just a part of them? How could a student know? Were there other reasons, not stated by the authors, why some of the Souterners may have been refused? Are the authors simply following what other historians have said? Must the student be restricted in this way? Those who advocate the utilization of the concept of a structure of knowledge quite obviously believe that the study of any discipline ought to involve more than the findings of the scholars. In this case, students ought to understand how distinctions can be made about the quality -- the validity and reliability -- of evidence.

3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

We would be hard pressed to argue with the Durants that if the lives of all people could be included in recorded history it would be a "juster," if a duller, record. But is a scarcity of Boswells the only reason the lives of most people are not recorded by historians? Clearly this is not the case. Most historians would obviously cherish additional testimony about the lives of "common people" in

---

most eras. This kind of evidence is sparse. Yet historians have to make general statements about how people lived, and how decisions were reached, based on the evidence they have. The question is, how much evidence must they have to do so?

The authors state that some of the Southerners who came to the Congress had been leaders of the Confederacy. They do not say what kind of leaders. Or who the people were. Or where they got their information. Such information would not have eroded the narrative. It might have been quite revealing of the nature of the discipline. There are not statements which say, "Some of the new members of Congress had been local officials in the South, two had been governors, and ten had been Confederate generals." Or, "Of all the new Congressmen from the South, only one had held a prominent office." The evidence, whatever it is, remains submerged in the selection quoted.

Following the Civil War, America turned a part of its attention to the expansion of the nation. The topic below, "East and West United by a Railroad," comes from chapter 10, "The Conquest of a Distance."^31

The Civil War was being fought in the East. In the West, the men who worked for these two companies fought against nature as

---

they pushed on to bind the East and West together by rail. Western products were needed by the Union armies.

They were still at work at the end of the war. The work took them longer than they had first expected. They had many problems. Where were they to get the thousands of men they needed? The Union Pacific hired large numbers of men who had just come here from Europe, many of them Irish. The Central Pacific hired some 10,000 Chinese who were brought to California to take these jobs.

The railroads were being built across Indian lands. The tribes did not want the "iron horse with little round feet" to cut across their hunting grounds. They attacked the workers; they destroyed camps and supplies; sometimes they ripped up the track.

Which company would finish its work first? The Central Pacific seemed to be winning the race. In 1866 Congress gave that Company the right to keep building across Nevada. It was to keep going eastward until its tracks met those of the Union Pacific. Now people all over the world watched to see which crew could build the most track.

The two railroad lines finally met on May 10, 1869, at Promontory, Utah, near Ogden. There a great celebration was held. Leland Stanford, California's governor, drove a golden spike into a silver-bound tie. Then two locomotives steamed forward until their fronts touched and their engineers shook hands. Then a telegraph message was sent to President Grant in Washington: "The last rail is laid, the last spike is driven. The Pacific railroad is completed!"
The Union Pacific had laid almost 1100 miles of track, part of it across the plains. The Central Pacific had laid almost 700 miles of track, most of it in rugged country.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show how conclusions and generalizations are verified?

We must recognize that, at best, the past is ambiguous. Based on the evidence he can find, the historian makes conclusions and generalizations which he hopes are unambiguous. But he recognizes that sometimes the records in which he grounds his conclusions are less than reliable. In such a case the best that he may be able to produce is a "fable agreed upon." While such a case is not always true, to a certain degree it is frequently true. The historian's problem is how to translate what he knows -- the discipline -- into viable subject matter. The question is, should this be done, ready-made, or should the student be made privy to what is involved in the translation process? The concept of a structure of knowledge opts for the latter. The authors of this text followed the former.

---

This definition of history has been attributed to Voltaire. For a discussion of Voltaire see The Varieties of History, edited by Fritz Stern (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), pp. 35-45.
The building of the transcontinental railroad may be one of the most exciting provocative stories in American history. But once the story is told, whether in imaginative language or the dull synthesis of the textbook, have all the educative possibilities been exhausted? The answer is yes if we are interested in ready-made knowledge. It is no if we are interested in a structure of knowledge. In the above paragraphs we are told very little about the premises on which the story rests. Did the authors construct the story from the literature of the period? From company records? From government papers? From personal letters or diaries? The student is not made party to these points. He is left with just the story, even though it is his education toward which the narrative is directed.

2. Is the difference between primary and secondary evidence clearly and concisely revealed?

In his 1961 ASCD address Arthur Foshay asserted that if subject matter had life it was because of the discipline behind it. If this claim has credence, it constitutes a serious indictment of public education. The textbook under consideration is a case in point. The story of the first

---

cross-continent railroad building, as a part of the story
of America, is told. But we do not know how this story was
constructed. Or how close it may be to what "actually
happened." Or how it can help a student grow intellectually.
What is it about this story that will enhance student under-
standing? The story itself? If this is not the case, then
we might question the value of this particular book, or
most textbooks.

A part of the discipline of history is the historian's
use of evidence. At best we can assemble only a small portion
of what past events were. Unless the student can see how
the historian used evidence, he is likely to understand
little of the nature of the discipline. We have paid little
attention to the whole matter of what constitutes under-
standing. In this topic, the only evidence cited is the
telegram sent to President Grant. Even then, we are not
told if this is to be considered as primary or secondary
evidence. We are not told of gaps that may exist. Or of
substitutes which may have had to be employed if primary
evidence was lacking. And if so, how much weight these
secondary or substitute sources were given. These are all
a part of the discipline itself. According to Schwab,
they are a part of the structure of any discipline. They
are not attended in this topic.
3. Is the amount of evidence necessary to make a generalization or reach a conclusion made apparent?

The matter of quantity of evidence needed to generalize is an unsettled one. What may be a sufficient amount for one generalization or conclusion may be insufficient for another. The amount of evidence available will vary from instance to instance. But perhaps this is not the salient point. The question may be, How well does this textbook reflect the discipline of history? If the discipline of history includes methodology as well as finding, we must conclude that it reflects the discipline as well as findings, we must conclude that it reflects the discipline only partially. The student simply is not told how conclusions were reached. Neither the kinds nor the amount of evidence used are discussed. The authors say that the railroads were built across Indian lands. They do not say where these lands were. They tell us that the Indians fought against the encroachment of the railroads. They do not say if this was true of all Indians, in all areas. How much do the authors know which they do not reveal? Or, are they just guessing? Or using suspect evidence? Or extrapolating on the basis of a small amount of evidence? It would be educative to know. As the book is written we do not know.
A structure of knowledge, as defined by Schwab, is not found in *The Story of America*. This does not preclude the possibility that textbooks might be written to reveal a structure of knowledge. It may mean that the Schwab model of a structure of knowledge is not applicable to history textbooks. Or it may mean that a structure of knowledge cannot be revealed through the use of content analysis, as used in this investigation. Chapter IV is an attempt to exhibit a structure of knowledge by modifying the Schwab model and adapting it specifically to history; however, the analysis of short selections is retained.

From the standpoint of the Schwab model of a structure of knowledge, *The Story of America* appears superficial. This may be because the authors had other purposes. There is evidence, for instance, that they were concerned with instilling patriotism in students. There are indications that with slight alteration a structure of knowledge might be created. This structure might correspond to the Schwab, or another model. More investigation is needed.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter was an investigation of three American history textbooks to determine if they contain a structure
of knowledge, as defined by Schwab. For purposes of readability, the chapter was divided into three sections. Section I was an investigation of *Rise of the American Nation* by Paul Todd and Merle Curti. In Section II *History of a Free People*, by Henry Bragdon and Samuel McCutchen, was examined. Section III was an analysis of *The American Story* by Harold Eibling and associates. The three components of the Schwab model were summarized, in outline form, then "telling questions" were asked in an attempt to reveal structure. In the case of each book it was concluded that structure, as represented in the Schwab model, does not exist. In all the text, the possibility seems to exist that a structure of knowledge may be created.
CHAPTER IV

CONTENT ANALYSIS USING THE MODIFIED VERSION OF THE SCHWAB MODEL

INTRODUCTION

The concept of the structure of a discipline is controversial, but relatively undeveloped. Bruner focused attention on the idea in 1960. Subsequently, many writers have dealt with the concept, some sympathetically and some critically. As yet there has been little research to determine if the concept is educationally viable or applicable to all disciplines. The discussion of a structure of knowledge in history has been particulariy volatile.

Joseph Schwab has defined structure. He created a three-pronged model based on his contention that every discipline has an organizational, a substantive, and a syntactical structure. Organizational structure focuses on how disciplines are related, with the emphasis on what makes each one unique. Substantive structure relates to the information and concepts implicit in a discipline. Syntactical structure is the peculiar methodology of a discipline.
In this chapter the three components of the Schwab model are retained and generally defined as the uniqueness of the subject matter, the substantive concepts, and the methodology of a discipline. But the specific definitions are modified in an attempt to relate the concept of a structure of knowledge to selected American history textbooks. Organizational structure, the unique subject matter, is defined as 1) the relationship of history to the social sciences; 2) the attempt of history to synthesize what happened in the past; and 3) the historian's treatment of every period and every event as unique. Substantive structure, the concepts implicit in the discipline, is defined as 1) a series of concepts relating to the vents, records, and statements of the past; 2) what was valued in the culture of the time; and 3) chronology. Syntactical structure, the methodology of the discipline, is defined as 1) the complementary relationship of content and method; 2) the necessity for an historian to generalize; and 3) a disciplined approach to the past.

In this chapter the three textbooks investigated in Chapter III are examined using the Modified Version of the Schwab model. Three topics are examined under each of the three components of the model. Telling questions are asked
in an attempt to reveal a structure of knowledge. The chapter is divided into three sections. Section I is an examination of *Rise of the American Nation*. Section II is an investigation of *History of a Free People*. The *American Story* is analyzed in Section III. Each section is followed by the Findings and Conclusions. The chapter closes with a short summary.

**SECTION I: CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION**

For purposes of this investigation, the authors are referred to as "professional historians." Merle Curti has for many years been a professor history at Columbia University, then the University of Wisconsin. Paul Tooc was for years the editor of *Social Education*. *Rise of the American Nation* was first published in 1950. The edition used in this investigation was published in 1969. The book contains 42 chapters. These chapters are divided into 12 units. Most of the chapters are descriptive; thirteen are analytical. The analysis is subsumed under the three components of the Schwab model of a structure of knowledge, as modified by this investigator. The first component is organizational structure.
The topics analyzed under this component of the model are taken from chapters 5, 32, and 42, respectively. Chapters 5 and 42 are analytical. Within the period covered, the authors analyzed and interpreted the events. The first topic is from Chapter 5, "Democratic Ideas Take Root in Colonial America." The section from which the topic comes is entitled, "Freedom to learn and freedom to think strike fertile soil." The topic, "The first public schools," follows: 1

Money to buy books, to travel, to hire tutors, and to attend private schools and colleges was not available to most of the people—the small farmers living near the villages, the frontiersmen, and the tradesmen and artisans of the towns. Most of their energy went into the hard job of earning a living. Yet a great many colonists learned to read, write, and do simple arithmetic. Even on the frontier, where neither schools nor churches existed, some children learned to read at the knees of their mothers. And in the towns, some children, while learning a trade as apprentices, also learned to read and write and do simple arithmetic through the kindness of their master or his wife. And in all of the colonies, there were at least a few elementary schools that children of poorer families could attend.

In the Middle and Southern Colonies some schools were run by the various churches. But these schools were few and far between. South of Delaware the children of farmers and other workmen had only limited opportunities to go to school.

In the New England Colonies it was easier to get an education. The Puritan leaders believed that the people were more likely to become God-fearing and law-abiding citizens if they could read the Bible and sermons.

In 1647 the Massachusetts government passed a law requiring that all towns except very small ones must provide schools for the children. This was the first law of its kind passed in the colonies or in Europe. The law began by stating that in the past it had been "one chief point of the old deluder, Satan, to keep men from a knowledge of the Scripture...by keeping them [the Scriptures] in an unknown tongue...."

For hundreds of years in Europe, the Bible had been copied mostly in Latin. During the Protestant Reformation, however, the Bible was translated and printed in German, French, English, and other European languages. One of the most famous of these translations was the King James Version of the Bible, published in England in 1611 when colonists were beginning to move from England to North America. The leaders of the New England Colonies were determined that the ability to read the English Bible should not die out in the New World.

The "Old Deluder Law," as it has been called, was not popular everywhere. Towns sometimes neglected to provide the education ordered by the
Nevertheless, the law was a landmark in the history of education, for it expressed a new and daring idea about education.

The town schools of Colonial New England have been rightly regarded as one of America's greatest contributions to modern civilization -- public responsibility for education of all the people. And free public education, paid for through government, has been -- and is -- one of the strongest roots of democracy.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

This question may be inappropriate. History textbook writers always incorporate the findings of the social sciences. They might be unable to write without doing so. But to ask if they have made explicit how they utilized these findings, and the methodologies of the various disciplines, is another question. In the topic quoted the authors used concepts from economics ("Money to buy books..."), sociology ("...children of poorer families could attend"), geography ("...all the colonies..."), "South of Delaware..."), and political science (laws). These concepts were necessary to the narrative. Without them generalizations such as "In the New England Colonies it was easier to get an education" would be relatively meaningless. The concepts
from other disciplines are needed to give substance to the
generalizations and conclusions. Even so, the reader still
knows only the conclusions as they are woven into the
narrative. He does not know that a particular concept
comes from a particular discipline and that the discipline
itself may have a peculiar methodology through which the
concept was derived. It may be that the text ought not make
these ideas explicit. If we assume that the results of
scholarship is what ought to be known, such a conclusion
is reasonable. If we assume that a textbook ought to also
exhibit a structure of knowledge in the sense in which
Schwab defines structure, other examples are needed.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted
their data in such a way that they create a
composite picture of the past?

The paragraphs quoted above focus on the role of
education in colonial society. There is an attempt to deal
with all the major geographical areas, New England, Middle
Colonies, South. The emphasis is obviously on New England.
This seems appropriate since the greater part of our
educational heritage emanated from this area, both geo-
graphically and ideologically. The bearing of the strict
Puritan religious views on our educational beginnings is
seen in statements which point up the deep-felt concern for
an ability to read the Bible. Even the influences of the Protestant Reformation and one of its results, the King James Version of the Bible, are reviewed. Seemingly the writers were concerned that the student see the relationship between the educational developments in the American colonies and their social and religious antecedents. In terms of a structure of knowledge these relationships are nebulous, at best. There are no statements which say, "The historian's role is to help us understand how life developed in the past. No one area of life could be separated from other areas, just as it cannot today. We focus on singular areas for purposes of study, but we must realize that our goal is to see how all areas interacted. In this way we get a composite picture of life in the past." If our concern is knowing the nature of knowledge, as well as the content itself, we need to make apparent what oftentimes may be implicit. In the case of this topic, the nature of the knowledge, in the sense that it may exhibit structure, remains implicit.

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

---

The above topic is basically descriptive. There may be some statements which can be viewed as analytic ("...the law was a landmark in the history of education..."). By definition, the conclusions are interpretive. But there is no indication that the authors attempted to relate what they described to either a theory of history or the present. No judgement statements are made which subtly, or unwittingly, attempt to impose the values of today on the past. The educational differences between the various geographical regions are pointed out. The impact of Puritan influence is seen. Yet, the authors did not clearly say that the past ought to be viewed and evaluated in terms of its own culture and that the task of doing this represents a major dilemma for the historian. He must constantly guard against imposing his own value judgements. He must forego the inclination to see patterns and causality in events which are related but essentially idiogetic. Such statements might not be appropriate to a short topic such as this. On the other hand, if we want to exhibit a particular structure of knowledge, somewhere such statements ought to be found. The above topic was chosen because it came as near being isomorphic to the Modified Version of the Schwab model as could be found. Still it does not clearly explicate this kind of a structure of knowledge.
The second topic examined in quest of an organizational structure is from Chapter 32, "The Nation Fights a War in Europe (1914-1920)." The two sections quoted below are entitled "Nationalism as a cause" and "Imperialism as a cause."

An intense spirit of nationalism was one of the underlying sources of tension. The term nationalism often refers to the strong feeling people have for their own country, but it may also refer to the desire of a subjugated people to throw off foreign rule and create their own nation. As you have seen, it was a desire to free certain Slavs from Austro-Hungarian rule that prompted Govrilo Prinzip and his fellow conspirators to assassinate the heir to the throne of Austria-Hungary. As for Austria-Hungary, it was the determination to crush the rising spirit of nationalism among the Slavic people and to hold the Austro-Hungarian empire together that prompted that nation to declare war on Serbia. But the spirit of nationalism was not confined to the Balkan Peninsula. In almost every country of Europe, as well as in the colonies overseas, there were subjugated people who longed to win their independence.

...Another disruptive force was imperialism — the struggle for colonies. As you have seen (pages 562-64), during the late 1800's and the early 1900's the major powers of the world were engaged in a race for empire. By 1914, so far as colonies were concerned, the nations of Europe could be grouped into two classes: the "have" nations and the "have-not" nations.

---

Great Britain and France, each with huge colonial empires, were among the "have" powers. Although Russia owned no colonies, it did possess immense areas of underdeveloped land, and so it was also in the "have" category.

Germany, on the other hand, was among the "have-not" nations. It did own colonies in Africa and in the Pacific, but its colonial empire was relatively small, and the nation was eager to secure additional territory. Italy was in a similar situation — and one of the reasons that finally brought Italy into the war on the Allied side was a promise of colonies when the war ended.

I.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

Historians have always used concepts from other disciplines. In a sense, there are not historical concepts. The historian performs the synthetic function of piecing together what happened in all areas of life in the past to form an overall picture. But the converse is also true. There is a sense in which all knowledge is historical. Carlyle raised this point when he asked the question, "...what is all knowledge too but recorded Experience, and a product of History...?"

It may be that historians in former times have not been as conscious of the use of

concepts from other disciplines as some are today. There is a movement among some historians to utilize to a fuller extent both the concepts and methodology of the social sciences.5

In the above topic the authors use a number of social science concepts. Nationalism and imperialism have at least political, sociological, and economic connotations. "Have" and "have-not" nations imply political, social, geographic, and economic concepts. What we do not know is whether the authors consciously utilized these kinds of examples to give flavor and balance to their narrative. Neither do we know how the concepts were derived. While this may be unimportant to the teaching of historical concepts and generalizations, it is important to teaching the nature of the knowledge. Traditionally, history textbooks have not dealt with such matters. If they were addressed to all, this was done by the teacher. It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that the nature of the knowledge ought to be included in textbooks.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?

Essentially, this may be the major function of the historian. If it is, it means that there must be some accommodation between the ideographic and nomothetic functions of the historian. He must, to echo von Ranke, sense the delicate balance between the retention of the individuality of each event and the relationship of each event to a more universal concept.  

The authors have attempted, in the above topic, to explain World War I (the universal in this case), by focusing on two specific concepts, nationalism and imperialism. In this sense, they have created a composite picture of the past. It is not a sufficient effort to create the particular organizational structure of knowledge demanded by the model being used. They have not explicitly wrestled with the questions of "how" and "why." But enough has been said to indicate that the vestiges of a structure of knowledge may be present.

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

---

Nationalism and imperialism, as defined by the authors, were apparently much more vital to the world of 1900 than they are to the world of 1970. In concert, these two forces helped create a situation which erupted into war in 1914. The same forces exist, perhaps in different form, in the world in 1970. World war has not come in 1970, however. Perhaps this is because the world today cannot afford war, in the way it could in 1914. Nationalism and imperialism were related to 1914 in a different way than they are in 1970. To interpret and apply the concepts in terms of their 1970 meaning would give a distorted picture of the past. The authors have avoided this error. What they have not done is discuss the concepts, and therefore the historian's craft, in terms of the changing meaning and usage of organizing concepts. Nor have they indicated whether the two forces of nationalism and imperialism are created by men or some omniscient or omnipotent force, uncontrolled by men. While such a claim would undoubtedly be eschewed by the authors, there may be a question as to whether young students can make such distinctions when they are left implicit. Is man the dupe of uncontrolled historical forces? Are nationalism and imperialism two of these forces? Is there a law which says that when these two are present, in a given relationship, war results? Or was there
simply a cause and effect relationship created by the circumstances of the times, which was peculiar to the times, which is not causally related to either the present or to some controlling theory?

The third topic analyzed under organizational structure is from chapter 42, "Americans Enter a New Epoch." This is one of the 13 analytical chapters in the book. The section from which the topic comes is entitled "Negro civil rights become an urgent issue." The following topic is headed, "The roots of the problem." 7

The struggle that reached a climax in 1963 had its roots deep in the past. Exactly one hundred years earlier, in 1863, President Lincoln had signed the Emancipation Proclamation and by 1870 the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments had been added to the Constitution. These three amendments freed the Negroes from slavery, gave them citizenship, and guaranteed them and all other Americans "the equal protection of the laws," including the assurance that the right to vote would not be denied because of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

For a number of years after the adoption of the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments, Negroes in many areas of the South voted and held public offices in local and state governments. A number were elected to and served in Congress.

After a few years, however, one after another of the southern states adopted laws that established a new pattern of relations between the two races. As a result of both law and custom, by the 1890's the Negroes' right to vote had been limited. Negroes were segregated from white persons in railroad stations, on trains, in streetcars, in public parks and buildings, in schools, churches, and hospitals, and in prisons and cemeteries.

Northerners for the most part raised no protest against these laws. On the contrary, Negroes in the North faced increasing discrimination. Then, in 1896, the Supreme Court ruled that laws establishing segregation did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment. In the case of Plessy v. Ferguson, the Court declared that the provision of "separate but equal" facilities met the requirement that all citizens were entitled to "equal protection of the laws."

As a result of these developments American Negroes entered the 1900's handicapped by problems they had not anticipated during the first hopeful years of freedom. Yet in spite of these handicaps, they made impressive advances during the next 50 years. As you have seen (page 653), they began to win increasing success in every field of activity -- science, medicine, the professions, business, music and art, entertainment and sports. By the end of World War II they had made marked progress toward fuller political, legal, and social rights.
I.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

The above topic contains numerous concepts from the social sciences: emancipation, constitutional amendments, law, law as an instrument of social purpose, segregation, and ethnicity, to list some of them. For the most part these concepts are used to fill in the descriptive narrative. There is not attempt to demonstrate how an economist, or a political scientist, or a sociologist might look at the events. The concepts from the social sciences are used in the almost completely descriptive way, even though the topic is from a chapter the publishers have labelled analytical. It is analytical in the sense that they have cursorily examined the taxonomic happenings which led to the current civil rights situation. It is not analytical in the sense that they have examined the nature of what is written or attempted to make apparent a structure such as is posited by the model being used here.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?
In the topic under consideration the authors suggest several reasons why civil rights have become an outstanding problem in contemporary America. For one thing, whites feared Negro involvement in public office following the Civil War. This led to the creation of "Jim Crow" laws. Finally, the Supreme Court gave the denial of civil rights the force of law in 1896. In fact, the authors have set up a taxonomy, resting on a cause/effect premise. With the coming of each event the likelihood was increased that civil rights would become a sensitive area of conflict at some time. The conflict began openly in the 1960's. Its climax may yet be unpredictable.

In spite of legally and socially sanctioned segregation, the authors point out that the Negro has made significant advances in the 20th Century. They do not say how. Is it due to the principle of countervailing forces? Or is there some other explanation? In order to understand what has happened the student needs to know how and why. A description of what happened only partially enables one to relate the past to the problems of contemporary life.

\*\*\*\*

One might argue that the identification of a structure of knowledge could supply a means of inquiry into these vital areas; however, no particular organizational structure is in evidence in this topic.

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

Stern and Croce, to cite but two, have both referred to history as the story of liberty. Man is continuously striving to be free. The above topic is a case in point. The American Negro has been legally free for over 100 years. This is different from being socially free -- free in fact. The authors presented his quest in terms of successive events, each of which increased the likelihood of his success. There is almost an inverse relationship between the measure which have been taken to deny him full civil rights and his achievement of these rights. In this way the striving for civil rights is related to the present. This does not mean that this striving, as presented by the authors, is couched in the values of the present. There is no indication that the authors viewed the kinds of events

which have characterized the civil rights movement as theoretical or dictated by historical laws. This is simply how they happened. Some historians do view successive events which finally culminate in a greater event as law-like. It would have been helpful, in terms of demonstrating that events all have their own peculiar context and ought to be so viewed, if the authors had made explicit how the Negro's quest for freedom has been peculiarly related to the attempts to deny this freedom. Other freedom movements, at other times, have also been related to their context, rather than to a theory of freedom-striving.

II. SUBSTANTIVE STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCEPTS?

There are three topics analyzed in an attempt to reveal a substantive structure of knowledge, as defined in the Modified Version of the Schwab model. As before, care has been taken to identify topics which seem to have a relationship to the model. The topics are from chapters 6, 24, and 39. The first topic, is from chapter 6, "New Tensions Strain Old Loyalties (1763-1789)." The section from which the topic comes is entitled "Tension increases

between Great Britain and the Colonies." The topic, "Repeal -- and continued unrest," follows: 11

The gap between Great Britain and the American colonies was wide indeed when Lord Frederick North became prime minister of Great Britain in 1770. The new prime minister urged Parliament to repeal the Townshend Acts. As he pointed out, the nonimportation agreements were once again ruining the business of many British merchants, and the cost of enforcing the law was proving to be much too heavy.

In 1770 Parliament repealed the Townshend Acts, which had imposed duties on so many articles of everyday use in the colonies. Parliament also allowed the Quartering Act to expire. But the British government insisted that a small import duty on tea be retained in the new law as a symbol that Parliament could tax the colonists. As George III put it, there must "always be one tax to keep up the right."

The repeal of the Townshend Acts brought a temporary end to much of the unrest in the colonies. But an occasional act of violence reminded the British that the basic issue remained unsettled.

One of these outbreaks occurred in June 1772 when several boatloads of men attacked and burned the British revenue ship Gaspee a few miles south of Providence, Rhode Island. From the colonial point of view, an alarming thing about the Gaspee affair was the announcement

by British officials that the suspected persons would be sent to England for trial. This decision threatened to weaken the practice of self-government in Rhode Island.

Even more alarming, because it seemed to show how the wind was blowing, was an announcement made at this same time by the royal governor of Massachusetts. From now on, Governor Thomas Hutchinson declared, the salaries of the governor and the Massachusetts judges would be paid by the Crown. This would free the governor and the judges from all dependence upon the Massachusetts legislature.

II.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are indispensable to the narrative?

The title of the chapter from which the above topic comes, the section title, and the topic itself all focus on one major point: as time continued, and event followed event, the gap between the American colonies and Great Britain widened. There are no statements such as, "From among the many facts and concepts which could have been chosen, the following seem to us to be both necessary and sufficient to demonstrate how the break between the mother country and colonies increased." The authors demonstrate the gap by focusing on the state of affairs in 1770, the impact of the coming of Lord North, the repeal of the
Townshend Acts, the retention of the tea tax, and the Gaspee affair and its subsequent consequences. As it develops in the hands of the authors, the narrative proceeds interestingly and with precision. But the reader may be led to believe that this is how it "actually happened." What in fact is true is that this is how it happened according to Todd and Curti. Other historians may have chosen other facts and concepts. Or they may have related them with a different focus. Or they may have discussed this time period with a different thrust. In a sense the authors have created a cause and effect relationship which may be true in a different sense in the hands of different historians. Historians choose from the past and create their own taxonomies which, as they write their narratives, lead to culmination points which they too select. Having done this it might be helpful to indicate what has been done. This is particularly true if there is an interest in revealing the nature of historical knowledge or a particular structure of the knowledge.

2. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

The late Johan Huizinga has made the stimulating point that "historical thinking is always teleological."
Though the past supplies our material and compels our attention, though the mind realizes that not one minute of the future can be predicted, nonetheless it is the eternal future that moves our mind." 12 Obviously the past cannot be relived and the present is constantly changing. It is the future toward which each singular event moves. In the above topic the focus is on "continued unrest." Implicitly the authors have directed the attention of the reader to the future. The existing gap in attitude between England and the colonies in 1770, and the subsequent happenings which culminated in war then a new nation, all point toward what is coming. In themselves they have restricted meaning. But when these events "deal with whole situations...not mere chronological sequences," as Strayer has argued, they make what is history. 13 This does not make history scientific, law-laden, or give it the power of predictability. It does bring into focus the unending quest of man to chart his future by probing his past. The above topic tacitly demonstrates this. The emphasis of the authors is quite


apparent, however. There is no direct attempt to reveal a structure of knowledge.

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

The authors concluded that prior to 1770 a gap existed between the American colonies and England and that succeeding events tended to exacerbate this gap. They then cited a number of events -- repeal of the Townshend Acts, retention of the tax on tea, the Gaspee affair and the trial of the guilty, and the British decision to pay the colonial governor and judges -- to illustrate how successive happenings continually widened the breach. Within this context several generalizations were expressed: following the repeal of the Townshend Acts, there was a temporary lull in colonial unrest; the Gaspee affair clearly exposed "how the wind was blowing"; and the British decisions following the Gaspee affair tended to destroy self-government in the colonies and make them more dependent on the mother country. All these generalizations are congruent with the information and concepts presented. If there is a weakness, in terms of exhibiting a particular structure of knowledge, it is in the fact that the relationship between the events and the generalizations is not explicated. If the authors had been especially interested in exposing a given structure of knowledge this might have been done.
In the search of a substantive structure of knowledge, in the sense in which it is defined in this model, the following topic from chapter 24, "Farmers Revolt Against Big Business Practices," is examined. The section from which the topic comes deals with the labious but simple life of the American farmer in the declining years of the 19th century. The topic which follows is entitled "Social life."14

Except for farmers who lives very close to a growing city or a large town, opportunities for social activities in 1870 were limited. For most farm families there were only three centers of social activity -- the nearest town, the church, and the school.

The Saturday drive to town in a wagon or buggy behind "Old Dobbin" was a big weekly event. Even a five-mile drive took an hour each way, and a ten-mile trip meant about four hours on the road. As for the "town" it might be nothing more than a country store at the crossroads, with a blacksmith shop on the opposite corner. Or it might be a sizeable village, or even a county seat with a courthouse, a railroad station, several stores, a bank, a doctor's office, a lawyer's office, and a considerable cluster of houses, including the homes of a handful of retired farmers.

The Saturday trips were a combination of business and pleasure. While the mother shopped for the few items she needed, and while the farmer arranged for the sale of his cash crops or settled his account at the bank or the store, the children played

with their friends. But with the shopping and the business there was the opportunity to chat with neighbors, to watch or take part in some horse trading in front of the blacksmith shop, and to get the latest news of the outside world.

The Sunday trip to church was another bright spot in the week. Once again "Old Dobbin" was hitched to the wagon or buggy, and the entire family, freshly scrubbed and dressed in their best clothes, drove down the road to church. There they sang, listened to the sermon, and when the service was over, gathered for a few minutes of leisurely talk before they drove back home.

II.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are indispensable to the narrative?

The authors began by limiting the social life of the 1870 vintage of American farm family to three centers; town, church and school. Within this context, they cursorily explored farm social life. The Saturday trip to the store and the Sunday trip to church were reviewed. In each case, assuming that town, church, and school were definitive of the social outlets available to farm families, the blending of business and pleasure were defined as necessary to the social life of the farmer. The role of the school was not discussed. To demonstrate the quandary in which the historian
finds himself, the authors might have pointed out that other, perhaps peripheral, social outlets were sometimes available -- for example, weddings and square dances -- but that they chose these three centers as illustrative or because they represented the major means of social expression. Within the framework the authors laid down the concepts and information seen to be necessary to the narrative. Questions might be raised, about broadening the context, or the inclusion of additional information and concepts within the framework which is given. The records of the past may reflect the kind of social life discussed in this topic. But there may be some question as to whether what is reflected in the records of the past might not be interpreted or ordered in a different way.

2. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

From the vantage point of the present, the authors seem to be saying in the above topic, "How simple farm life was in 1870." Without the advantage of hindsight such a point of view might not be taken. Social life in 1870 may have been more complicated than in 1800, even though it appears simple when viewed in terms of the complexities of 1970. So the authors, exercising the historian's prerogative of retrospect, were pointing to the future while
probing the past. Huizinga called this the historian's constant search for "whither."\textsuperscript{15} Probably a contemporary commentator would have interpreted rural social life differently, even though he may have described it in comparable terms. By the same token, historians in 2070 will probably interpret American social life in 1970 differently from the way it may be described in current media. The question for this study is, Does the student recognize this quality in the historical knowledge to which a textbook exposes him? The teacher may point this out. But what if there is no teacher? If we were to write a history textbook specifically intending to reveal a structure of knowledge consonant with the Modified Version of the Schwab model we could not say that by asking the above question we exhibit a structure of knowledge, even though a structure may be implicit.

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

Among the conclusions and generalizations found in the above topic are the following: 1870 farmers had a limited social life; the opportunities for social life emanated from three basic centers; Saturday and Sunday

\textsuperscript{15}Huizinga, \textit{Op. Cit.}, p. 293.
trips to town and church were big events; trips combined business with pleasure. In each case, there is a detailed description of what social life in these various centers may have been like. In this sense then concepts and information are consistent with the conclusions and generalizations. No referents are cited or indirectly alluded to. The student does not know whether the generalizations and conclusions are derived directly from the records and artifacts of the past and therefore reflect the values, priorities, and emphases of the time or are the product of the authors' imaginations. But inasmuch as the need for consistency is important to the revelation of the structure of knowledge being discussed, there is this kind of consistency in the above topic.

The third topic investigated for a substantive structure of knowledge is from chapter 39, "American Fight a Second World War (1941-1945)." The section from which the topic is taken deals with wartime production. The topic, an inset, follows:  

During World War II, many more women than ever before disregarded the old saying that "woman's place is in the home." Actually this idea of "woman's place" had been diminishing for many years. In 1860, when most women agreed with men that woman's place was indeed

---

in the home, only 2½ million women were gainfully employed. By 1920, the number had risen to 5 million, and by 1940, to 11 million.

It was the war, however, with its demands for manpower, that shattered most of the remaining prejudices against working women. By 1943, an additional 2 million women went to work in war plants, actually replacing men who had left for the armed services. And, for the first time, the American armed forces, which had previously used women only as nurses, now organized corps of women to substitute for men in non-combatant jobs. More than 250,000 women entered the Army (as Wacs), the Coast Guard (as Spars), the Navy (as Waves), and the Marine Corps. In the services, women worked as machinists, storekeepers, and office workers; they operated radios, and drove jeeps and trucks. When people recovered from their surprise at seeing women in these new role, the began to speak of "the girl behind the man behind the gun."

Given the opportunity, women showed that they had the ability to work side by side with men, and to work just as effectively. By the end of the war, virtually the only jobs that remained closed to women were those that required extraordinary physical strength.

II.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are necessary to the narrative?

Arieli, commenting on the creation of what he calls an "American ideology," makes the point that meaningfulness
is dependent on the grouping of homogeneous concepts. This may be a truism. For the historian it is vital. Much of his task is the expert selection and ordering of his concepts. Since he cannot actually recreate the past as it was lived, he must select information and concepts which support whatever segment of the past he is striving to resurrect. In the above topic the focus is on women in the work force. The authors selected concepts and information to illustrate this role of women in American history. They pointed out the increasing growth in the numbers of women entering the public work force, the apparent reduction of prejudices against such a role, the role the armed forces played in World War II, and the general effectiveness of women. These concepts and information sufficiently demonstrate the point. We might raise some question as to whether they are necessary. It may be that other concepts and information could just as effectively have illustrated the point. In either case, the student cannot gain such an insight into the discipline of history from reading the above topic. Whether necessary or sufficient, it would be educative for the student to know why the concepts and information used were chosen.

2. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

The role of women in American society differs considerably from what it was in 1660. Quantitatively, the authors show, the number of women engaged in public work has increased prodigiously since that time. Can we predict, on the basis of such evidence, what will be the role of women in another 90 years? Probably not. But the knowledge of the increased role of women in the workforces does help us understand the role of women today. And it is probably an indication that American women are more apt to continue to participate in public life than they are to revert to their 1660 role. The function of the historian is, it appears, not to explicate what the role of women ought to be, but rather to find out what it has been in order to help us better understand what it is and may become. This does not make history scientific or enable the historian to forecast the future. But it does point up the interest of the historian, and of all men in human potential. In a real

---

1b R. G. Collingswood has argued that history gives us confidence because it shows what man has done, therefore what man can do. If this were absolutely true it would, of course, preclude all progress. In the sense in which Collingwood probably intended, the idea is useful. See R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986).
sense, as Croce has argued, we create our own history. By the same token, we probe our past in an attempt to more intelligently create the future. This is implicit in the above topic. In terms of revealing a particular structure of knowledge it might be more educative if it had been made explicit.

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

The two outstanding generalizations in the above topic relate to the American woman's disregard of the idea that woman's place is in the home and their insistence that they have the ability to compete in a male-oriented world of work. In both cases, sufficient information and concepts are presented to support the generalizations. In the first place, the increase in numbers of women working is brought into sharp relief by focusing on the situation in 1880 and its subsequent increase. Second, the need for women to work is demonstrated, then the areas which she has entered as a workman are seen. In all these areas the authors say, she has been effective. The only significant difference from men has been in areas requiring great physical strength.

Perhaps it is inappropriate to expect the authors to make explicit in any short passage a positive response to the above telling question. But as an example, this topic demonstrates what is true of the entire book. Concepts and information may sufficiently support the conclusions and generalizations. In order to reveal a structure of knowledge, as defined by the model being used, it would be helpful if these points were made explicit.

III. SYNTACTICAL STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPTS?

Syntactical structure refers to the peculiar methodology employed by a discipline. The three topics analyzed in search of a syntactical structure are from chapters 22, 36, and 40. The first one, from chapter 22, follows. The chapter relates the saga of the "Last Frontier." The chapter section from which the topic comes is concerned with the Indians on the Great Plains. The following topic is entitled, "'Americanizing' the Indians."20

The federal government made its first attack upon the problem of assimilating the Indians with the passage of the Daves Act in 1867. In this law Congress looked forward to the time when the reservation system would be ended and the Indian would be "Americanized."

The Dawes Act provided that each head of a family could, if he wished, claim as his own 160 acres of land. Bachelors, women, and children were entitled to lesser amounts. Legal ownership of the property was to be held in trust by the federal government for 25 years. During this period the Indian could neither sell his land nor use it as security for a mortgage. This provision was designed to protect the Indians from unscrupulous speculators. The Burke Act of 1906 modified this provision. It gave the Secretary of the Interior authority to reduce the 25-year period in any case in which he was convinced that the Indian himself was capable of handling his own affairs.

The Dawes Act and the Burke Act also provided that Indians who accepted the land and abandoned the tribal way of life were to be given citizenship, including the right to vote. Meanwhile, Congress granted larger appropriations for Indian education and made education compulsory for all children.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

Perhaps Burkhardt was right, that history is what one age finds worthy of note in another. 21 But if he was right, the problem of "how" one age finds what is worthy in the past remains. We might raise the question, of all the

information about the American Indian, why did the authors choose the subject, "Americanization"? It seems reasonable to assume that it was due to what has happened to the Indian, resulting in how he lives today. To bring this point into focus the authors showed that the Congress passed acts which, in fact, required the Indian to forsake his ancient ways of life and his heritage and become "American." Otherwise he was penalized, socially, psychologically, and economically. To understand the condition of the American Indian today and to be able to deal with the situation now and in the future, such information is probably necessary.

The question is, Could not other information have been presented which would fulfill the same purpose? Probably so. If the student is to learn something of the nature of the knowledge, why particular information is selected and how it is used ought to be made clear. A selection process, based on a particular purpose, seems to have been true in writing the above topic. But how and why were not revealed.

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

In the above topic the authors states that (1) the Dawes Act portended the end of the Indian reservation system,
and 2) the restrictions placed on the Indian by the Dawes Act were for the protection of the Indian. These general statements raise some questions: Could not we just as readily conclude that the Dawes Act led to deeper entrenchment of the Indian in his cultural habits, rather than "Americanizing" him? Could not we argue that the restrictions found in the Dawes Act were for the comfort or convenience of the white culture rather than the protection of the Indian? Will future historians with points of view more sympathetic to the dilemma of the American Indian write the story differently? Each generation is confronted with differing needs, and differing points of view. Each generation writes its own history. What any given generation of historians writes depends on its reasons for probing the past. From generation to generation this will vary, which means that historical knowledge is ephemeral. Any generalizations which are made, or any conclusions which are drawn ought to reflect this quality of the knowledge. The general statements in the above topic appear to be subject to varying interpretations. This is not stated, however. In terms of exposing the structure of knowledge suggested by the Modified Version of the Schwab model the ephemeral quality of historical knowledge is not made apparent in the above topic.
3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

It may be inappropriate to expect a short topic to reveal the methodology of the authors. But the above topic was selected because it appeared to come as near as any which could be found to be isomorphic to the model being used as the heuristic tool. If, as Randall has claimed, this historian's methodology is primarily induction, it may be difficult to make explicit this quality in a short portion of the narrative. The alternative may be to speak directly to the point of historical methodology rather than to expect the narrative to reveal it as a collateral reward. In the above topic there are a number of questions which are left unattended which might reveal the integral relationship between method and content. Why were these concepts and this information chosen? Why these generalizations? Why are there no explicit hypotheses? Why no statements which say that history is a selective confrontation with the past? Why no statements which say, "Based on what we know in the present, the following seems to have happened in the past."

Such statements may not be necessary to historical narration. They are necessary to exhibit some of the nature of the knowledge, in this case a particular structure of knowledge.

---

Chapter 36 describes the events of the 1930's, when America was moving from isolationism toward World War II. The following topic, from a section where the pros and cons of isolationism are discussed, is entitled "The majority remains isolationist."  

In his familiar "quarantine" speech President Roosevelt expressed views that the majority of Americans were not ready to accept. Proof of this came with the "Panay incident." On December 12, 1937, Japanese planes bombed and strafed a United States gunboat, the Panay, and three American oil tankers on the Yangtze River near Nanking, China (see map, page 736). Several Americans were killed and numerous others were wounded.

Secretary of State Hull immediately sent a sharp note to the Japanese government. He demanded full apologies, compensation, and a promise that no such incident would recur. The Japanese met all of Hull's demands.

During the course of this "incident", which might have led to serious international consequences, the American public revealed how strongly it favored keeping out of war. While the Panay matter was still headline news, Representative Louis Ludlow of Indiana proposed an amendment to the Constitution. This amendment would have required a national referendum to ratify a declaration of war except in case of actual attack. Largely because of pressure from the President, the proposal was rejected. Meanwhile, a public opinion poll revealed that 54 per cent of the American people thought that the United States should completely withdraw from China.

By the end of 1937, the tide of aggression was rising rapidly in Asia as well as Europe. Many Americans, including President Roosevelt, were becoming increasingly alarmed. But the American people as a whole clung to the belief that it was possible for the United States to remain isolated.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

The study of history may amuse us. We may find it academically challenging or aesthetically pleasing. But beyond this, there are reasons for studying history. Commager, among others, suggests that the study of history gives us perspective. It reminds us that "time is long and our own lives fleeting." Inasmuch as studying the past gives us perspective it is important that we see some relationship of the past to the present. In the topic under consideration the authors discussed an American dream at least as old as Washington's Farewell Address: the desire to avoid "entangling alliances." At various times in the history of the nation this desire has been voiced loudly. Especially when war has threatened. Although the authors do not speak directly to the issue of war and peace, the above topic is

is crucial in contemporary America. Without saying so, they call into view the long-standing contradictions found in the American dreams of imperialism and isolationism, universal prestige and universal appreciation. We might remember various events in our past which would focus our attention squarely on the many contradictory positions we see in the present. The authors chose to use the concept of isolationism. Perhaps they would have made this choice clear had they been interested in a particular structure of knowledge.

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

Indirectly, the initial sentence in the above topic calls to attention the ephemeral quality of historical knowledge. The American people may have been "not ready" to accept Roosevelt's proposal that the nation end its policy of isolation. But in 1941 the country went to war. It may be more correct to say that the expression "not ready" was clearly based on the degree of provocation. The authors offer no evidence, in terms of data, to support the generalization that the Americans were not ready to accept Roosevelt's proposal. But even if we accept the generalization as true, it may be that another historian, in a different time, may interpret the response to Roosevelt differently. There is
clearly a difference between a reluctance, or not being ready to do something, and an absolute refusal to do. It would have been helpful, had the authors intended to expose something of the nature of the knowledge, or a particular structure of knowledge, to say something about the quality of the knowledge. The authors might have said, "As we see events in the 1930's, the American people responded to Roosevelt's speech the way they did for the following reasons...."

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

We might raise the question, Do the facts presented by the authors support the generalization "the majority remains isolationist"? How does an historian reach the point where he can make such statements? Must he have hard data? Are the results of polls sufficient? In the topic under investigation we do not know. The generalization is given and various happenings are discussed in support of that event. But how were these events selected? Did the authors have an hypothesis which dictated the use of particular information? Or that discounted other information as irrelevant or unimportant? What is different about the way an historian works from the way an economist, or an
anthropologist, works? Why is history a separate discipline partially because of its peculiar methodology? These are points which are not revealed. Perhaps we ought not expect to find them in any single topic. But it does not seem unreasonable to expect that such points will be dealt with somewhere, if we are concerned with revealing something of the quality of knowledge. There are no isolated topics which bear on the quality of the knowledge. And a particular structure, or any structure, is not discussed anywhere in the book.

The last topic examined for an organizational structure of knowledge is from chapter 40, the period from 1945 into the 1960's. The section is entitled "Kennedy challenges the nation to advance to a 'New Frontier'." Specifically, the topic deals with the election of 1960.

Both the Republicans and the Democrats nominated relatively young and markedly energetic candidates for the Presidency. The Republican nominee, Richard M. Nixon of California, was 47. He had served in both House of Representatives and the Senate and since 1953, as Vice-President in the Eisenhower Administration. The Democratic nominee, John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, was 43. He, too, had served in both houses of Congress.

The Vice-Presidential candidates were also men with distinguished records. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., a former United States Senator from Massachusetts, was serving as Ambassador to the United Nations when the Republican convention chose him as Nixon's running mate. Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, who shared the Democratic ticket with Kennedy, had served in Congress since 1943 -- for eleven years in the House, and then, in 1946, in the Senate, where he had made an outstanding name for himself as a vigorous and effective leader.

During the campaign the Presidential candidates confronted each other in a series of televised debates. The central issue was the condition of the nation. Kennedy charged that as a result of our failure to deal adequately with urgent issues, the United States was losing prestige and influence to the Communists throughout the world. He called for "a supreme national effort" to reverse what he believed to be a downward trend in the nation's fortunes and promised if elected "to get America moving again." What the nation needed, he said, was to advance to a "New Frontier."

Nixon denied Kennedy's charges. He insisted that the United States was stronger than it had ever been before. So far as influence was concerned, he declared, "Communist prestige in the world is at an all-time low and American prestige is at an all-time high." Nixon charged Kennedy with advocating "wild experimentation" and "reckless" policies. He promised if elected to continue Eisenhower's programs and to build a more secure nation on their foundations.

The voters, disturbed the gravity of the charges and countercharges, turned out in record numbers on Election Day.
The tabulation of the electoral votes gave Kennedy 303 to Nixon's 219. But the final count of the popular votes revealed a different story. Kennedy had barely squeezed through to a victory. Out of a total of more than 66,000,000 votes, he had won by a margin of only about 115,000 votes.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

It is probably neither ironic or coincidental that the authors, in the above topic, describe certain characteristics of the times. Both candidates were relatively youthful. The members of both teams were all highly competent. The campaign was unique in that it utilized a major component in the modern storehouse of technological sophistication, TV. The charges and countercharges revolved around the topic of prestige. And the closeness of the election symbolized the lack of clarity that exists in the thinking of the American people relative to the most appropriate and sure avenue to peace and an end to our overpowering internal troubles. All of these points bear pointedly on the present. They represent qualities and characteristics we admire, or to which we aspire. They represent the troubles which beset us and the uncertainty with which we approach them. Perhaps
the authors are saying, "If we can find meaning in these events we may be able to find meaning in the present."
There is much that could have been said about the election of 1960. The above topic is basically a description of that election. Students ought to understand that in the events described there is meaning for their lives. Perhaps a teacher could serve this function. But the textbook might also serve this function if it was the purpose of the authors to expose a structure of knowledge.

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

Commager has said of written history, "There is bias in the choice of a subject, bias in the selection of material, bias in its organization and presentation, and inevitably, bias in its interpretation."26 The authors, in the above topic, make at least two generalizations. One refers to the youthfulness of the candidates. The second refers to the charges and countercharges leveled in the campaign. In both instances the information presented supports these generalizations. But in time it may be determined by subsequent historians that these were not the salient points involved in the 1960 presidential campaign.

Then other generalizations may be made because new authors may choose different content as being important. Or other generalizations may be made because the content used is interpreted in the light of changed circumstances or values. At any rate change may come. This is characteristic of written history. But it is not a characteristic emphasized by textbooks. It is not a characteristic emphasized by this book, either in this topic or elsewhere.

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

Vico referred to the discipline of history as "The New Science." 27 Croce said that when one does historical research, "what the poet said happens." 28 Clearly these are differing points of view. Is history art or science? The question has been widely discussed. Smith and Hughes, for instance, say that it is both. 29 As far as the student

---


is concerned the question has ramifications which affect his understanding of the discipline as he studies it. What should he know about historical knowledge beyond the findings and conclusions of scholars? How can he utilize historical methodology to arrive at his own conclusions and guide his decisions? Does methodology relate directly to what he learns? These appear to be important questions which are not dealt with in the above topic. Neither are they spoken to elsewhere in the book. This topic was selected because it appeared to come as near as any which could be found to exhibiting a syntactical structure. The authors might have said, "We believe history to be both art and science. Basically, the historian uses an inductive methodology. This means...when he does thus and so he is emphasizing the artistic qualities of the knowledge. When he does thus and so he is emphasizing the scientific qualities of the knowledge." Probably it was due to their major concern being different, but the authors made no such statements.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Schwab model was intentionally modified to correspond to history. In the analysis of Rise of the American Nation using this version we have been able more often than when using Schwab's model to say that selected topics had the potential for exhibiting a structure of knowledge. But we found no selection which we could say was
completely isomorphic to the model. The potential lies in what is implicit in the subject matter. In order to claim that a structure of knowledge exists, what is implicit needs to be made explicit. It may be that textbooks can be written to reveal a structure of knowledge. Further modification and refinement of the Schwab model might produce a guide to writing such a book.

SECTION II: CONTENT ANALYSIS OF HISTORY OF A FREE PEOPLE

In this section three topics are investigated under each component of the Modified Version of the Schwab model. The topics were selected because of their seeming congruence to the model.

The authors are referred to as "teacher-historians." Samuel P. McCutchen was a long-time Professor of Education at Duke University. Before his retirement, Henry W. Bragdon taught American history for many years at Brooks School, North Andover, Massachusetts, and at Phillips Exeter Academy...

1. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE: WHAT IS THE UNIQUE SUBJECT MATTER?

This component of the model is applied to selections from chapters 7, 17, and 19. One is a full-page inset, relating history to the social sciences. The other two are from the narrative portion of the text. The first topic is
Jefferson liked to speak of his election to the Presidency in 1800 as a "revolution." It was perhaps a revolution in the sense that men who distrusted democracy were replaced by those who believed in it, but it was surely one of the mildest revolutions in all history. Not only was there no violence, but surprisingly little Federalist legislation was repealed. The Alien and Sedition acts had already run out and were not renewed; the period necessary for naturalization was reduced from fourteen years to five. The excise tax on whiskey was abolished. The major features, however, of Hamilton's financial program remained untouched: The Bank of the United States, the Funding Act, and the assumption of state debts. Jefferson hoped to do away with the federal debt not by canceling it but by paying it off rapidly. The money to do this was found by practicing the strictest economy in government. The regular army was reduced to 3,000 men, and it proposed to put almost the entire navy in dry dock.

Once in control of the federal administration, the Republican leaders found that their new role of being in power instead of in opposition pushed them toward modifying or even violating some of their previously expressed principles of government. Jefferson, for instance, professed to fear executive power, and in his Inaugural Address hinted that he would allow Congress to guide policy. He reduced the symbolic dignity of the presidency. He made gestures toward giving Congress more detailed control

---

of the executive departments, but he soon found that if he did not give leadership, his party would break into factions. He therefore used his position as party leader to influence congressional legislation. By consultation with Republican leaders in Congress, and by seeing his supporters gain key positions, Jefferson became just as much "chief legislator" as Washington had been. Similarly, Jefferson professed to fear extension of the power of the federal government, but, as the next chapter will show, when he felt he had to choose between the welfare of the nation and his principles, he chose the former. Thus, he illustrated the fact that the "outs" tend to be strict constructionists, because they want to prevent action by their opponents who control the federal government, while the "ins" are apt to be loose constructionists, because they are in power and wish to act.

I.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

John R. Palmer, an historian, has made the unlikely assertion that what students study in school called "history" does not yield understanding. What does yield understanding is a study of the social sciences. He therefore argues that a study of both the findings and methodology of the social sciences ought to precede a study of history. If this approach has merit, then it seems quite reasonable to

conclude that written history which does not make explicit the findings and methodology of the social sciences is less than educative. In the selection under investigation, various social science concepts are implicit: "revolution," banking, and the sociological differences between people composing different political parties. But these concepts are not identified as political, economic, or sociological. Nothing is said of the methodology used to arrive at such concepts. Yet the historian obviously uses these and many other ideas from the social sciences. It is true that he relates them to each other, and to other non-social science concepts, in an attempt to portray a unified picture of the past. But the above selection, or this book, does not make apparent more than the findings of the social sciences. The differences and similarities between historical and social sciences methodology and intent are not revealed. In the sense suggested by the Modified Version of the Schwab model, structure is not revealed by asking the above question.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?

A search of the literature would doubtless yield a long list of reasons for studying history. A prior question might be, Can students study history fruitfully, for whatever
reason, in the fragmented way in which it is often served up? To avoid fragmentation textbook writers must take care to assure that the selection and organization of content fits into a gestalt with a message. Ward has claimed that "history...means bringing to bear honest questions in a way that will yield for students in return a gain both in rational understanding and an expansion of human sympathy."³

But in order to ask intelligent, meaningful questions a student must have some insight, however superficial, into the continuity of history — the relationship of most areas of life in the period he is studying. Bragdon and McCutchen, in the above topic, relate their discussion to the concept of revolution. As they use the concept, and as it is often used in the Jeffersonian context, revolution means radical, acute change. This idea seems to be left dangling. There is only moderate evidence offered to support the notion and likewise a thin argument opposing its legitimacy. We might well raise the question, Why did not the authors clearly and forcefully muster strong evidence to either confirm or deny the idea of the "Revolution of 1600"? The student could then ask "honest questions" in a way that would yield "a gain

both in rational understanding and an expansion of human sympathy." And he might learn something of the nature of history as a discipline, which is a fundamental benefit to be derived from understanding, to echo Bruner, "how things are related."

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

The differing viewpoints about whether history is nomothetic or ideographic are embedded rather impressively in their own history and are not apt to be solved by the stroke of a pen. But it may be fruitful to think about the educative possibilities inherent in both points of view. Krug, for instance, argues that general statements are useful for ordering data but that in the "real" world of the student it is the unique, the specific which "impinges on the minds of the young." Other claims have been made for teaching generalizations. Both points of view appear viable.


5For example, see Hilda Taba, "Techniques of In-Service Training," Social Education, Volume XXIX, Number 10 (November 1965), pp. 464-476; Eugene M. Gilliom, "Structure and the History Curriculum," The Social Studies, Volume LIX, Number 2 (February 1968), pp. 70-76; and James G. Womach, Discovering the Structure of Social Studies (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1968).
and both appear to relate to the above question. Students need to see the uniqueness in singular events as well as how these events, singularly and in concert, relate to the greater context in which they occurred. This will preclude evaluating events in terms of current values or relating them to some abstract set of organizing principles.

In the above selection the authors appear to have consciously ordered their data and evaluated its significance in the context of the times. For instance, the ideas of paying off the public debt, and foistering the power of Congress rather than the Executive are discussed as viable concepts. In terms of 1970 thinking they would probably be viewed differently. In terms of a theroretical construct, which itself would reflect a certain amount of current value, they would be apt to be discussed differently. What might have been helpful, in the sense that it would have aided the student's insight into the nature of historical knowledge, would have been to make this aspect of writing history explicit.

The second selection examined for an organizational structure of knowledge is from chapter 10, "Parties and Politics." The temporal setting is the 1890's. This topic is a full-page inset entitled "History and the Social
Sciences: Economics, Sociology." It was chosen for its obvious relationship to this component of the model. The selection, subtitled "Was an Agrarian Revolution in Prospect?" follows:

Much of this section on "The Emergence of Modern America" deals with the unhappy plight of farmers in an age of industrialization and urbanization - an age when industry was outstripping agriculture, in both productivity and profits. In many farming communities there was such a bitter sense of grievance that there was fear of a revolution. For an understanding of the explosive situation and for explanations of why revolution did not occur, history can turn to the social sciences.

The economist would note that farmers were increasingly in the grip of economic forces beyond their control - middleman, railroads, bankers, and the variable demands of a world market (see p. 422).

The sociologist would note that farmers developed a strong consciousness of belonging to a separate and isolated group in society, as evidenced, for instance, by the formation of the nationwide organization, the Grange. Furthermore, farmers felt they were losing public esteem....

The political scientist would stress the fact that federal laws worked to the disadvantage of the farmer (see the first paragraph of the section on the Populist party, p. 455). The political scientist would also concern himself with the way the farmer organized to try to gain control.

---

of the state and federal governments through the Grange, the Populist party, and Bryan's "free silver" campaign of 1896. He would also seek explanations for the failures of these movements....

Ultimately the farmer did not revolt. Why? The economist would point out that after 1896 farm prices rose and for over twenty years there was a period of prosperity. The sociologist would add that the farmer's sense of isolation diminished with improved roads and communications, so that they felt less removed from society as a whole. The political scientist would suggest that the farmers gave up the battle after the Grangers, the Populists, and Bryan's free silver crusade failed; he might also note that gradually the federal government acceded to most of the demands made by farmers - thereby dampening the potential revolutionary order of this group. For example, a separate Department of Agriculture was established in 1889 to help meet the farmers' needs....

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

Unlike the narrative portion of the book, the above topic represents a direct attempt to relate history to the social sciences, economics and sociology. A number of concepts from political science are also revealed. These concepts revolve, in the hands of the authors, around the question of why the late 19th Century farmer did not revolt. Economic, sociological, and political reasons are suggested
which delineate the farmers' dilemma in bold relief. Then economic, sociological, and political reasons which mitigated against revolt are suggested. In a sense, the authors have used the findings of the social sciences to explain the sometimes unenviable, sometime ambivalent position of the farmer. They did not attempt to demonstrate the various methodologies used by the social scientists and how these differ from historical methodology. It may be that in a short selection it is not reasonable to expect the authors to exhibit both the findings and the methodologies of a variety of the social sciences. If we assume that method and content are not dichotomous, it seems reasonable to claim that attention be paid to both findings and methodology.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?

The stated purpose of the above selection is to demonstrate how the use of the social sciences can shed light on historical problems. The resurrection of the past can be viewed holistically. How do you give life to that which is dead? How do you put flesh on dry bones? The authors have utilized the social sciences to accomplish this task. This need not make history a science or distract
from its aesthetic quality, as some have suggested. In the selection under analysis the authors have explored various aspects of one facet of life -- that of the farmer. More specifically, they have explored one aspect of the life of the farmer -- those conditions which caused him to threaten to revolt. In this restricted sense we can affirm that the authors did create a composite picture of a restricted area of the past. We might raise the question, if we are interested in revealing the nature of the knowledge, should not this type discussion be in the narrative of the text?

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

The authors have used some social science concepts to demonstrate that different approaches can clarify common problems. This in no way implies that they wrote from a predetermined or theoretical point of view. Neither is there any evidence that they wrote imposing the values or points of view of the present onto the past. The problems of the 1890 vintage American farmer are reviewed in that

7A clear example of an historian who disclaims any utilitarian function of history is Philip D. Jordan, "The Usefulness of Useless Knowledge," The Historian, Volume XXII, Number 3 (May 1960), pp. 237-249.
context. The problems of isolation, political impotency, and economic deprivation are generally not true of the American farmer in 1970. Today's farmer has different problems. Today's historian has problems, too.

Max Savelle has suggested two approaches to history. The historical school called *historicism* Savelle refers to as "pure" history. Their concern is the resurrection of the past. The school of historians identified under the epithet *historicism* Savelle refers to as "applied" history. They are interested in applying the findings of history to the problems of the present. Another approach to history is suggested by those who see promise in the application of the concept of the structure of knowledge to unveiling the nature of the knowledge in a discipline. The inset investigated here indicates that textbooks can be utilized to make clear the nature of historical knowledge. A bad text need not, as Bragdon has suggested, dictate bad teaching. But neither should dull textbooks necessarily continue to reflect history as a dull subject.

---


The third and last selection investigated in search of an organizational structure of knowledge is from the introduction to chapter 19, "Imperialism." This is the first chapter in Part 6, "New Horizons." The time is the late 19th Century. The topic follows:

The United States was late in joining the race for empire. With an abundance of raw materials, an immense home market, and little surplus capital available for foreign investment, this country lacked the economic motives which operated in Europe. The tradition of isolation tended to keep America within its borders. Furthermore, the conquest of "subject" peoples seemed at variance with the fundamental idea of the Declaration of Independence — that people have the right to rule themselves. When the United States did acquire an overseas empire, most of its citizens, including the President, had no premonition of what was coming.

Although it may appear as though the American adventure into imperialism occurred almost by chance, voices had already been raised in favor of expansion overseas. Thus Alfred Mohan demanded not only the building of a great fleet, but the acquisition of coaling stations and strategic harbors in the Pacific and the Caribbean. A clergyman, Josiah Strong, in a book entitled Our Country, wrote that it was the mission of the United States to spread Christianity and civil liberty by establishing colonies. Strong, like other imperialists, borrowed the language of Darwin to support his arguments: he maintained that the Anglo-Saxons were the "fittest to survive" in

——

the great competition between races for the control of the globe. People of English stock, he wrote, were "destined to dispossess many weaker races, assimilate others, and mold the remainder," until they had "Anglo-Saxonized mankind." Such pseudo-Darwinian notions were preached by influential historians and political scientists. They were also held by a few important politicians, notable Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts and his close friend, Theodore Roosevelt, President McKinley's Assistant Secretary of the Navy. While the business community was in general opposed to foreign adventures, some American corporations were actively seeking foreign markets. If businessmen could be shown that by acquiring colonies the United States could expand its markets, they could be converted to imperialism. For many businessmen this conversion took place during the Spanish-American War.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

There is a sense in which history can be thought of as a "human science." At least, it can be thought of as a study of humanity in time. In this sense, then, history is never finished. The social sciences constantly study the human condition, but from differing vantage points. One discipline relies upon another for insight into the problems of mankind. Taken in total, we get an overall picture of
man. The historian relies upon other disciplines to furnish his data and sharpen his insight. In the above topic, Bragdon and McCutchen relate concepts from political science, economics, sociology, psychology, biology, and geography. In this way they fill out and enrichen their narrative. But the fact that the many concepts they utilize come from many disciplines lurks beneath the surface. The authors do not make this explicit. To reveal a structure of knowledge, at least as defined by the Modified Version of the Schwab model, explication of the uses and methodology of the social sciences is needed.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?

Different historians express different views of what is history. Sometimes they express similar views in different ways. Oftentimes we gain improved insight into the nature of historical knowledge by listening with more than one ear. For instance, Jordan considers history to be an "aggregation of truths, half-truths, semi-truths, etc."¹¹ Savelle claims that the chief function of history is to answer the question "what happened in the past, and why?"¹² Gustavson drew an

analogy between the outline of history and the front page of a newspaper. Both give the framework of what happened and both tend to focus on the unusual or spectacular.\textsuperscript{13} Considered in concert, these viewpoint, to cite but a few, impress us with the all-encompassing chore of the historian. No area of human life should escape his view. Any one short selection may not represent a total view of human life at any one time. But we can determine whether the authors focused comprehensively on the area of life they laid out to investigate.

In the above selection, the focus is on imperialism. The author delineated the various forces which undergirded the race for colonies: economic gain, power, dominance of the "fittest," and the stated desire to "Christianize and Anglo-Saxonize." Historical information is then used to illustrate how each of these concepts operated and interacted with other forces. The mature, analytical, reader can perceive this aspect of the knowledge. There is some question whether the high school student could perceive it.

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

The authors' statement that most American citizens "had no premonition of what was coming" when they acquired an empire may be viewed as an indication that what is said is related to the times in which it occurred. We might suspect that had what was said been related to either the present or some theoretical construct it would have been worded differently. Some have attempted to identify laws in history. It seems more reasonable to agree with Gustavson that history is constantly revised because new factors appear or take on new meaning. This quality tends to make history untheoretical and unscientific, in the sense that the natural or social sciences are theoretical. General covering laws have yet to be identified. Imperialism, in the way it is discussed in the above topic, would not be congruent to today's world. There are no "virgin" areas waiting for colonization, in the same way that Africa was "waiting" to be colonized in 1890. But neither do the


authors imply that imperialism was directed by some gargantuan law or theory. Circumstances being what they were, imperialism "happened." This is how life, and therefore history, occurs. Students need to see this quality in order to understand the nature of the knowledge. Such is not made apparent in the above topic.

II. SUBSTANTIVE STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCEPTS?

The three selections investigated for substantive structure are from chapters 3, 26, and 32. Chapter 3 describes the colonial struggle to become independent of England. The following topic is entitled, "Moving Toward Separation."

In spite of warlike measure, the majority of the Continental Congress did not at first favor separation from England. Instead, they wanted union with the mother country through common loyalty to the king, but with the right to rule themselves and not submit to Parliament. In a petition to George III, the Americans blamed all their troubles on his ministers, "those artful and cruel enemies who abuse your royal confidence and authority for the purposes of effecting our destruction." Congress appealed to the king for relief from Parliament and continued to open its meetings with prayers for his health. The Americans were careful to refer to the British armies they were fighting as "ministerial" troops.

No matter what Congress might have intended, events were driving them toward separation. First, there was the great fact of continuing war. Not content with bottling up Gage in Boston, the Americans invaded Canada -- a possible base for British operations. One force under General Richard Montgomery, starting from Ticonderoga, took Montreal and advanced on Quebec by way of the St. Lawrence. Another little army under General Benedict Arnold also reached the great stronghold after an amazing march through the wilderness of Maine. When in December the two armies joined on the Plains of Abraham outside Quebec, they did not number more than 1,200. Yet the commanders attempted to surprise the defending garrison by an early morning assault. The attack failed when Montgomery was killed and Arnold wounded; as a result, Canada remained in British hands.

11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Did the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose were necessary to the narrative?

In the topic quoted, Bragdon and McCutchen chose to relate selected concepts and information to support the proposition that in the years immediately preceding the American Revolutionary War there was indeed a notable "moving toward separation." Even though they do not state that they are dealing with only some of the events which led to separation, it is obvious that this is the case. But the question is, Would students recognize this selective
process? Are the concepts and information necessary to the narrative, or are they merely illustrative of the point being emphasized? Perhaps other concepts and information would have done the job just as well. It would appear to be anti-historical to assume that one or two events necessarily caused a singularly focal event such as the Revolutionary War. The distinction between what is necessary and what is sufficient ought to be kept clear-cut. There are obviously times when certain information is necessary to establish unique points. For instance, it would probably be extremely difficult to explain the geographical and ideological divisions in post-World War II Europe without relating to the Yalta Conference and the many ambiguous connotations it suggests. The above topic seems to fall into a different category. But the authors do not openly deal with this characteristic of the knowledge.

3. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

---

10 Gustavson has asserted "No single cause ever adequately explains a historical episode." See Gustavson, *Op. Cit.*, p. 55. If it is important that college freshmen learn this characteristic of historical knowledge -- Gustavson's book is aimed toward college freshmen -- why is it not important for students to learn it at an earlier age?
There is a sense in which the future is now. This is just another way of focusing on the inexorable march of events. Time may be the single most unique characteristic of history. Beyond the satisfaction of knowing, as the 19th century advocates of historism claimed, there might be little value in studying history unless we can relate it to both the present and the future-present. Looked at in this way, all of history is a story, perhaps without climax or denouement. This is to focus on the teleological quality of history, not to deny it.

In the selection quoted above the authors were pointing toward the war and then colonial independence. This reveals the teleology in the story. Mankind, like Heraclitus' stream, is never static. Every event is not eschatological. Perhaps none are. But they all fit into the vast Mosaic which constantly forges into more and more time. To understand the value of the study of history, a student should be exposed to such ideas. Perhaps this could be done by focusing on a particular concept of the structure of knowledge. Asking the above question does not, however, reveal the structure posited by the Revised Version of the Schwab model.
3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

Bruner has argued that we create knowledge to give structure to the regularities in experience. Implicit in our acceptance of this assertion is the assumption that "regularities" do in fact exist. If experience is irregular there may be some question using Bruner's definition, as to whether knowledge in structured form can exist. On this basis, historians have denied that history can have a structure. It seems only reasonable to assume that neither regularities nor structure can exist unless the conclusions reached are consistent with the information explored.

In the selection quoted above, the authors make two outstanding points: the majority of colonial Americans did not favor separation from England, but events were definitely moving them in this direction. The information and concepts then presented (petition to George III and continued fighting) illustrate the legitimacy of the conclusions. This is not

---


20 For example, see the assertions of Mark Krug, who was educated as an historian.
to deny that other causal factors were involved in the widening break between mother country and colonies. It does demonstrate that "method and matter are the opposite sides of the same coin." Learning the historians' method may not make apparent a structure of knowledge, in Schwabian terms or otherwise, but it may well be a part of that process.

The second topic examined in an attempt to uncover a substantive structure of knowledge is from chapter 26, the initial chapter in Part 6, "The Roosevelt Years." The topic, "Industry and Labor," follows:

The principal measure whereby the New Deal tried to promote the recovery of industry was the National Industry Recovery Act of June 1933, which Roosevelt hailed as "probably...the most important and far-reaching law ever passed by the American Congress." It proposed a partnership of business, labor, and government to attack the emergency of hard times. Much of its inspiration came from the United States Chamber of Commerce which in 1931 proposed a "national economic council" to balance production with consumption and to prevent cut-throat competition. If permitted to combine to control standards and prices, asserted the Chamber of Commerce, industry would keep up wages and insure workers against accidents, sickness, and old age.

---


The law provided that representatives of management and labor draw up "codes of fair competition." These were based on the notion that one of the primary causes of the depression was overproduction. The United States was a "mature economy," it was argued, with a productive capacity greater than its needs. What was demanded of industry as of agriculture was controlled production, with equitable arrangements to divide the proceeds among different business firms and their employees. Codes were established to spread employment by reducing the length of the work week, to put a floor under wages, to allow industries to fix "fair" prices, and to punish "chiselers."

To spread business among as many firms as possible, factories were usually limited to two shifts a day. Every code was supposed to have the force of law and was enforced by a "code authority" appointed by the President. The various codes and code authorities were under the over-all direction of a National Recovery Administration (NRA). As head of the NRA, Roosevelt appointed a colorful, energetic ex-army officer, General Hugh S. Johnson, formerly Bernard Baruch's right-hand man in the War Industries Board.

The NRA was launched with parades, fireworks, and speeches. Business firms signing code agreements were allowed to display a blue eagle with the words "We Do Our Part." The beginning of the experiment was accompanied by a revival of business confidence; production rose temporarily to 93 per cent of the 1929 figure. Soon about 600 codes had been drawn up, covering 22 million workers and nine-tenths of American business concerns.

11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are necessary to the narrative?
It is quite apparent, to anyone familiar with the Roosevelt years, that there was much more to life in the 1930's than industry and labor. The above topic is simply one part of the story of that period. And the concepts and information presented represent only a part of the story of industry and labor. The authors were selective in what they presented. For the most part, what they chose to write about was probably derived from the records and statements about that period. This means that the records and statements had to be sifted carefully before a decision was made about what to write. Such might not be true of an ancient period where few records may exist and at best only limited conclusions can be reached. But were the concepts and information used necessary to the narrative?

The authors presented the conclusions that 1) the National Recovery Act was important, 2) the Act attempted to be impartial, and 3) the Act did in fact bring significant relief from depression. In doing so they mustered sufficient evidence, primarily from source materials, to warrant the conclusions. But they did not indicate that the information they used is either exclusively necessary, representative of

---

"all" that happened, or a depiction of the Roosevelt years as they "actually happened." In terms of revealing the nature of historical knowledge, by revealing a particular structure of knowledge, the quote selection is not particularly productive. Perhaps no short selection would reveal a particular structure; however, the above selection came as near being isomorphic to the model being used as any that could be found.

2. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

Recorded history has taken account of a rather impressive number of futurists. Some of them, like Orwell and Huxley, have been less than optimistic. Others, like Marx, have pictured a future world of equality and tranquility. However fanciful, inhumane, or ill-conceived we may deem such projections to be, they all have a common quality. They all focus on yet-to-be-spent time. In historical terms, they all point out important lessons to be learned about the nature of historical knowledge. There are utilitarian, academic, and aesthetic reasons for probing the past. They are all important. They all relate the past end of the continuum to the future. Heibromer has captured this
important quality of history in his reference to "the future as history."\textsuperscript{24}

The concepts of economic sufficiency, sociological stability, political involvement, and the overall quality of life are important considerations in our time. They were also important, as the above quoted selection attests, in the 1930's. The same concerns will doubtless be important tomorrow. History is not a segmented phenomenon which we can divide literally. It is a constant, ever-moving process of mankind acting in time and space. The future is always its goal. We can claim with reason that the student might understand more fully this aspect of history if it was made more explicit than it is in the above selection.

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

It has been cynically averred that all history is guessing.\textsuperscript{25} There is a sense in which this is true. There is also a sense in which it is not true. Few, if any,


\textsuperscript{25}This is another statement attributed to Voltaire. See Fritz Stern (ed.), \textit{The Varieties of History} (New York: Meridian Books, 1956), pp. 35-45.
historians would claim the dignity of the term history for writing that was totally ungrounded in fact. There are times when the historian has such a plethora of fact, oftentimes conflicting, that he has great difficulty in sorting out what to use, and how to use it, to create a consistent picture of the past. Even then he cannot say what actually happened. At best he is interpreting scattered bits of the past.

In the selection under investigation the authors make the general conclusions that the National Industry Recovery Act was intended to promote recovery and that it did indeed do so, at least temporarily. They in turn present information to support these positions. This information is consistent with their conclusions. This is not to say that other information could well have yielded other conclusions. Or the sum of all the information preserved about the period could have been presented without interpretation. In such form the information may have been relatively meaningless. But it would have focused on the important relationship between information and conclusions. If we are interested in exhibiting a structure of knowledge, we probably ought to make this explicit.

The following topic is from the last descriptive chapter in the book, "New Frontiers." The time is the 1960's --
26 the Kennedy years and beyond. The topic is entitled "Affluence and Insecurity."26

In 1955 the economist John Kenneth Galbraith wrote a book, The Affluent Society, in which he declared that the recent American prosperity was something new in the world. In all previous societies, productivity had been so low that most people could expect nothing but backbreaking toil and poverty. The economies of most countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are in this category. The United States and a few other highly developed countries, are however, in sight of a day when all people can live in abundance.

Not only has American Productivity run far ahead of increases in population, but wealth has become more equally divided. During the "golden twenties," the top 5 per cent of the people amassed 35 per cent of the nation's income. By 1960 this share had sunk to 15 per cent, even before taxes; and most Americans earned enough for luxuries as well as for the necessities of life. The proportion of home owners increased from 40 per cent in 1940 to nearly 60 per cent in 1960. So many could afford cars that new super-highways became overcrowded as soon as completed. There was more leisure; hours of work were shortened, and millions of workers enjoyed vacations with pay. An automobile for nearly every family, combined with annual vacations, led to the development of a new business: the motel. First appearing in the late 1930's, motels soon were built along every highway from Maine to California. Leisure time also produced booms in gardening equipment and power tools.

Most Americans became more secure as well as better off. Unemployment insurance and social security were extended to the majority of jobholders. Such programs were supplemented by a variety of private welfare plans, promoted by employers or trade unions. Business executive, facing high income taxes, often preferred to be paid in annuities after retirement rather than in higher salaries. Federal subsidies protected farmers against serious loss. Federal legislation also protected bank depositors, investors, and mortgage holders.

In spite, however, of the greater diffusion of prosperity, the United States had not reached the point where anyone received enough for a satisfying life. There remained a hard core of poverty, both rural and urban. Indeed, the bottom 20 per cent of the population gained no greater share of the wealth than in the 1920's.

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are necessary to the narrative?

The concepts "affluence" and "insecurity" tend to represent polar positions. But this is not necessarily so. They may very well be opposite sides of the same coin. On the one hand, affluence has brought security in ways no other society has ever known. On the other hand, affluence has cast into bold relief, if not exacerbated, the condition of the remaining poor. The topic quoted above dwells more on
the role of the former than the latter. The enviable economic position of 20th century America has brought with it peculiar problems. These problems are subsumed under the general conclusions that 1) America has more material wealth than any nation in history, 2) the wealth is more evenly distributed than in most nations, and 3) hard core poverty has remained. Facts, in sufficient quantity, are then supplied to illustrate these ideas. This does not make the particular facts necessary to the narrative. They may be sufficient, but the student would probably better understand how the historian works, and the nature of the discipline, if the rationale behind the choice of the facts used had been revealed.

2. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

The Durants ended their short treatise on the uses of history with the assertion that if man is fortunate he will transmit as much of his heritage as possible to his children.27 This does not seem a peculiar or unreasonable assertion, but it does raise the question, Why? Should man

be impressed that he, "with his puny life span, is but a pygmy walking among giants whose growth and decline must be measure in terms of centuries"? That man does not live in the past? That at best man lives in the fleeting present, which is inexorably eating into the restful future? That we need to grasp as much of the past as possible to help us better perceive, better order, better evaluate, and better appreciate our never-static present?

Bragdon and McCutchen doubtless understand this restless quality in history -- the unshakeable connection between past and future. Embedded in their description of what has happened in the past is perhaps the implicit question, "What will happen in the future?" We cannot know. History does not provide us with the skills of prediction. But this we can know: the study of the past, unconnected with the present, is of limited value. In the sense that a structure of knowledge might better help the student to inquire, perceive, and understand, to have made the connection between past and present apparent would have been helpful.

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

---

The three general ideas of affluence, equality of distribution, and residual poverty are clearly set forth in the above selection. Ample information and concepts are then presented to demonstrate the ideas. In this sense a balanced picture of the topic "Affluence and Insecurity" is presented. The narrative flows and the reader is caused to focus on events in a cause and effect frame of reference. Still, some questions linger. What is especially educative about the information presented? Could other information have illustrated the same ideas? Why did the authors choose to include what they did? Is more than consistency needed between conclusions and referents? What about history ought a student to know that is not revealed in the topic under investigation? Or the entire book, for that matter? These questions are left unattended, either in this selection or in the book as a whole. It might be educative, in terms of revealing a structure of knowledge, to have dealt with them.

111. SYNTACTICAL STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPTS?

To determine if a syntactical structure of knowledge exists in the textbook, selections from chapters 6, 16, and 25 are investigated. The selection quoted below, from
chapter 5, is entitled "Internal Dissensions." The discussion involves the debate over foreign involvement in the second Jefferson Administration.

Jefferson's great majority in the election of 1804 might seem to show that the United States was becoming completely united. But two plots, in both of which Aaron Burr was implicated, revealed that the federal union was still in danger of breaking apart.

The Louisiana Purchase drove some New England Federalists to plan for secession of the northeastern states. They feared that the expansion would submerge New England as a force in politics and would subordinate its commercial interests to the agricultural interests of the South and West. "The People of the East," said a prominent Federalist, "cannot reconcile their habits, views, and interests with those of the South and West."

It was felt essential that New York should join the new federation. The plotters found a tool in Aaron Burr, who was willing to desert the Republican party and run for governor of New York as a Federalist candidate in 1804. Once elected, he apparently hoped to detach his state from the Union.

Burr's plans were thwarted in part by Alexander Hamilton, who in 1800 had helped to prevent his being elected President over Jefferson. Some of Hamilton's criticisms of Burr were quoted in an Albany newspaper and had a wide circulation. Burr demanded that Hamilton

either back up or deny what he had said, putting his demands in such a form that they might be regarded as a challenge to a duel.

It is strange that Hamilton should have finally agreed to fight. He had a wife and several young children; he was burdened with debts; and his eldest son had recently been killed in a duel. Apparently, he believed he must observe the code of military men of the day so that he might later be available for command. He foresaw a situation in which he might be needed as an American Napoleon to suppress an uprising of the people and restore order.

Early on a July morning in 1804, Hamilton, Burr, their seconds, and a physician rowed across the Hudson to a little shelf of rock at the foot of the Palisades. At the signal to fire, Burr, an excellent shot, sent a bullet into Hamilton's body. Hamilton died the next day. Thus he went to his death in part because he had tried to protect the Union from dismemberment and in part because he lacked faith in government by the people. When a New York coroner's jury indicted Burr for murder, he slipped out of New York, but this was not the end of his troubles.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

It might be argued that the freer a society, the stronger the forces which tend to both unite it and those
which tend to pull it apart. If this is the case, we may learn valuable lessons about freedom and dissension by studying history. And these are lessons that any person in a free society ought to learn. Every generation is forced with the not-to-be-denied present. Every present is shot through with problems to be solved and decisions to be made. The study of history is not an automatic panacea to the resolution of problems. Nor is it a guide to faultless decision-making. But it may help us to realize that our lives are in many ways similar to the lives of earlier generations. And it may also help us see that the discipline of history is a vibrant, viable study, not just the study of the "dead past." In a real sense the past lives. The more we understand the demands of the present, the more intelligently we can probe the past. The more we probe the past, the more incisive we will become about problems of the present.

There is a need to unite the country today, as there was in Jefferson's time. There are forces that tend to tear it apart, as there were in Jefferson's time, although sometimes in geographical or ideological terms, they need not be. The more important need is to understand them in a way that helps us better organize our lives and sensitively deal with the demands placed upon us. In this sense, a textbook might
be more helpful if these lessons were made apparent. They are not in the above topic.

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

Students have long been baffled at how history, written by various historians using the same facts, can differ. This kind of bafflement does not always extend to other disciplines. History is thought of as having already happened, therefore is unchangeable. This was the approach of the 19th century Ranke "school" of historiography. The fact is that history is as ephemeral as any other body of knowledge, even though the conclusions historians sometimes reach are written as if they are as solid as concrete. In the above selection, for instance, the authors begin by pointing out how the 1804 election might have been viewed as a great national cohesive force. But things are not always what they seem. Not only was there open dissent, it was undoubtedly true that certain groups, such as the Federalists, would have interpreted the election differently. Their values and frame of reference were different. In addition to this, the authors point out that Burr's plots had national implications. But would all authors have interpreted Burr's activities so seriously. Could not they be viewed as simply machinations of an eccentric man? Did
Burr ever command a large enough, or devoted enough, following to be viewed as a threat to national survival, or national unity? The important point is, questions of this nature need to be raised if we are to reveal a structure of knowledge.

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

Disagreement over one point does not necessarily indicate disagreement over all points. Mark Krug has soundly criticized the work of Bruner and the concept of the structure of a discipline. Yet the same Krug has argued that teachers must break away from "the slavish 'covering' of textbooks and substitute an intelligent selection of events, issues, and problems." Students need to see, first, how a scholar probes the past, and second, how they also can probe the past. It follows then that student needs to learn, either from the textbook or the teacher, or both, how to do this kind of investigating. He might approach the selection quoted above by asking the questions, Could other examples of internal dissension illustrate the concept of dissent as well as those used? How does an historian go about selecting

\[30\text{Krug, Op. Cit., p. 440.}\]
such examples? Could anyone do so? Such questions might reveal what the above topic does not reveal as it is now written: the complementary relationship between method and content.

"The Opening of the Trans-Mississippi West" is the title of chapter 16, from which the following section is taken. The time is the period following the Civil War. The topic, "Peopling the Great Plains," follows:

For nearly forty years after cultivation approached them, the Great Plains resisted settlement. Even allowing for the Indian menace, the most fundamental reason for farmers' unwillingness to venture into the great ocean of grass was that it was a wholly new environment. The frontiersman was used to getting water by digging a well 10 or 20 feet into the ground. In the Plains few streams ran all year round, and underground water was 30 to 300 feet down. The American pioneer was a woods dweller, dependent on trees for fuel, buildings, and fences. On the Plains, trees were found only in the bottom lands near rivers. These conditions discouraged settlers.

By 1860 the Indians no longer offered a hazard. Other difficulties were overcome by the progress of the industrial revolution. Cheap iron and steel made possible the drilled well in a sheet-iron case and the iron windmill. Barbed wire made for the lack of wooden fence rails. As has been noted, the most important factor in

---

promoting settlement was the railroad. "You may," wrote a spectator of the Dakota boom of the early 1860's, "stand ankle deep in the short grass of uninhabited wilderness; next month a mixed train will glide over the waste and stop at some point where the railroad has decided to locate a town. Men, women, and children will jump out after them. From that moment the building begins."

Meanwhile improved agricultural machinery cut the cost of raising crops. The reaper, in general use in 1865, was followed by the mechanical binder which tied the grain into sheaves as fast as it was cut. By 1880, two men and a team could harvest and bind 20 acres of wheat a day. The steam-driven threshing machine also came into general use. Other machines speeded the production of corn and hay. In addition to solving technical problems, the industrial revolution speeded the expansion of agriculture by creating a vast new urban market for food, both in America and Europe.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

Muller maintains that history solves nothing. Perhaps this is true. But that is far different from claiming that history focuses on nothing or has no relationship to our lives. Croce has viewed the study of history as the

story of liberty. Man has long striven to be free. Thomas Carlyle, writing to Alexander Herzen, said that if we value anything above freedom we will lose it with our freedom. History can focus on man's struggle to be free and give this struggle perspective. In one sense, the story of the American westward movement is a chapter in this struggle. Men faced unknown challenges and braved uncharted miles of sprawling plain in an effort to be free, to live a life which they could order and determine. In the same sense, all of history can be viewed in its relationship to our lives in the present. This quality of the knowledge is not revealed, however, by asking the above question.

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

The authors conclude that settlers were reticent to move to the Great Plains because of the strange environment; that by 1880 the Indian problem had passed; and that the introduction of mechanical equipment reduced the cost of raising crops on the Plains. These conclusions are all supported by information and reasonable arguments. But there are not statements which say, "As we see it..." or

"Given our current sense of values we have reached these conclusions." It may be that another generation of historians will conclude that men hesitated to move to the Great Plains because of their attachment to their homes. Or that it was not the Indian, but rather the white man who was a problem. Or that the good of low-cost production was greatly outweighed by over-production and the subsequent economic difficulties. What men see in the past is determined by their needs in the present. This will inevitably change. Could not this quality of the knowledge have been exhibited in the above quoted selection?

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

The authors' title to the selection quoted above smacks of a mechanical, automaton view of man. Perhaps this is due to the influence of technology on our age. Were the Great Plains "peopled" or did people choose to move to the Great Plains in quest of personal fulfillment? Is this the same sense in which we talk of an ambitious man "driving himself"? Perhaps not. Perhaps so. The important point is that history is written from a particular point of view. This is part and parcel of the historian's craft. To deny it is to deny what one cannot escape -- himself with his
predilections, values, etc. To fail to recognize the point is to understand only a part of history which like any discipline, is more than scholarly findings and consistent conclusions. It is also methodology, which means personal background, frame of reference, and a system of values as well as the scholarly accumulation and sifting of evidence. The authors, in the topic being investigated do not focus on these points. But they might have, had the explication of a structure of knowledge been important to them.

The last topic examined for syntactical structure is found in chapter 25, "Crash." The topic which follows is entitled "Hoover's Political Philosophy."  

In the closing days of the 1920 campaign, Hoover made a speech explaining his idea of the proper relation of government to business, and his belief in what he called "the American system of rugged individualism." The great prosperity of America, he said, was based on three factors: self-government, as far as possible through local agencies; individual freedom to encourage initiative; and equality of opportunity. This was in contrast to the European doctrine of "paternalism" (in which the government attempts to provide for individual security) and "state socialism" (in which basic industries are run by government). In the emergency presented by the First World War, it had been necessary

to regiment "the whole people temporarily into a socialistic state," but such regimentation was wholly out of place in peacetime. (See pp. 605-610).

The true role of government, Hoover argued, was that of "an umpire instead of a player in the economic game." It was a false liberalism that favored such "liberal" legislation as government operation of electric power plants. Once the federal government invaded the field of business, democracy would be threatened, since it depended on decentralization, and personal liberty would be endangered, because it depended on economic freedom. Hoover made clear, however, that his idea was not one of "devil take the hindmost." "It is," he said, "no system of laissez-faire." Within its proper sphere, the federal government had a part to play in helping to provide "economic justice as well as political and social justice."

Hoover mentioned conservation of natural resources, flood control, and scientific research as legitimate activities of government. Occasionally it might sell power or commodities as a by-product. But if government went further than that, it would undermine "the very instincts which carry our people forward to progress." As an example, Hoover pointed to Russia, whose natural resources equaled America's and whose people worked as hard, but which was far behind America in wealth because it lacked the benefits of 150 years of freedom and self-government.

"Our experiment in human welfare," Hoover maintained, "has yielded a degree of well-being unparalleled in the world.... We are nearer to the ideal of abolishing poverty and fear from the lives of men and women than ever before in any land."
III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

The specific question toward which the above selection is addressed is, "What bearing on events did Herbert Hoover's political philosophy have?" In order to generalize about this matter the authors selected excerpts from a particular campaign speech as a basis on which to ground their conclusions. This is an example of selectivity which, according to Nagel, is prerequisite to an historian writing anything. 35

Although the selection raises some serious questions about historiography, it also directs our attention to the relevance of history in dealing with contemporary problems. Was Hoover suggesting simplistic solutions for complex problems? For instance, is "equality of opportunity" equal to the opportunity itself? Is this why the authors included this particular speech? Are they suggesting that we ought to wrestle with questions such as, How individual is freedom today? Is self-government actually best for a people? They might have been. Perhaps to query history about such matters

would be educative and in the long run nationally significant. After all, this was Hoover's philosophy. Can we defend the proposition that the application of this philosophy has solved crucial problems? Time not only destroys, as Muller has pointed out, it also preserves. If we can probe what is preserved, in an attempt to improve the quality of our lives, we may find an importance to history that far transcends its "story" qualities. But this may be a purpose which was not central to that of Bragdon and McCutchen. At least they did not make such a purpose clear.

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

Hoover's statement are directed to the praise of the American system. In this sense, it is a "typical" political speech. For the most part, the authors seem willing to let these statements stand without commentary. They were intentionally portraying Hoover's political philosophy. But the philosophy itself raises some questions. Does Hoover's idea of "rugged individualism" indicate a strenght or a weakness? Would not the student be benefitted if the authors had explored the ramifications, both immediate and long-range, of such a philosophy? Was Hoover's idea of government as an economic "umpire" a viable philosophy which
could be applicable to any generation? Or was it simply a reaction to the times in which he lived? Were his statements and actions after his election to the White House consonant with this speech? Do historians today interpret this speech as commentators did in 1928? Are future historians apt to assume a different interpretation? If so, what might make them change? In terms of revealing a structure of knowledge or something about the nature of historical knowledge such questions would have been provocative.

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

Ernest Nagel has accused historians of justifying their selectivity by using "the convenient phrase 'other things being equal.'" In the sense that historians rarely seem to think it important to explicate their methodology, such an allegation may be warranted. Writers who write about history frequently comment on the necessity of choosing what from the past bears on the present or the particular point in the narrative needing grounding. Those who write history rarely do so. There is then a clear-cut division between method and content. As long as we view the study of history as the findings and conclusions of historians such a dichotomy

36Ibid., p. 362.
seems reasonable. But if we think of history as both methodology and matter, more than the results of scholarly inquiry is demanded. For instance, we might ask, Why was the one Hoover speech chosen to exemplify his political philosophy? Were the positions taken in this speech consistent with Hoover's administrative policies? Did he ever make a public statement which contradicted his 1920 philosophy? If so, of what importance was it? Should not the student be confronted with these and similar questions? After all, there seems little reason to treat historical interpretations as sacred. The very nature of historical explanation may make the interpretations anachronistic at a later date. It might be educative for a student to understand this.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The question raised in the analysis of *History of a Free People* appears to be efficacious in the sense that they were intended. They cause us to focus on some qualities of historical knowledge which would doubtless lead to a richer understanding of the meaning and usefulness of the discipline of history. They seem to indicate that the qualities in the knowledge the questions were designed to reveal are probably implicit in the discipline. For a
student to clearly focus on the nature of the knowledge these qualities need to be made explicit. As the text is now written the thrust is toward the presentation of substantive knowledge. Implicit in this familiar approach is the assumption that substantive knowledge will effect the behavioral changes deemed desirable in this culture. Such an assumption is probably not supportable. But the book itself may be amenable to rewriting in such a way that both substantive knowledge and the nature of the discipline can be revealed.

SECTION III: CONTENT ANALYSIS OF THE STORY OF AMERICA

For purposes of this study the authors are referred to as "non-professional" historians. They are all teachers or administrators in the public schools.

In this section of the chapter, three separate selections are investigated for organizational, substantive, and syntactical structure, using the Modified Version of the Schwab model. These topics were selected after a careful reading of the text in an attempt to find selections isomorphic to the model. This first component of the model is organizational structure.
1. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCEPTS?

Selections from chapters 1, 14, and 19 are investigated to determine if they reveal an organizational structure of knowledge. The first one, from the chapter, "Land of the Free," follows. The topic is entitled, "The Right to Own Private Property."¹

For almost three hundred years our people kept moving west. They found new lands to settle; they planted on millions of new farms; miners dug deep into one new area after another. From all this, many men made great fortunes. In this growing nation, your life was as good as you could make it. Whatever you earned was yours.

The land they owned was very important to the people who settled our country. Often they had to fight to get it. Why shouldn't they use it as they wished? If a man found coal or iron or marble under his land, he claimed the right to mine or to quarry it.

When England ruled its thirteen American colonies, the British government had passed laws to control business. The English wanted their colonies to help make England richer. They tried to make the colonies grow things needed in England, such as hemp, lumber, and tobacco. In turn the people of the colonies were supposed to buy the manufactured goods they needed from the English.

Then our country became free. We got rid of English laws about business. Government rules about what a man could do with his property were ended. A new idea came instead. We call it "free enterprise," or business left alone by the government.

Adam Smith, a writer from Scotland, wrote a book called The Wealth of Nations. It was published in 1776, the year that we declared our freedom from England. Many Americans read the book. In it, Smith said that it was best for any country to leave business alone. Let each person do what seems to him the best things to make his own living. As each man's wealth grows, the whole country will grow richer and stronger....

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

The authors used a variety of social science concepts in the selection quoted above. They did not clearly and unequivocally demonstrate the source of these concepts or how they were derived. It may be claimed that a short topic such as this ought not be expected to reveal such information. Or that this kind of diversion from the narrative would erode the flow of the story. These claims may well be true. If textbooks continue to be written in the way they have traditionally been, such a claim is understandable. If the purpose for teaching history in the schools continues to be
mastery of factual data, the claim is understandable. But if our purposes proliferate to include the nature of the knowledge it seems reasonable to assume that textbooks ought to reflect this concern.

The above topic has concepts from geography, sociology, psychology, economics, and political science. Neither the methodology nor the source is stated. We cannot claim that we have exposed a structure of knowledge, in the sense that it is defined in the Modified Version of the Schwab model.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?

The right to own private property has been an important and long-standing concern in Anglo-American history. In modern times much of the push in this direction has used the 17th century eloquence of John Locke as a springboard. Jefferson substituted the expression "pursuit of happiness" for the Lockian term "property" when he adapted Locke's statement to the Declaration of Independence. But the change of expression did not change the concern. The concept continues to be vitally important in our culture. The tone in the title of the above topic focuses on this concern.
Yet the authors do not make any statements such as, "Since this is such an important idea in the history of the English-speaking people, we think it necessary that you see how all areas of life are related in its pursuit." Perhaps such a statement would intrude into the smoothness of the narrative. In terms of revealing what is basic to the discipline it might have been helpful.

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*, published in the year that the American Revolution began, can itself be viewed as a revolution. Economic and social mobility were not widely prevalent in western societies. The reactions of early Americans can be better understood and appreciated when viewed in this context. There is no indication that the response early Americans made to the possibilities inherent in such freedom was one of widespread jubilation. If viewed through today's cultural filter, such a response probably would be expected.

There is not direct indication that the authors were writing from a theoretical frame of reference. The book was basically descriptive. Historians with varying theoretical
causes to champion would probably write it the same way.
It may be that the above topic is theoretical in the sense
that it does not clearly show the usefulness of the study
of history. This is the popular use of theoretical. But
this is true of almost the entire book. There is no obvious
intent to make the entire story isomorphic to some pre-
determined idea of what written history ought to be. At
the same time, the authors do not make apparent the fact
that they are describing what their evidence indicates
probably happened.

The second topic investigated for organizational
structure is from chapter 14, "Americans Win the Southwest."
The topic, "Eyes on Texas!" follows:

Americans had pushed beyond Kentucky
and Tennessee even before Mexico won its
independence in 1821. They had settled in
Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and
Missouri. Some of them wanted to move into
Texas, but Spain would not let them in.

The map on page 294 will show you one
reason why they wished to go to Texas. The
Indians who had been pushed west of the
Mississippi now lived south of the Missouri
River. People thought the land west of the
Indian lands was a useless desert. The
Santa Fe trail had not yet begun. It was
not yet known that men could cross the
Great American Desert in wagon trains.
Texas seemed to be the best place a man
could choose for a new home.

---

\[2\] Ibid., p. 293.
In 1820 the Mexicans were fighting to be free from Spain. In that year, Connecticut-born Moses Austin came to San Antonio. He told the governor that he had become a Spanish citizen by moving into Missouri in the 1790's. At that time, Spain had still owned that land. Now he wanted to be a Mexican citizen. He was ready to bring 300 settlers into Texas with him. All of them would become Roman Catholics.

The governor said he would let the new government of his country decide. He felt sure that Austin and his friends would be welcome. You see, the leaders of the Mexican government had talked about Texas. They knew that they could not keep the American settlers out for long. Some day, the United States might even try to take Texas. The way to stop this might be to build up Texas quickly. They knew that the Americans in Texas made good citizens.

Texas had to be made strong. It needed more forts and more soldiers. This would protect it from a possible attack. Most of the people there made their living raising cattle. The Mexican leaders hoped they could bring in other industries.

What should be the first step in building up Texas? Texas needed people! Hadn't the United States grown stronger as people poured in from Europe? Why not open Texas to some Americans and to people from Europe?

1.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?
The above topic is rich in social science concepts: geographical, political, economic, religious, and sociological. The authors have used these concepts to develop the narrative. The emphasis is on the story, not the nature of the knowledge. There was no attempt to reveal the structure of knowledge defined by the model being used, or any other structure. Aesthetically, the careful weaving of concepts from various social science disciplines makes an interesting story. Add it probably has much educative value. It does not exhibit a structure.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?

The authors have discussed the pros and cons of the Americans using the Texas territory as a "swing" area in the push to the West. In this sense the topic being analyzed is consistent with the title, "Eyes on Texas!" They do not say whether what happened in Texas was singularly unique or illustrative of the kinds of problems faced by early pioneers in varying sections of the continent. They do not state, for instance, that at one time and place the anthropological problems of different cultures meeting were of primary concern. And that at another time and place, the economic problems involved in making a living were most important. And that, when looked at from the vantage points
of differing problems, involving differing concerns, and solved in differing ways, we get an overall picture of the "past." This does not mean that we literally resurrect the past. But first we would have to have more than a superficial understanding of the "why's" and "how's." We are not able to tease this out of the above selection.

3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

Since we are constantly confronted with the temptation to evaluate everything, including the past, in terms of our own backgrounds and values, it might be educative if textbook writers would speak to this point. The authors do not say, either in the above topic or elsewhere, that to impose the present on the past or relate the past to some preconceived theory is anti-historical. To reveal a particular structure of knowledge, such statements might be helpful. The problems of the 10th and 19th centuries obviously do not exist today. The descriptive nature of textbook writing tends to rule out a theoretical framework. It does not rule out personal predispositions, bias, or the desire

---

3 It might be argued here that to attempt to make history conform to a structure of knowledge is also anti-historical. Schwab does not suggest that structure be used to demonstrate "what actually happened" or in any other way guide historiography. He rather claims that structure is a pedagogical concept. It can be used as a "context for inquiry" to confront the past.
to indoctrinate. Some of the latter may exist in the text under consideration -- or any text. There is no indication that either a general or specific structure of knowledge exists.

Chapter 19 is entitled "Passing of the Frontier." Section 4 in this chapter is called "The Indian's Last Stand." Subsumed under this section is the following topic, "The Indians Must Go!" This is the third and final selection investigated for an organizational structure of knowledge.

In the beginning, the Indians owned all of the land in the West. Today, almost all of it has been taken from them. At first, they gave it up after they had lost wars in which they tried to drive out the pioneers. After such a war, a treaty would be signed. Men speaking for our government made a promise. If the Indians would move further west, they would be left in peace. The defeated Indians had no choice; they accepted the promise. Then, each time, our people would break the agreements. The Indians would then be pushed on to some other place. What were the Indians to do? They were proud warriors who wanted to keep their land. They saw that they would have to fight for their rights and for their land.

Our government meant it when it put aside part of the Louisiana Purchase for the Indians. This was to be Indian land forever. It was reserved, or kept, for Indian use. As you have read, a large part

of this reservation was part of the "Great American Desert." Whoever thought that such wasteland, or the mountains to the west, would ever be wanted by anyone but the Indians?

Then gold was discovered in California. Later the cattlemen came to the Great Plains. Railroads began moving people and goods across the plains and the mountains. Western lands seemed to be worth more and more. Again the Indians were pushed back!

I.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Have the authors shown how they used the findings and methodology of other disciplines, particularly the social sciences?

Apparently denigrating the irrelevance of some teacher education programs, Schwab asserted that teachers "have been permitted to think that 'induction' was a simple process with a singular meaning." To a great degree the same could be said of textbook writers. This is intended neither as another attempt to "beat the textbooks," nor as a criticism of authors. It is a fact. Textbook writers, as some have attested, work with certain kinds of restrictions. These include, political and social balance, length,

---


avoidance of "side-taking" in controversial issues, and such like. The usual result is a somewhat readable, somewhat superficial, somewhat innocuous product. The reasons far transcend any one textbook writer, or textbook writers as a whole. If reasons exist they are probably ingrained into the web and woof of our educational heritage. Education has long been professionally and popularly equated with mastery of factual information. Inquiry, analysis, behavioral changes have been viewed as happy collateral results of this primary purpose regardless of whether they in fact happened. The above selection exhibits these traditional characteristics of textbooks. Social science concepts are present -- from political science, psychology, economics, sociology, and geography. There is no indication as to how sociology related to the narrative. Or how the methodology of psychology compares or contrasts with that of the historian. Or how his findings complement historical scholarship. Perhaps it is not fair to criticize one short topic for not exhibiting these characteristics. But the overall book does not exhibit them either.

2. Have the authors organized and interpreted their data in such a way that they create a composite picture of the past?
Educators and history scholars must face the question, is it better to teach history as dogma or as "a fable agreed upon"? Are these the only alternatives? Either one is probably misleading. It seems reasonably safe to conclude that historians would reject the latter. But is it any more educative to espouse the former? Is the student to believe, unquestioning, that what he reads in a textbook is what in fact happened in the past? Is he to accept the emphasis, the interpretation, the nuances of meaning? Or are we to inadvertently feed his schizophrenic tendencies by telling him to study a textbook but not accept what it says? Nowhere in the above topic do the authors make such a statement as, "Although we cannot actually know what happened, in the way it happened, we have tried to write what to us seems warranted by the evidence. Where we could not or did not know, we have said so." Or, "At best we can know a part of what has happened in the past. We have tried to write what seems reasonable and warranted, in the light of the information we have." It is a big assumption to suppose that high school students know this already. Probably they do not. To demonstrate a structure of knowledge, and therefore something of the nature of the knowledge, such points should perhaps be clearly and concisely made.
3. Are the events and people of the past related specifically to the context in which they existed, rather than to some general theory of history, or to the present?

The Comtian organization of knowledge posits a theoretical taxonomy of the disciplines. Schwab claims that this organizational model is, unwittingly, widely used in the schools. Then he asserts that it "is one of the most tyrannical and unexamined curriculum principles in our time." Its tyranny lies in the implicit declaration that all disciplines are theoretical. There is a sense in which this allegation is true. The topic under consideration serves as a case in point. To understand and properly evaluate what an historian says about the condition of the American Indian, and how he got that way, a student needs to understand something about the nature of history, and the academic purposes of historical writing. Otherwise the theoretical aura, however thin, that necessarily surrounds every discipline will become a shroud. The authors do not have to lapse into the academic traps of writing with a predetermined purpose or imposing the present onto the past. By assuming that students will grasp the structure -- or the

---

nature -- of the discipline without the authors making it explicit will have the same effect. Such seems to be the case with the above topic. The teacher may be able to partially counter-balance the effects of a less than adequate textbook. But why should he have to? Newsome claims that the teacher is the link between theory and practice. Should not this include the teacher, plus his pedagogical tools?

II. SUBSTANTIVE STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE SUBSTANTIVE CONCEPTS?

The three selections examined in search of a substantive structure of knowledge are from Chapters 10, 17, and 25. The selection from chapter 10, "The United States Doubles Its Size," deals with the territory acquired through the purchase of Louisiana. The topic is subsumed under the title "Plans to Explore."

Jefferson had long wanted to explore the land beyond the Mississippi. Early in 1803 he got Congress to give him $2,500 secretly. He was to use it to explore, and to have conferences with the Indians about trade.

---


The President chose two young men to explore Louisiana. They were Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, the younger brother of George Rogers Clark. Jefferson told them to follow the Missouri River to its source. They might find a water route to the Pacific. Most important, they were to keep a careful record of all they saw.

Lewis prepared with care. He learned how to make maps. He had to know how to fix latitude and longitude. News of the Louisiana Purchase came that summer. New Lewis and Clark would find out how their country could make use of its new lands.

Lewis and Clark set up their group during the winter of 1804. They trained their men in the area around St. Louis so that they would be able to manage well in the wilderness. Jefferson told them to gather scientific facts. But none of the party knew much about science. We can imagine how hard it was for the leaders to decide what man to put in charge of getting each kind of fact.

The day came when Clark handed each man notebooks and a waterproof cover for his papers. He explained that President Jefferson wanted each man to keep a record of the trip. They must carry a notebook at all times. In it, they were to write down everything they saw in their travels.

What were they asked to record? Since there were no maps of the new territory, they had many questions to answer. Just how large was the land bought from France? Where were its lakes, rivers, and mountains? Some of the men were to keep a record of the animals they saw. This was important because the explorers had to depend on the game they killed for their meat. They were also looking for fur animals. Other men were told to describe the kinds of birds they saw and the different plants they found.
Lewis and Clark found out a great deal. Their men were not scientists but they did keep good records. Their notebooks were filled with good descriptions of the animals, plants, birds, and fishes they had seen. Many of these were new to our people.

What were some of these new kinds of living things? The men described the grizzly bear, the badger, the mountain beaver, and the prairie dog. They told of the prong-horn antelope, the Oregon bobcat, different kinds of deer, and other animals. They had seen such birds as the ring-necked duck, the lesser Canada goose, the western meadow lark, two kinds of grouse, the nutcracker, the American magpie, the western tanager, and the great grey owl. They had described more than eight-five different kinds of birds. They had killed and preserved some of these birds and animals. These were brought back to be shown in museums. They also brought home leaves, flowers, and whole plants that they had found.

Each man had kept his own notebook. Their records were different in many ways. In 1814 some of them were printed into books known as the Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. These books added much to what we knew of the land and life west of the Mississippi River. Later, the findings of this expedition were used to back up our claim that all of this land should be part of the United States.

II.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are necessary to the narrative?
Nagel has made the uncomplicated point that unless an inquiry is selective it is of limited value. This may not be as uncomplicated as it first appears. Even when an historian has an abundance of evidence, there are still likely to be gaps in his data. These gaps may represent information vital to his narrative. In turn, he must use a substitute for primary evidence, extrapolate on the basis of insufficient evidence, or change the course of his narrative. When an abundance of evidence exists, he may be faced with the opposite problem of choosing what to eliminate. At any rate, he ultimately must make some choices. These choices must reflect the necessary focal points which fill out his narrative.

In the above topic, the authors have developed the story of how Jefferson got the money, chose the men, implemented the plan, and finally used the results of the exploration of the Louisiana Territory. Taken en toto all the information fits together to form a smoothly flowing, interesting narrative. The supporting information used is sufficient for the purpose for which it is used. It may not be necessary, however. Other concepts and information could

perhaps have served as well. What may be more important, is that the student may have better understood history as a discipline had this point been clearly presented.

2. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

As Comnager has noted, time is long and our individual lives are short. Viewed in this way, history is seen as never completed and never standing still. We are constantly forging forward on a continuum. What happened yesterday affects today and today will surely affect tomorrow. Logically, this is a sound approach to the study of history. Pedagogically, it reduces the likelihood that we will teach isolated facts in isolation. In the above topic the authors create a smoothly flowing story of how Lewis and Clark explored the Louisiana addition to the United States. Obviously the land and the expedition have both had a positive effect on future generations. But would not the student better understand the discipline, and therefore the study of history, if he were shown directly that history is a continuum? Perhaps. This is not shown in the above topic. The "factual" story is presented.

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?
Implicitly the authors generalize that the Lewis and Clark expedition was beneficial to the development of America. Only the positive aspects of the expedition are related. Nothing is said of the hunger, the cold and heat, the loneliness, the despair, the feelings of futility, and all of the other aspects of human sacrifice which went into such a lengthy and momentous trip. Yet they surely occurred. The conclusions and generalizations which seem to be there, either stated or implied, are all supported by information and concepts. It seems reasonable to assume that the above selection could have been more educative. If the authors had clearly stated why they chose the particular information and why and how they reached the particular generalizations and conclusions it would have demonstrated a vital lesson to the student. History is not an exclusive array of data, but rather a selection of data, arranged in a particular way, which results in particular conclusions.

The second topic investigated in quest of a substantive structure of knowledge is from chapter 27, "The Thirties and World War II." The topic is entitled "Hitler's Rise to Power."  

The Nazi party of Germany had ideas much like those of Mussolini. Its leader, Adolf Hitler, had told these to the world in books and speeches. He built up a political party which was like a private army. By 1933 Hitler and his party, with the help of the army and the leaders of industry, had taken control of Germany. He acted quickly to carry out his ideas.

We call Hitler's plan Nazism. It is another form of fascism, the kind of dictatorship by then in power in Italy and Japan. What did Hitler do? He first destroyed democracy in Germany. The laws were changed and the courts ruled by his followers. Those who did not agree with Hitler, or those who he feared might not agree with him, were jailed or killed. Millions of people were put in "concentration camps," where most of them remained and millions died. All freedoms were ended. Hitler won great support from his people through his control of all schools, newspapers, and radio stations. From the beginning, he set up the Jews as a target group. His people were told that the small number of Jewish citizens of their country were its enemies. Hitler and his followers then took all Jewish property and businesses. It became a crime to be a Jew; about six million Jews, first in Germany and later in other lands, were jailed, placed in camps, tortured, and killed while Hitler ruled Germany. Another six million non-Jews had also died as the Nazis tried to destroy all those who stood in their way.

At the end of World War II, the people still alive in Nazi concentration camps were freed. It was then clear how much they had suffered there. Millions of Jews had died in gas ovens; others had been starved to death. Still others had been used as the victims of medical experiments.
The world had never known so savage an attack on one group of people. We know now that Hitler used his attack on the Jews to cover an attack on all religions, on labor unions, and on those leaders of his country who did not agree with his ideas. By 1937 the right to disagree had been wiped out in Germany. Hitler was ready for the second part of his plan.

II.1. Questions to be asked for content analysis:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are necessary to the narrative?

Written history is grounded in the records and artifacts of the past. But this is not the whole story. It is also grounded in the kinds of records and artifacts available, and in the selectivity, frame of reference, ordering and interpretation by the historian of the data derived from the records and artifacts. Beyond this, written history is bounded by certain philosophical principles. For instance, little credence is granted an historical narrative, however interesting, which is not logical. It must be logically equatable with the information presented. This means that history is more than the accumulation of facts. It might be possible to write two different histories of a

---

particular period or topic, based on different evidence, or evidence interpreted differently, which would little resemble each other.

In the selection under analysis it is difficult to claim that certain information or concepts are necessary to the narrative. They sufficiently demonstrate the rise of Hitler to power, but other evidence might do just as well. It is difficult to claim that what is written reflects all of the past. Or all of the topic. Or that it reflects what the culture of the past valued. It may just reflect the fact that a particular culture valued keeping records. So we cannot say that we have revealed a structure of knowledge. This does not mean some kind of structure may exist. But the structure posited by the Modified Version of the Schwab model does not appear to exist.

2. Doe the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

The question about why we study history is an old, but persistent, one. It sometimes appears there are as many answers as there are questions. Some historians see a utilitarian purpose in history. Others, Jordan for example, see history as solely "an adventure of the mind." Whatever use scholars may see in history, they all must
agree that unless there is a present and future the study of the past makes little difference. It is possible to study eras or topics from the past paying only minor attention to chronology. But it would make no sense to write about the Battle of Salamis and the flapper of the 1920s in the same paragraph. They share little in common, either chronologically or otherwise. Historians are interested not only in what happened but why and how it happened. When there is no contiguity the "why" and "how" become difficult.

Having the advantage of retrospect, we are interested in Hitler in the 1930s both because of his actions then and their subsequent widespread effects. This point is not clearly revealed in the selection being investigated.

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

Historians must generalize on some level. To refuse to do so reduces the writing of history to chronicle-keeping. To generalize on the basis of non-experimental evidence is fraught with dangers. Yet this is the only kind of data available to the historian. One expectation is that the historian's generalizations will be consistent with his information. This means that he will both reveal his evidence
and that it will be congruent with his conclusion or generalization. Unless this is true we tend to reject the writing, even though it may be rich in evidence. The evidence must be isomorphic to the conclusion.

In the selection quoted above the authors make several generalizations, supported by no evidence: "He first destroyed democracy in Germany." (This assumes that democracy as we think of it existed in Germany.) "All freedoms were ended." (No limitations on the usage of "freedom" are suggested.) "The world had never known so savage an attack on one group of people." (Some comparable or contrasting examples could have been used to illustrate the point.) The need for evidence and consistency are not shown. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true.

The last sections analyzed under the substantive component of the model are from chapter 20. The time period is post-World War II. The selections are entitled, "How Did Communism Begin?" and "The Ideas of Karl Marx." 13

Communism was an idea at first. We do not know who was the first to have this idea, but a French historian named Jules Michelet wrote about it long ago. Michelet looked for a

He wrote a book in which he said that history has been the story of the struggle between working people and those who own land. The way to have peace, he said, is to live so that no man has more than any other man. All things should belong to all people together. The Latin word communis has a meaning close to the idea of belonging to all. Michelet's idea, then, was that the whole community should own all the property.

...In 1848 two German writers, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, wrote a small book called The Communist Manifesto. (A manifesto is a public statement of a set of ideas or plans.) In their book they told how their group, the Communists, wanted a complete change in the way people lived. They would do it by force if no other way would succeed.

Marx later wrote a book called Capital. In it he further explained his ideas. He said that the working people (the proletariat) are at war with the middle class (those who own the land and businesses that produce goods). He believed that the workers would get poorer and the middle class (the bourgeoisie) would become richer. Marx felt there was only one way to prevent this. The workers should take full control of the government and of all business and property. The people together should own everything.

The ideas of Karl Marx are followed by about one third of the world today. One great change in them has been made by those who call themselves Socialists. They too want to see public ownership. However, they feel that such a great change should come only when people want it. They do not follow the Communist
idea of using force to change a government. They feel that the rights of people should never be taken away. Socialists want a democratic change. Some of our country's allies today are ruled by such democratic Socialist groups.

11.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors reveal why the particular concepts and information they chose are necessary to the narrative?

The concepts and information in the above topic were selected by the authors. The beginning of Communism and the impact of Karl Marx could have been shown using a variety of other information. Who knows where the idea of belonging to all began? Perhaps with Michelet. But also perhaps with Christ? The description of the works of Marx focuses on his primary works. What about his lesser works? Or why he thought the way he did? Little attention is given to societal conditions in 1850. This may be as important to an understanding of the impact of Marx as what he wrote. The question then is between necessity and sufficiency. What is sufficient may not be necessary, or vice-versa. But to understand the discipline of history and how an historian works, these points need to be revealed.
2. Do the authors show that the historian is always pointing to the future, while probing the past?

The idea of communism and the works of Marx have definitely had an impact on the modern world. But, in terms of this investigation, this may not be the important point. In fact, all inquiry into the past points to the future. Whether the past has a spectacular or small impact on the future does not change this unique quality of the study of history. One period of time is contiguous to another. When this is no longer true, there will be no more time. Sometimes one age has a direct and telling impact on the succeeding one. At other times such an impact is delayed. But that history runs on like a stream does not change. Advocates of the concepts of a structure of knowledge opt for the revealing of the nature of a discipline. They claim that to refrain from doing so is to leave students half-educated.

3. Are the conclusions and generalizations consistent with the information and concepts presented?

The authors make the general conclusions that communism was an idea at first and that today one-third of the world's population follows the ideas of Marx. Ample evidence
is then offered to support these statements. But this deals only with the facts of history. The student is told nothing about history as a discipline. The facts are what Martin has called "history positive." Yet in addition to "history positive" there are the principles of logic and consistency which control an historian's work. There is a sense in which these may be as important as the facts. It is not the raw facts which make telling impressions, but rather the facts as they are related to each other and to a greater context. This quality of the knowledge, though important in terms of a structure of knowledge, is not revealed by querying the topic quoted above.

111. SYNTACTICAL STRUCTURE: WHAT ARE THE METHODOLOGICAL CONCEPTS?

The three topics discussed under this component of the model are from chapters 11, 17, and 20. The selection from chapter 11, "The Monroe Doctrine," follows:

Spain was a weak country by 1812. Its American colonies broke away from it at about this time. The people of South America were led in their fight for freedom by San Martin and Simon Bolivar. One

---


by one they won their independence. Most of them elected new governments, some like that of our country. At the same time Mexico and the states of Central America became free as well.

The Spaniards turned to the rulers of the other countries in Europe. These rulers had put down the revolution in France. They had agreed to stop any others in Europe. Now they had to help in the Americas as well. At the same time, the Czar of Russia, who owned Alaska, decided to take control of the coast south of it. This would include part of the Oregon country.

President Monroe saw that what the Spaniards and Russians were doing might hurt our country. The British were also worried. They advised Monroe to speak out. He did so in December of 1823. In a message to Congress, Monroe declared that European powers could not set up new colonies in the Americas. He said that the United States would not do anything about the European colonies already in the Americas. He then added that the new free nations in South America must be left alone. If any European country tried to hurt or control them, the United States would look on this as an unfriendly act. In turn, he promised, we would not mix ourselves in matters that involved Europe alone.

We call Monroe's statement the Monroe Doctrine. Our people liked what he had said. Other countries at first thought that we had no right to cut them off from the Americas. At this point, England openly agreed with us. The rest of Europe had to accept it. Since then, the idea of "America for the Americans" has been one of the chief parts of our foreign policy.
Why did the British favor the Monroe Doctrine? They were most interested in trade. So long as Spain held these lands, it was hard for any other country to trade in them. When they became free, English merchants had begun to do business with them. If Spain were to win back the colonies, these Englishmen would not be able to profit from such trade.

The Russians did not want to fight both England and the United States. They soon gave up their claims to land in North America, except Alaska.

III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

Hunt and Metcalf claim that unless the student queries the past in search of ideas that will better guide his life, the study of history will never amount to more than an academic exercise. The facts of history, they assert, should be used as springboards to translate information and concepts into personal knowledge. Personal knowledge, as they use the expression, means knowledge that

---

serves as a satisfactory explanation or solution to a personal question or problem. If this is true, it is not difficult to see that the importance of the past will differ for different individuals as well as for different generations. To probe the past for generic knowledge amounts to little more than an academic exercise. From the student's standpoint it may even be nonsense learning. In an attempt to see the bearing of the Monroe Doctrine on the present we might ask the following questions: Why is the Monroe Doctrine still important? Was Monroe justified in stating such a bold position? On what grounds did he explain his statement? Would a President today be likely to make a similar assertion? Could he get away with it? If public and world reaction would be different, why? Such questions might well be helpful to the student in a quest for the nature of historical knowledge.

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

Perhaps Schwab is correct in claiming that we have for the most part taught as if knowledge were dogma and

---

students receptacles. He follows this claim by asserting that unless students see the ephemeral nature of knowledge, they are not likely to become active inquirers into subject matter. Considerable effort has gone into the discussion of whether history is an art or a science. Echoing Meyerhoff, Reagan asserts that "Clio is schizophrenic." History is both an art and a science. If this is true, as it appears to be, then such discussions are probably relatively unfruitful. We ask the wrong questions. Perhaps we should ask, what characteristics of the knowledge reveal its ephemeral quality? How can we clearly show the student that history is ever changing? The authors assert, "our people liked what he had said." (Throughout the text they used the expressions "our people," "our government," etc. We can only conjecture who are the antecedents of the pronouns.) Suppose this assertion is true. Would it have been true in 19uu? Would it be true today? Are the needs of the nation the same today as they were in 1o23? Has the impact of the Monroe Doctrine on American lives long since

---


become academic? If so, what does this say about historical knowledge? These questions are not addressed in the text. They might have been.

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

For the most part academic scholars have treated historical inquiry as if induction was an immutable method and the description of the past the acme of purpose. It seems somewhat strange then, as Gowin suggests, that educators continue to look to academic scholars for leadership in structuring disciplines for pedagogical purposes. \(^{20}\) How long will we continue to assume that historical information will have meaning for students even when it is strange and unrelated in their lives? How long will we continue to assume that such distinctions as those connoted by the terms "ideographic" and "nomothetic" will be useful in explicating the nature of the discipline? \(^{21}\) If every discipline has a peculiar methodology, as Schwab suggests,


\(^{21}\) Ibid., p. 281.
and if the substance of a discipline is integrally connected to its methodology, how can we expect students to understand when we concentrate on only a part of what is "history"? Yet the above topic, and the entire text, seem to make this assumption.

The second selection investigated for a syntactical structure of knowledge is from chapter 17, "The Civil War." The topic, "The Freed Slaves," follows:

Few of the slaves had been prepared for their freedom. What were they to do? They had never had a chance to learn how to do the things which any free man must do for himself -- find a job, educate himself and his family, plan and decide from day to day. How could our country help several million freed slave, or freedmen, to look after themselves?

In 1865 Congress set up the Freedman's Bureau. The men who ran it were to furnish food and clothing to those in need. They were to help the freed Negroes get work and make a living. The task was more than this or any other government agency could handle. The Bureau lasted for only a few years. In that time, however, it gave out more than twenty million packages of food; it set up more than a hundred hospitals; it helped open more than 4,000 schools for Negro children.

Church groups and other private groups in the country also helped. Negro leaders joined in the work, and the

---

Negroes began to move forward. The new Southern state constitutions set up free public schools for both whites and Negroes. By 1877 about 600,000 Negro boys and girls were in Southern schools. Special schools taught trades and trained teachers. There were also three Negro colleges -- Fisk University, Howard University and Hampton Institute. The better education they gave was important. Still, Negroes had not yet been able to win many of their rights as citizens.

### III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

There is a sense in which all the past has a bearing on the present. But we cannot know all the past. Nagel has asserted that historians only show the "primary" evidence on "most important" aspects of the past and cover their ignorance of the rest by such innocuous statements as "other things being equal," etc.\(^\text{23}\) Perhaps. But how do they evaluate what is primary and what is secondary? What is primary to the narrative of history, as judged by any particular historian, may be secondary to the student who is probing the past in an attempt to understand his life, his culture, and his world. We can claim that there is a vital relationship

---

between the Reconstruction period and the domestic problems today. Essential as this relationship may be to an understanding of America in 1970, it is only exemplary of the discipline of history as it could be presented to the student. In the final analysis the emphasis in all history is teleological. Seen in this way, history is constantly moving because life is constantly moving. The topic being investigated here does not reflect this quality of the knowledge.

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

In the above selection the authors make two outstanding generalizations: the Negro was unprepared for freedom, and subsequent to his being freed he was denied many of his rights. The question is, Are these generalizations immutable or could they change? As the authors have written the text they appear to be unchanging. It is true that the historian does not "make" knowledge in the sense that a scientist does. But does this mean that historical generalizations do not change? Obviously not. But is this made apparent to the student? Focusing on the same period, C. Van Woodward, in The Strange Career of Jim Crow, empathetically demonstrated that the freed Negro was deliberately
and methodically denied his civil rights by "legal" means.  

Thomas Dixon, in The Leopard's Spots: A Romance of the White Man's Burden, 1865-1900, and other works, drew far different conclusions. How could this be? Historical knowledge, even though based on the records of the past, is ephemeral. The student needs to see this to understand the discipline of history. The above selection is not written to reveal this aspect of the discipline.

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

Gowin suggests what perhaps ought to be axiomatic: writing history makes history. This claim is not made in the textbook under consideration. Perhaps it ought not be. The thrust of the book is clearly to present the information necessary to fill out a smooth, easily readable story. The assumption may be that implicit in the story there are clues which will unveil the nature of historical knowledge. If


25 Thomas Dixon wrote a trilogy espousing the "cause" of racism. His work is discussed by C. Vann Woodward, Op. Cit., p. 78.

such an assumption is not implicit, then it is not there. It is not made explicit. But this seems a big assumption. A more likely explanation of why the book is written as it is might be found in the purposes of the authors.

If we look carefully at the above topic, a singular question arises: Could we so order the information and concepts used by the authors to show that the Negro was better off as a slave than he was when freed? Probably so. If so, would this unequivocally prove that the Civil War was a tragic mistake? Not because it represents something tragic about the American people, but because it disturbed the tranquil life of the hapless black man. If we could create such an interpretation and muster factual data to support it we would demonstrate that the way an historian uses his data is as important as the concepts and information used.

The following selection is from chapter 20, "The Industrial Age." The topic is from the section dealing with electrical power and is called, "Let There Be Light!"^27

Edison's most useful invention was the vacuum tube. This is a glass bulb from which the air has been forced out. Electric power runs into it and through some material

which then heats up and glows. It is used in many ways today, the best known being the electric light bulb. Other men later used bulbs to make radio tubes and other items that are very important in modern science.

Edison's problem was to find the right kind of wire, or filament, to go inside his bulb. He needed something that would glow brightly to give off light, but would not burn up too quickly. Finally he worked it out. He was ready to show his electric light in public.

On an October evening in 1879 he threw the switch which sent an electric current into his lamp. People stood around watching. They saw the tiny wires inside the vacuum tube turn from red to white heat. The wire glowed, giving off a bright and almost magic light.

The light was so bright it hurt the eyes of those who were watching it. It seemed like a little sun!

The electric light burned on and on for forty hours. Edison kept improving his invention so that it would burn even brighter and longer. Within three years one part of New York City was using electric lighting. The streets seemed to turn from night into day. People walked through them as though it were New Year's Eve. They smiled at one another as they thought of how far science had taken their world.

Edison lived to be 64 years old. He gave the world more than a thousand inventions. In 1929 the whole country honored the man who was clearly the greatest of all American inventors.
III.1. QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED FOR CONTENT ANALYSIS:

1. Do the authors show that the study of history is an attempt to probe the past and reveal that which has a bearing on the present?

Ernest Nagel has stated that unless we query the past for a purpose we are not apt to find the solution to the problem or the answer to the question we ask. This requires selectivity. This is what Schwab has called a "context of inquiry." The context we use will determine what we find, just as what we seek will dictate how we probe. Such a view seems not to be widely held, at least by textbook writers. The very nature of a textbook, as they are often used, suggests there are certain bits of information and certain conclusions needed by everyone. The structure of knowledge posited by the Modified Version of the Schwab model suggests that such is not the case. For instance, the authors stated that Edison's discovery was one of the most important ever. Generally speaking, this may be true. But is it true for a high school student? Does this suggest a reason for him to probe the past? It may. But if he chooses some other reason, however trivial it may seem, is his probing any less the study of history? If history is inquiry of the past to assist living in the present, the reasons for searching must be individual.

---

2. Do the authors clearly indicate that the generalizations they make reflect the ephemeral quality of the knowledge?

Scriven has argued that there are certain truisms about human nature and life which can serve as the basis of history writing. Granted, these are somewhat ephemeral, he claims they are no less reliable, and much more "explainable," than Hempel's theory of general laws. As far as this investigation is concerned, an answer as to who is right and who is wrong may be unimportant. The more salient point may be that whatever methodology we use, we do not alter the changing quality of historical knowledge. The important questions may be, what do we want to know? why are we searching the past? The authors assert that the vacuum tube was Edison's most useful invention. On the surface, this appears indisputable. But is it? Why did not the authors say, "As we see it, the vacuum tube was Edison's most useful invention"? Perhaps to the young student something else is more important. At least, the student should be helped to dig into the past to ask his own questions and make his own judgments. He then might test them against the conclusions of "experts." Judgements of the authors should be identified for what they are, if we are interested in exhibiting the nature of the knowledge.

3. Do the authors show that a historian's work consists of his methodology as well as his findings and conclusions?

According to Martin, singular propositions are "history positive." Yet "history positive" alone may not be history as we use the term. History is more than singular propositions. It is singular propositions related. It is singular propositions weighted. It is singular propositions interpreted. It is historical imagination linking singular propositions when gaps are found where linkage ought to be. This is seen in the next to the last paragraph in the quotation above. Who knows whether people in the 1600's walked in New York smiling, frowning, or expressionless? Who knows what they thought? Why did not the authors say, "People perhaps walked through the street smiling and thinking..."? Schwab has claimed that the evidence needed to support such a sweeping generalization is far different from that needed to support a singular proposition. In terms of revealing a particular structure of knowledge, or incisively investigating the nature of historical knowledge, these qualities of the knowledge need to be revealed.


FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

It is overly apparent that the authors' primary concern was relating the story of America. They chose to do so in simple, readable, narrative style. Much of the narrative is apparently based on secondary evidence. There are obvious gaps in the data where evidence was lacking. Possibly the authors could have used these gaps to demonstrate the nature of historical scholarship. Students could have been shown how an historian resolves such a dilemma. As it was, the authors, chose to gloss over such gaps or fill them using historical imagination as if it were evidence. This was never made explicit. In few instances only did they allude to the problems of historical inquiry. Yet, overall, the narrative could perhaps be adaptable to the Modified Version of the Schwab model. Such an adaptation would require further modification of the model as well as rewriting of the book.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

In this chapter the basic components of the Schwab model were restated and redefined. Then the chapter was divided into three sections, corresponding to the three textbooks investigated. Each book was discussed in terms of questions designed to reveal a structure of knowledge.
The discussions were then followed by the Findings and Conclusions. In the case of all three books it was determined that a structure of knowledge, as defined by this model was not apparent in the book. But it was also pointed out that the potential for the creation of a structure, or raising an implicit structure to the level of visibility, may exist in each book. What may now be viewed as weaknesses or gaps in the narratives might be turned into opportunities to make clear lessons on the nature of historical knowledge.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

SUMMARY

This investigation began with a chronological background to the study, dating back to 1960. In that year Jerome Bruner published *The Process of Education*. This work stimulated a thoughtful, sometimes vitriolic, literature focused on the concept of the structure of knowledge. Subsequent to Bruner's initial statement, Arthur Foshay challenged the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development to consider the nature of the knowledge as they developed curricula. Then, beginning with a short article in 1962, followed by two more full-blown articles in 1964, Joseph Schwab defined the concept of structure. Bruner had not done so. Schwab's work made the concept of the structure of knowledge appear to be a viable educational idea. Other scholars began to enter the discussion. Bruner wrote two more widely discussed books. Mark Krug took strong exception to the utility and wisdom of structure in the social sciences. Numerous conferences and symposia were conducted to discuss
the idea. Lowe and Gowin, among others, published literature expressing optimism that the concept of structure was an efficacious idea that could be utilized in history and the social sciences.

The purpose of this study was to investigate selected American history textbooks for a structure of knowledge, using the Schwab model as the heuristic tool. The model, as distilled from Schwab's articles by this investigator, was then modified and the same textbooks analyzed a second time using the Modified Version of the Schwab model.

The investigator recognized that he should impose certain limitations on the study. Consequently, three books were selected, the Schwab model was chosen as the investigative device, and the model was modified by the investigator for the second analysis. Another investigator might have limited himself in other ways.

Six hypotheses were stated. The first three hypothesized that the textbooks being investigated would exhibit a structure of knowledge as posited by the Schwab model. The last three hypothesized that the textbooks would reveal a structure of knowledge as defined in the Modified Version of the Schwab model.
In order to make the investigation functional, the Schwab model was reduced to outline form and reviewed. This was followed by a review of the model as modified by the investigator. The Modified Version of the model retained the three basic components of the Schwab model, but modified the definitions. In the case of both models, the investigation was conducted by asking "telling questions" in an attempt to reveal a structure of knowledge.

The methodology employed was content analysis. Both qualitative and quantitative analyses were used.\(^1\) The investigator read each book cursorily, then carefully, and attempted to select topics which seemed to have the closest correspondence to the model being used.\(^2\)

\(^1\)The content analysis used to determine if a structure of knowledge existed in the books was qualitative. Another investigator would discuss the books differently. The quantitative analysis is in Appendix A. Topics with seeming correspondence to the models were simply counted and recorded.

\(^2\)It is recognized that certain limitations are inherent in the study, which may not always be clear to either the reader or the investigator. There is undoubtedly some question as to the appropriateness of short topics to make clear what may be characteristic of an entire book. The models themselves are perhaps inadequate to fully reveal what may be vital characteristics of the knowledge. And content analysis may not be totally effective in exposing the qualities of knowledge sought by the investigation.
Chapter II was a review of related literature. From this review it was concluded that no actual research had been conducted to determine if history has a structure of knowledge. For this reason the investigator decided to examine some American history textbooks. This investigation was carried out with the full realization that to either confirm or deny that the textbooks had a particular structure of knowledge did not necessarily answer the question of whether the discipline of history has a structure. But it would be a beginning from which additional research might follow.

Chapter III was an analysis of the three following textbooks, using the Schwab model of a structure of knowledge as the investigative tool:


Chapter IV was an investigation of the same three books using the Schwab model as it was modified by the investigator.
Schwab defined structure in a general sense. He claimed that his model had application to all disciplines, but acknowledged that history presented some peculiar problems. This investigator examined three selected American history textbooks using the Schwab model. The same books were examined a second time using the Schwab model as it was modified by the investigator. Following are the conclusions derived from the investigations.

The Schwab Model

The three textbooks did not reveal a structure of knowledge as defined by Schwab. On numerous occasions there was evidence that such a structure might be implicit in what was written. With few exceptions, this structure was not made explicit. The exceptions were the few instances when Bragdon and McCutchen inserted insets, as introductory statements to units, which discussed the relationship of history and the social sciences. Such a discussion was never included in the narrative portion of the book. And the discussion in the insets dealt exclusively with the findings of the social sciences. There was no discussion of the varying methodologies of the social sciences and how these differed from, but complemented, historical methodology.
It seems reasonable to conclude that the authors of all three texts were concerned primarily with filling out a narrative which would tell the story of the American people. There is little or no indication that they were concerned with explicating the nature of the knowledge, which the concept of the structure of knowledge is designed to do. This raises the same question Gowin has raised: Ought we to continue to rely on academic scholars when we make curriculum if we are interested in revealing the nature of knowledge as well as the findings? 3

Finally, there may be some question about the appropriateness of the Schwab model to make clear a structure of knowledge in history textbooks. It could be that another model, defined in other ways, would be more appropriate.

The Modified Version of the Schwab Model

Using the Modified Version of the Schwab model did not result in the exposure of a structure of knowledge. We were able to say more often than we could using the Schwab

---

model that the potential existed for either revealing an implicit structure of knowledge or the creation of a structure. No topic was found which was completely isomorphic to the model. It may be that structure can be defined in many ways. Ford and Pugno suggest that structure is a concept in search of a definition.\textsuperscript{4} But a plurality of structures might raise some serious questions about the utility of the concept of structure for curriculum making and teaching.

Essentially, the application of the Modified Version of the Schwab model to the three textbooks revealed numerous instances where structure seemed implicit. It was perhaps the case that the model itself was not honed finely enough to raise this structure to the level of visibility. It was apparent to the perceptive reader that numerous instances existed where inadequate or conflicting information inhibited the smooth flow of the narrative. These cases might have been utilized to reveal something about the nature of historical knowledge. In no case was this done.

General Conclusions

The investigation has revealed a number of epistemological concerns calling for a response. There is the dual

\textsuperscript{4}G. w. Ford and Lawrence Pugno (eds.), The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1964), Introduction.
problem of distinguishing between the logical and the psychological and at the same time recognizing that the melding of the two is, in the final analysis, psychological and personal. Knowledge is not something which exists in the abstract. People make knowledge. They psychologically synthesize information which is logically structured. The interaction of the logical and psychological results in insight and therefore growth. This is when, as some have argued, subject matter becomes knowledge.\(^5\) In this sense knowledge is always emergent, never static. Recognition of this fact may constitute an argument for attention to the usefulness of the concept of a structure of knowledge.

Some have argued that structure has little pedagogical value. Others have suggested that its usefulness as a pedagogical tool should be investigated. There appears to be no compelling reason for us to assume that structure -- or generalizations or concepts for that matter -- will necessarily be taught as dogmatically as factual information has been. We should keep in mind that structure is a pedagogical concept to be utilized in teaching, not dogma to be taught. Our goal ought to be to teach the nature of the

\(^5\)This argument is cogently made by Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf in *Teaching High School Social Studies* (New York: Harper & Row, 1960).
knowledge as well as the content. If structure can be used to accomplish this goal, then it is a viable concept. Its usefulness will rest on its ability to reveal how one discipline is different from another; how a discipline goes about making its knowledge; what kinds of concepts and information are included in the discipline; and how the discipline grounds its conclusions and generalizations. There is no research now in the public domain which rules out the concept of the structure of knowledge as a means of accomplishing these goals.

Scheffler has made several epistemological claims which are related to this investigation. They may serve as a means of finally summarizing the research. First, he suggests that there are several guiding questions which can direct our quest for knowledge: How ought the search for knowledge be conducted? and, How ought knowledge be taught? Second, Scheffler claims that the concept "to know" is broader than the concept "to believe." If we know, he argues, we are not mistaken. This raises the question,

---


Can we "know" the past? Obviously not. We can only "believe" the past. But we may be able to "know" how to probe the past and understand something about the nature of history, even though we may not be able to "know" history itself. This investigation has indicated that for purposes of knowing about the nature of history the concept of a structure of knowledge may be a viable one.

**Implications for Further Research**

This investigation is only one step toward the accumulation of sufficient and reliable data on the basis of which we may make some educational decisions. First, it is important that this research be replicated, using the models employed here and perhaps additional ones. We need to know the reliability of this research plus the results that may come from the application of different models to the same type research. Such investigations might allow us to make some decisions about the wisdom of pursuing the quest for a structure of knowledge in the discipline of history.

Second, we might write units of American history, using a model of a structure of knowledge as our guiding light.⁹

---

These units then could be used in actual classroom sessions. The focus would be on revealing a structure of knowledge, as defined by the model used to write the material. This would demand that the model be carefully prepared, perhaps with the aid of historical scholars. In essence, this would result in a conscious attempt to blend the concepts of a structure of knowledge, analytical thinking, and inquiry into a context for teaching both the findings of historians and the nature of historical knowledge. Such an approach has credence only if we are willing to view history as always subject to change rather than being overly concerned with what "actually happened." A third implication has to do with the relationship of disciplines. The question is not what organizational pattern is "right," but rather the need to clearly reveal that there is a relationship and suggest what the implications of such may be. There is a

---

10 D'Angelo has argued that "Critical thinking never will be taught adequately in schools until teachers are educated in some way about the nature of critical thinking and its application in the curriculum." See Edward D'Angelo, "Philosophers as Critical Thinking Consultants," School and Society, Volume 90, Number 2324 (March 197), p. 166.

need to know more than concepts and generalizations. The logical relationship of concepts and generalizations, both within disciplines and between disciplines needs to be explored. For instance, we sometimes group disciplines according to subject matter, giving little or no attention to the logical structure of the content. This leads us to group a discipline whose structure is basically deductive with one whose structure is basically inductive. Such a grouping may not be wrong. Research is needed which will allow us to explicate for students the similarities and differences between content and how different disciplines focus on similar problems, or make knowledge.

Finally, cooperative research is needed between psychologists and logicians. The dovetailing of the logical with the psychological ought to be by design. To date, such research has not been done. There is evidence in the

---

12 There is a need to go beyond thinking of structure as simply concepts and generalizations. These still focus primarily on content. The additional need is to reveal how they relate to other concepts and generalizations and how they are derived.

13 This point is discussed by Thomas G. Aylesworth and Gerald M. Reagan in Teaching for Thinking (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1969), Chapter 1.
literature that the discussants of the concept sometimes confuse psychological, with logical structures. A conscious effort to relate the two in the exploration of history ought to enhance the achievement of both. These kinds of research will perhaps help us progress toward the needed goals of cognitive growth and student involvement as active learners in the educative process.
APPENDICES

Appendix A consists of two figures for each textbook. Figures 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 show the approximate number of times topics corresponding to each component of structure, as defined by Schwab, were found in major sections of the books. Figures 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 reflect the approximate number of times topics corresponding to each component of structure, as defined by the Modified Version of the Schwab model, were found in major sections of the books. It should be noted that these topics were chosen for their apparent correspondence to the models, as seen by the investigator. A total of 27 topics were investigated with each model.

Appendix B is an example of how a topic might be rewritten to reveal a structure of knowledge.
### Figure 1.1
Number of times topics which were consistent with the components of the Schwab model were found in each unit of *Rise of the American Nation*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Intro.</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>1960's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 1.2
Number of times topics which were consistent with the components of the Schwab model were found in each unit of *History of a Free People*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Prologue</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>Epilogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 1.3
Number of times topics which were consistent with the components of the Schwab model were found in each unit of *The Story of America*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- The values in the tables represent the number of times topics consistent with the components of the Schwab model were found in each unit of the respective books.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Intro.</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Late 1960's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.1** Number of times topics which were consistent with the components of the Modified Version of the Schwab model were found in each unit of *Rise of the American Nation*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Prologue</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
<th>Epi-logue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2** Number of times topics which were consistent with the components of the Modified Version of the Schwab model were found in each unit of *History of a Free People*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.3** Number of times topics which were consistent with the components of the Modified Version of the Schwab model were found in each unit of *The Story of America*. 
APPENDIX B


Since we have records which tell us large cities, or even medium-sized towns, were widely scattered in the America of 1670, we can conclude that opportunities for social activities were quite limited for most farmers. In view of the records we have, it seems reasonable to conclude that there were three centers of social activity -- the nearest town, the church, and the school. Since schools are discussed elsewhere, we will discuss only towns and churches here.

Sometimes historians do not have adequate information on which to base conclusions about life in the past. This is partially the case here. Based on what information we have, we can imagine that the Saturday drive to town in a wagon or buggy behind "Old Dobbin" was a big weekly event. It is estimated that a five-mile drive took an hour each way, and therefore a ten-mile trip meant about four hours on the road. Different historians have differing views about what towns were like in 1670. From the records and literature of the time we feel justified in concluding that towns may have varied widely in both size and "personality", just as they do today. The town may have been nothing more than a country store at the crossroads, with a blacksmith shop on the opposite corner. Or it might have been a sizeable village, or even a county seat with a courthouse, a railroad station, several stores, a bank, a doctor's office, a lawyer's
office, and a considerable cluster of houses, including the homes of a handful of retired farmers. There seems to be no reason to believe that towns then were basically different from what they are today. But they may have been.

The records we have indicate that Saturday trips were special times. Since we have diaries and other contemporary accounts of such times we may conclude that the people valued these times. At least they valued them enough to make some kind of records describing them. This is not always true. In all likelihood the Saturday trips were a combination of business and pleasure. The mother probably shopped for the items she needed while the farmer arranged for the sale of his crops or settled his account at the bank or the store. The children may have played with friends. But at any rate, the family undoubtedly used these special occasions to do their business, visit with friends, and catch up on news of the outside world.

Based on the letters and papers we have, it seems that Sunday was also a bright spot in the week. We can imagine that once again "Old Dobbin" was hitched to the wagon or buggy, and the entire family drove to church. Like us, they probably scrubbed clean and wore their best clothes. In fact, we probably got this custom from them. If what we do today is anything like it was then, and it probably is, we can imagine what the service was like. Many of the patterns for what we do today were set by people in the past. So like us, they probably lingered after church services to visit before going back home and another week of work.
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