1. SOCIAL SCIENCE, SOCIAL EDUCATION, AND SOCIAL STUDIES: DESCRIPTIONS, DEFINITIONS, AND ORIGINS

THIS INTRODUCTION TO the history of social studies begins with an important task: to unravel the origins[1] of the central conceptualizations used to fashion the program of the seminal 1913–1916 Committee on Social Studies, produced under the auspices of the National Education Association.[2] Among many writers of social studies literature, it is popularly held that the field was an outgrowth of the traditional history curriculum[3]—that is, that the roots of social studies can be found with the examination of the development of history as a field of study in the nineteenth century and its extension into the twentieth century.[4] The search for the genesis of social studies, however, did not begin with nor extend from the development of the traditional history curriculum. Instead, the birth and growth of the social studies movement had its own set of unique beginnings.

Nonetheless, despite the separate origins of social studies conceptualizations, there are strong parallels between the growth and development of the traditional history curriculum and the social studies.[5] The prehistorical account of social studies ideas—that is, those that existed before the term was introduced by the 1913–1916 Social Studies Committee in 1913—can be divided into three branches. The first, like that of Thomas Jesse Jones's Hampton curriculum,[6] is

Copyrighted Material

linked directly to the creation of the program of the 1913–1916 committee. The second, as expressed in the 1892 Madison report of the Committee of Ten[7] and the 1898 report of the American Historical Association's Committee of Seven,[8] although related in part to the 1916 Committee's program, belong more in the longer tradition of foundational studies centered in the subjects of history and geography.[9] Finally, the third branch, as exemplified by individuals like Noah Webster, Emma Willard, and Peter Parley (Samuel G. Goodrich),[10] which, although related to both traditional history and social studies curricula in spirit and intent, can claim no direct lineage to the genesis or development of the 1913–1916 Social Studies.[11]

This chapter traces the beginnings of the social studies movement prior to 1913. Chapters 2 and 3 take up and include that portion of the emerging "traditional" history curriculum that later social studies insurgents annexed as part of the movement to place social studies into the public schools.

One particularly nagging problem that has plagued social studies research, one that Robert Barr, James Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis worked to clear up, is the problem of zeroing in on the varying definitions of social studies.[12] The concern over definitions, however, is more one that followed the introduction of social studies into the public schools after 1916 than it was for the 1913–1916 Social Studies developers. Still, although a definition of social studies was thought to be clearly stated by the 1913–1916 Social Studies conferees (see appendix p. 204), the term itself and its origins requires delineation and expression. Two other terms, *social science* and *social education*, often used as synonyms for social studies, also require definition and description. Each of these terms will be examined in the order of their appearance in educational and professional literature.

SOCIAL SCIENCE

Social science ideas, like social studies ideas, have a record antedating the beginnings of the discrete social sciences as found in the professional literature of the nineteenth century.[13] Given this heritage, it is helpful to expose those roots of the social sciences that are directly related to the notion of applying social science findings

Copyrighted Material

through formal education. The 1913–1916 Social Studies Committee concept of social science can best be characterized as the use of social science data to define the limits of freedom and support of the status quo, as well as the means to promote the social welfare of the masses. Formal education in this model utilized social control for social service.[14] The program was designed to encourage students to identify and analyze social problems, as well as to present solutions that not only contributed to the cause of sustaining individuals and groups from the ravages of urbanization and industrialization, but also led to beneficial social progress. In addition, with citizenship education as a major emphasis, students were to be socialized (learn the rules of society); acculturated (learn to adopt the culture of others); and enculturated (learn to be part of their own culture). Democratic principles were to be used as a guide for all learning within the social studies.

The foundation of social studies education stems from the attempt to utilize education for the promotion of social welfare. This concept had its beginnings in Great Britain after the 1820s and quickly spread to the United States.[15] Typically, social welfare leaders lobbied government and industry to protect women, children, families, and workers in general from the social, economic, and political exploitation commonly associated with a rapidly expanding urban and industrial environment. In this context social science provided reformers with a special purpose as watchdogs over human welfare.

An example of this function can be found in the creation of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science that was formed in Great Britain in 1857 for the purpose outlined in its title. Its American counterpart, commonly known as the American Social Science Association (ASSA), was started in 1865 essentially for "treating wisely the great social problems of the day."[16] This new group of dedicated individuals, inspired by the work and mission of the British organization, recognized the importance of developing education as a vehicle of social progress and welfare. Here, through various social science subjects, ASSA thinkers proposed solutions to significant social problems of the day, such as crime, poverty, and social injustice.

The ASSA worked to efficiently disseminate its ideas through education and public debate. Although the primary function of the ASSA was to "accommodate social theory and social practice,"[17] an important consequence of its efforts forged a union between social science and educational reform. Indeed, in 1887, one of the earliest

Copyrighted Material

calls for social science in secondary schools was made by Carroll D. Wright, the first U.S. Commissioner of Labor. Wright argued that movement into the school curriculum would clearly further "broaden [the] public appeal" of the association.[18] Additionally, Wright's plea also emphasized the link between social science instruction and good citizenship.

Formal investigations in anthropology, political science, economics, sociology, social statistics, social psychology, and social geography comprised the bulk of the social science fields that materialized in the nineteenth century.[19] Social science, which first appeared as a self-contained field of study with a broad outlook, became the title of a group of discrete sciences in the 1880s, as researchers carved a niche in the emerging modern university for their particular specialty.[20] Largely because history and geography were more established during the nineteenth century, history, stemming from the tradition of the humanities, and physical geography (often labeled "pure geography") were largely excluded from social science characterizations, essentially standing apart and distinct from social science.[21]

Social Science and the Social Sciences

The beginnings of social science and the subsequent development of the individual social sciences can be attributed to the changing social, political, and economic elements of society in the Western nations. Historians of the social sciences tell that the social revolutions of the nineteenth century were directly related to changes in population, labor practices, technological advances, the factory system, urbanization, growth of political ideologies, and modern warfare.[22] Although many of these factors benefited Western societies, for social reformers there were clearly undesirable social consequences. The self-appointed task of these reformers was to seek solutions to societal problems as well as to expose what were perceived as evils that dissolved the fragile fabric of humanity.

As the conditions of life affected by these sweeping changes worsened, social reformers institutionalized compassion into the social notion of humanitarianism.[23] In general, this socially founded expression of thought and action sought to improve the human condition as found in slums and factories, and to provide relief for the poor, the insane, and the imprisoned. In addition, social reformers set out to abolish slavery, to spread literacy, and to extend suffrage. The social, political, and economic conditions of nine-

Copyrighted Material

teenth-century America provided a ready intellectual and political climate for the secular extension of Enlightenment social theories, as well as those who wished to spread the religious version of the social gospel. Nonetheless, the "good society" was possible, social commentators explained; science taught us that humanity was not bound, that truth could set us free. As Edward Bellamy later predicted, the "golden age" was "before us and not behind us, and [was] not far away."[24] The power to reform society through its fundamental restructuring was within the grasp of citizens.

Given the extreme positivistic social utopias of Bellamy and Henry George,[25] among many others, two key points require explanation with social theory. What was the relationship of the individual to society? And what was the relationship of society to the individual? As the social sciences developed in the nineteenth century, the answers to these two questions came to define one's political, economic, and social orientation as well as one's philosophy of education. For the social reformers, the individual was responsible to join other individuals in a concerted effort toward social reform. For the Social Darwinists, the individual followed the relentless ebb and tide of social evolution. For the traditionalist Emersonians, the individual was supreme. Each of these perspectives can be found in the formation of the social studies program of 1913–1916. The social theories written during the nineteenth century are complex, and often appear contradictory to readers. Nevertheless, there were two strands of thought centered in social science that gave the 1913–1916 Social Studies its distinctive character. A third strand of thought (individual as supreme) is discussed in the following chapter.

The first strand of thought is found in the positivistic outlook of Auguste Comte. He proposed and defended a "science of society," wherein society was perceived to be on a steady progressive march. Comte's science of society—which he named sociology—sought a natural law to account for this progress. This view of social progress advanced that the investigations of social science provided the raw material from which new dynamic paradigms of society could be generated and applied. Education in this model was to be used not only as an "intellectual" force, "but also, and more emphatically, [as a] moral" force.[26] As a theoretical descendent of Comte, the early John Dewey[27] did much to further the use of social ethics and scientific method in education through his attention to identify and analyze social problems, as well as to examine the process of working out possible solutions or alternatives.[28]

Copyrighted Material

Another strand of social thought developed in the nineteenth century by Herbert Spencer and continued by William Graham Sumner affected education. Departing from Comte's notion that there was a natural law of progression and could be manipulated for social purposes—that is, social progress—Spencer and Sumner pictured a rather pessimistic view of society and social change. Social reformers in the Lester Frank Ward tradition, which was derived from Comte, believed in an optimistic society in which institutions could be created, altered, or changed in response to societal change. The Spencerians, by contrast, held that society could not be guided or controlled through conscious human efforts. Moreover, for the Spencerians any interference or attempt at governing societal change could actually work against and retard the natural eventual evolution of society.

At best in the laissez-faire tradition of Spencer and Sumner, education could only insulate individuals from the ravages of civilization by explaining the natural order of things. As with societal change in the holistic sense, education would not mitigate the conditions of life. "Evil," Sumner wrote, "only alters its form."[29] To Social Darwinists like Sumner, men and women could exercise no meaningful effect upon the problems of society; they could only protect themselves against the inevitable.

Eventually these thoughts extended into pedagogic theory in which education was viewed as the best tool to instruct the mental development of the individual's "mind [as it] unfolds in a definite order fixed and controlled by some great natural law."[30] The relationship of the individual to society was defined by a "great natural law" that ultimately rendered the individual powerless. Social science for the Social Darwinists revealed and outlined the "great natural law." Education as defined by Spencer's disarming but central question, "What knowledge is of most worth?,"[31] was used to explain to individuals how the universe was organized and what place the individual held in this organization. Spencer wrote:

> It must not suffice simply to *think* that such or such information will be useful in after life, or that this kind of knowledge is of more practical value than that; but we must seek out some process of estimating their respective values, so far as possible we may positively *know* which are most deserving of attention.[32]

"In the order of their importance," Spencer classified the steps toward this knowledge as: (1) self-preservation (health); (2) economic

Copyrighted Material

security (vocational training); (3) child rearing and family responsibilities (preparation for parenthood); (4) civic-mindedness (citizenship training); and (5) leisure activities (preparation for the proper use of "free" time).[33] For example, to Spencer, educators were not to offer students half-baked notions of how to raise children. Rather, drawing from the social sciences, educators were to direct students to *the* way to raise children, *the* way to maintain a sense of social cohesiveness, *the* way to prepare for life. In the end, Spencer, as well as Sumner, had no interest in teaching students to turn the social, political, or economic tables to favor a harmonious society.

Some obvious problems with this line of thought were apparent, even for the Spencerians. What was *the* way? How do we recognize it when we find it? How was *the* way then taught to children? Despite these and related critical questions, Spencerian thought enjoyed great popularity in the later years of the nineteenth century.

Spencer's fourth step, however, was to become particularly instrumental in the development of the social studies. By the late 1890s Spencer's "civic-mindedness" was translated into a variety of conceptualizations that ranged from overt indoctrination to a reasoned decision-making model (as later found in the 1916 Committee suggestion of a course in Problems in American Democracy). In the context of an intensifying nationalism, by the 1890s citizenship education had become a dominant idea in American educational thought for both the traditional history advocates and the emerging social studies insurgents. The distinction between citizenship as the general purpose for schooling, and citizenship as a specialized school offering was formulated in these years. The social studies insurgents, however, centered their curriculum on citizenship, whereas traditional historians assigned citizenship education to a secondary role.

Spencer believed that citizenship training should be founded in a course he labeled "descriptive sociology." He noted that the content of such a course would be "drawn from the broad materials of history, economics, political science, sociology, psychology, and anthropology."[34] By adding geography and contemporary problems to this list, Spencer's subjects would essentially match the content of the 1916 social studies. Much later educational thinkers, such as David Snedden, were particularly influenced by Spencerian thinking toward citizenship education. Using Spencer as a base, Snedden sought to develop a curriculum from what thoughtful adults felt was needed for proper citizenship. In this view, the needs and interests of the child were not considered essential in curricular matters.

For social reformers like Lester Frank Ward, the Spencerian

Copyrighted Material

search for the laws of social evolution proved too elusive. To Ward, Social Darwinists wrongly focused upon looking for and explaining a consistent law that could account for why the rich were rich and the poor were poor. Any educational application that stemmed from this theory would ultimately be flawed. "The object of education," for Ward, was "social improvement." Education was "really needed for the purpose of making better citizens."[35] The spirit of humanitarianism that flowered in the tradition of Ward eventually recognized the importance of education as a vehicle to attend to the needs of society.

The notion of humanitarianism, as it was voiced in Great Britain and the United States during the nineteenth century, laid the foundation for the development of an American educational system whereby the knowledge gained by social science investigations could be used to instruct and enlighten future generations in the necessities of attending to social welfare. Individuals had a duty to service society, to provide for the needs of the group over the interests of the individual, to guard against the exploitation of nonsocial individuals who sought to advance their personal agendas without regard to social consequences.

In sum, social science theory, as it emerged from the nineteenth century, posited two opposing views of change that were relevant to education. Both strands of thought acknowledged change as phenomenon. The amount and speed of social progress, however, divided social scientists. For the Spencerians, social progress was slow and steady, and could not be directed. For the followers of Ward, social progress could be bent and shaped. Without the human possibility of making any conscious effort to direct or channel change, the value of education for the Spencerians was at best a conserving agent to filter the harsh realities of change; it was not a core or central institution of society. In the Ward model, however, where meaningful involvement in change was possible, education played a vital role in society as a vehicle for guiding social progress.

In this latter view reconciliations were discussed to what may be called the related paradoxes of freedom versus conformity, and individual versus society. These paradoxes emerge simultaneously wherever individuals seek to maintain their freedom while society-authority imposes restrictions. As paradoxes, no permanent resolution is possible; they continue to persist regardless of any attention. In their application to education, these paradoxes could be described in the form of two sets of questions. First, How much freedom should be allowed in school curricula (and the class) that will not thwart the creative energies of students and teachers? How much

Copyrighted Material

conformity must be instilled through instruction to prevent chaos? And secondly, How do teachers foster and encourage the intellectual, physical, and psychological growth of the individual? How do teachers instil a sense of social responsibility that favors the welfare of the group over the individual? Ostensibly, to educators, the modern democraticlike school needed answers to all these questions to function, but At what point was the balance to be set? Notwithstanding other variations of these questions reflecting diverse educational interests, the paradoxes of freedom versus conformity and individual versus society were consistent themes in educational theory then, and, of course, persist today.

Social control efforts are a *natural* response to the freedom versus conformity and individual versus society paradoxes. In a general sense, social control efforts are means used by the status quo to move citizens on the freedom-conformity continuum. The question is whether or not a particular move in one direction is warranted; not that social control is an evil. Social control is not an evil in and of itself; it is merely a response to the paradoxes of social life. What is critical is *how*, *when*, *to whom*, and *for what purpose* the response is given. Society does not exist in a steady state; it is a dynamic entity. This nature requires repeated adjustment and readjustment to maintain any semblance of fragile order. Thus, social control is not only necessary, it is inevitable. The twin paradoxes help organize the context of social reform. In this context, then, formal education is inescapably an element of social control.

During the nineteenth century, in the complex arguments that developed from the effort to reconcile these paradoxes, the philosophical division between the nonsocial individual and the social individual unfolded and took significance. Education for the nonsocial individual was specialized and personal, resulting in the growth and maturation of individual characteristics. Education for the social individual, by contrast, led directly to the improvement of society and, by association, to the individual.

Self and Society

At this point it is important to clarify two issues. For the Spencerians directed social change was a nonissue; it led to no meaningful social progression. In this view, the paradox between self (individual) and society (social individual) had little significance. For the followers of Ward, though, the difference was sharp and distinct, and required progress toward reconciliation if society was to advance.

The program of the 1913–1916 Social Studies ultimately re-

Copyrighted Material

vealed its philosophical orientation through the attempt to argue both sides of the seemingly contradictory but necessary notion that education could be used as a tool for social control.[36] It fostered a benign conformity, as well as a system for social service that attended to the welfare of society and extended freedom.[37] Here social control and social service were vehicles used to attend to the twin paradoxes. Social control, first identified and discussed by Edward Ross,[38] may be placed on a continuum where, on the one hand, it could be identified as a direct, prescriptive, indoctrinative method of teaching the views of the political and economic status quo. Social control in this context essentially rendered the student passive. It was not compatible with social service that sought to extend freedom. On the other side of the scale, social control could be seen as an open-ended, guiding system of education that attempted to address inevitable social, political, and economic change through an enlightened method of experimentation and questioning. This view of social control enabled students to participate. It dovetailed nicely with the version of social service that extended freedom.

Through the mechanisms of this less overt social control and social service, the 1916 conferees sought to harmonize the two central paradoxes of education. Drawing freely from social science conceptualizations of Lester Frank Ward,[39] the prototype program of the 1913–1916 Committee on Social Studies was rooted in a delicate balance between competing social theories. Deeply indebted to the new discipline of sociology,[40] the Social Studies conferees sought, on the one hand, to attend to the needs of society, while, on the other hand, to demonstrate an earnest interest in addressing the needs of individuals.

The program of the 1916 Social Studies did not reflect either a conspicuous or a hidden allegiance to the so-called corporate or monied interests of the state. Instead the 1916 document was imbued with a sense of social purpose that fostered traditional democratic principles and challenged students to question, experiment, or test the institutions and ideas of the status quo. Nonetheless, the full extent of the social studies conferees challenge of the status quo—especially the notion of questioning political decisions—will never be known, because politics and attitudes resulting from World War I quickly closed the door to free inquiry into several sensitive areas.[41]

The division between social studies advocates and traditional historians, as will be discussed later, was not centered on the supposed dilemma between social control and social service, although this was a voiced concern of the social studies conferees. Instead, the

Copyrighted Material

dispute was focused on the differing philosophical views as to what purpose and by what method citizens, or individuals, should be educated in society. Put simply, Where on the freedom-conformity/individual-society continuum would the line be drawn? To benefit society through the individual, or to benefit the individual directly?

It is here that the Spencerian line of thought entered into the educational debate between the traditional history advocates and the social studies insurgents as each group argued their position from a different perspective. The traditional curriculum historians used a mixture of Spencerian social theory and their own Emersonian view of the individual. In contrast, the social studies insurgents made use of sociological ideas from Ward and the more pedagogically appealing arguments of Albion Small, George Vincent, Charles Horton Cooley, Edward Ross, and Franklin Giddings.[42]

SOCIAL EDUCATION

As education became a major issue of social reformers in the 1890s, the notion of social reform as education emerged under a common term. By the end of nineteenth century, the name for this type of development shifted from social science to social education and social studies. That the move to social education came slightly in advance of the first use of the term "social studies" or "social study" should not be interpreted as significant. More or less, the initial deviation between the terms amounted to a difference in scope: social education was viewed as a generic term for a socially centered school curricula that constituted *all* of what went as courses or subject fields. History, geography, or the social sciences in this view of social education were not purposely collected or emphasized under any common umbrella term. What cemented curricula together was a sociological outlook toward education, an outlook that held that the purpose of education was to prepare students in and for social life.

Social studies as a conceptualization had a more narrow agenda: to prepare and serve citizens with "democratic" skills through the specific course/topical areas as found in the social sciences, history, and geography. In essence, social education represented a broad view of education based on social science, whereas social studies, although sharing the purpose of education based on social science, was defined as a specific field of study within the general school curricula given over entirely to citizen preparation.

In 1896 Conway MacMillan, an education professor at the Uni-

Copyrighted Material

versity of Minnesota, presented one of the earliest suggestions for "social education" in schools.[43] Although MacMillan treated popular Hegelian and Herbartian educational themes, his "thought [was] dominated by Spencerianism." MacMillan presented to his readers the concepts of the social and nonsocial individual: the social individual was an individual cognizant of the needs of the group/society. By contrast, the nonsocial individual thought only in terms of the self.[44]

MacMillan believed that a reconciliation of the two competing natures would be an individual; to be a member of a group was possible with "social education." Rather than looking at the paradox between individual and society from the societal standpoint, as social reformers did, MacMillan presented this paradox from the individual's perspective. He reasoned:

> Education of the schools—social education—[in the broad interpretation] has therefore not only the duty of stimulating the individual to do his best as an individual, but more fundamentally it must from its very nature so mould him that he will be the best as a member of society.[45]

Here MacMillan sought to rally educational leaders against what he called the "conservatism of society" and "formalism." He argued that the future of education would not be found in educating the individual apart from social considerations. MacMillan claimed that "the next great step in educational reform and progress" would be taken "from a basis of sociological and thoroughly scientific enquiry into the characteristic of the modern citizen."[46] Although MacMillan was arguing for social education from a broad perspective, ultimately the social studies insurgents fashioned the sociological perspective as the foundation in a more limited program.

Notwithstanding MacMillan's call for a "social education," the notion of presenting an educational perspective apart from the individual as supreme was troublesome to educators. In the *Third Yearbook* of the National Herbart Society (1897), Charles DeGarmo, a noted teacher-educator, explained to the cautious that the education of the social individual was founded in a "social," not a "socialistic," concept of society. DeGarmo's view, drawn heavily from William James, was that the socialistic version was too "unwieldy and highly mechanical" and unsuited to a nation like the United States. Speaking from a Spencerian position, DeGarmo argued:

Copyrighted Material

> [A "true" social concept] permit[ed] the agencies of production to remain in private hands, and eschewing all artificial schemes of distribution, [was] marked by its freedom of association, by its permission of individual initiative in every department of life, and by its division of authority between large and small bodies. It [was] permeated by the Anglo-Saxon idea of local control of local affairs.[47]

According to DeGarmo the new socialized or social-centered education would not be a threat to individual freedom or laissez-faire attitudes; it was in actuality a boon to freedom. "The non-social individual," wrote DeGarmo, "centers all his thoughts and activity in himself. The social individual, on the contrary, expands his personality."[48] To DeGarmo, borrowing from Dewey, the new socially tuned education would focus upon how schools would educate social individuals.

DeGarmo's proposal was founded on three bases: the "formation of right social ideals," the "cultivation of adequate social disposition," and the "formation of efficient social habits."[49] These "ideals" were to be developed through "school studies"; the "dispositions" were to be cultivated by "awakening of an abiding interest in the social ideals"; and the "habits" were to be formed "with respect to regularity, punctuality, silence and industry also with respect to punishments and to play." Thus, in the educational setting socially centered education guided the social individual to greater freedom, thereby addressing the paradox of freedom versus conformity.

DeGarmo's theme, originating in William James and John Dewey, became quite familiar to educational readers before 1913. In 1906 William Owen of the University of Chicago High School changed the emphasis from social education as simply helpful, to social education as necessary. Owen reasoned that the school as a "social institution," like other social institutions, needed to "be tested by its fitness to perform social service."[50] Here, in an attempt to argue that a "unified view of the world" was required to make "individual effort rational and social aims intelligible," Owen addressed the paradox of the social versus nonsocial individual (society versus the individual).

Nonetheless, Owen's concept of social education, like that of DeGarmo and MacMillan, was still a general call to socializing the entire school system under a uniform curriculum. Similarly, Colin Scott also wrote extensively about "social education" in the early

Copyrighted Material

1900s.[51] Scott attempted to detail what such a socialized curriculum would look like. However, as did other social education writers, he did not single out the social sciences or history for special curricular attention. These writers, in the spirit of the Social Education Congress that sought to further the cause of social service,[52] essentially worked to bring social service and social control ideas into the overall school system.

David Snedden

Within a decade of MacMillan, the call for a unified social education, opposed to a broad theoretical interpretation of social education, was refined and focused. In 1907 David Snedden, one of the most prolific educational writers of his day, argued that there existed "an awkward tendency in present discussion to use the term social education too broadly or inclusively."[53] To Snedden, although all subjects in the school curricula had social significance, not all subjects were social-centered. Given this foundation, Snedden separated school curricula into five divisions: "(a) physical education; (b) vocational education; (c) cultural education; (d) social education; and (e) the education which aims at general mental discipline."[54] In Snedden's treatment of social education—which he also called "social study" here—we find several important bridges or conceptual links between theory and practice. First, Snedden placed an idea of social education in the school. Then he positioned social science with history as complimentary elements of the same curriculum. Next he explained that in using this "social education" or "social study," the newer developmental approach to pedagogy was necessary to counteract the "intrusion of the adult standard into the affairs of children's education."[55] Later, Snedden's three conceptual links were incorporated in the 1913–1916 social studies proposal.[56]

Although others articulated the need for socializing education or placing the social sciences in the schools before him, Snedden presented the first argument that called for a focused or more defined social education, together with an attack on the traditional history curriculum. Snedden explained:

> The educator is asked in his mission of taking the child from where he is physically, vocationally, socially, and intellectually, to where he ought to be in these regards at early maturity, to teach so many subjects . . . that he is obliged to make numerous choices, and he feels that he has the right to call

Copyrighted Material

> upon the proponent of any special subject to justify its inclusion in the curriculum. So he asks, why teach history to children?[57]

With this "simple" question Snedden advanced the social education/studies movement from a theoretical base within social theory to the arena of school curricular politics. His question attacked the entrenched traditional history curriculum, which to its proponents was a given. Snedden did not wish to displace history per se; however, he did argue for a different type of history to be taught. To historians Snedden's suggestion that history instruction be adjusted to fit social needs and considerations was tantamount to a declaration of war against the field of history itself. Snedden argued strongly that the preservation of "chronological continuity" was "both cruel and futile," that such instruction produced "little more than verbal knowledge and a feeling of repression towards the subject."[58] It would seem that historians would bristle as their rock of "chronological continuity," the foundation of history instruction, was laid to siege by Snedden. Still, initially Snedden's question attracted little attention among historians. However, other social-centered educators picked up Snedden's attack.

In a refinement of Snedden's position, Charles Ellwood offered that in "some cases" history should be taught from "the sociological point of view."[59] Although a modification of Snedden's attack, Ellwood's position acknowledged the shifting sands of school curricula. To the social education insurgents, the traditional history curriculum was not impervious to change. The notion that educators could question and adjust traditional history curriculum opened the argument for social studies to enter the school curriculum.

By sharing slogans, the social studies insurgents symbolically joined the forces for social efficiency in the 1910s. Snedden's potent appeal that questioned the validity of the traditional history curriculum rallied many educators against the history camp. Moreover, Snedden's clarification of history's place in the curriculum combined with his argument for social education/studies provided the spark that launched the movement to place social studies into the schools at the expense of the traditional history curriculum. In sum, Snedden's writing moved the concept of social education from simply a vague orientation of the curriculum to a specific concept of citizenship education.

One year after the Social Studies Committee reported, Henry Johnson, then dean of the entrenched traditional history camp, rec-

Copyrighted Material

ognized the serious nature of Snedden's charge.[60] For Johnson and the traditional historians, however, it was too late; the social studies foot was already solidly in the school door.

SOCIAL STUDIES

In a title revealing its philosophical origins, the Committee on Social Science was formed in 1912 as part of the National Education Association report on the Reorganization of Secondary School Studies.[61] The term "social studies" itself had to wait another year before it entered the mainstream educational vocabulary with the publication of the preliminary report of the retitled Committee on Social Studies in 1913.[62]

Although the popularity of social studies did not rise appreciably until the decades of the 1920s and into the 30s, the term did have a limited but significant history before 1913. Beginning in 1905 "social studies" was used by Thomas Jesse Jones, who later became chair of the Committee on Social Studies, as the title of a course of study for blacks and Amerindians at Hampton Institute in Virginia.[63] In this setting, Jones, as an "Instructor in Social Studies," presented a curriculum that included political, sociological, and economic work, but clearly excluded any formal instruction in history and geography. In the spirit of Booker T. Washington, Jones taught social study that accepted at face value second-class citizenship for blacks and Amerindians, and sought through the study of social science the gradual improvement of both.

Education for Jones appeared to attend to both social service, defined as the helping of blacks and Amerindians to survive in the world, and social control, conceived as the explaining to blacks and Amerindians their role in American society. Although there were parallels to the education advocated by social reformers of the American Social Science Association, education for the Hampton social studies, at least the practical application, was decidedly directed at social control. Under Jones, students at Hampton were not instructed or inspired to political activism. Instead, students were taught to accept the political and economic status quo as well as Anglo-Saxon values. This type of educational system was not radical. Schools, in the main, accepted the political and economic status quo and were essentially immersed in Anglo-Saxon values. In view of the social conditions at the time, what made the Hampton social

Copyrighted Material

studies unusual was that blacks and Amerindians were given the opportunity for an advanced or higher education.

The sense of social education as a means of reconstructing society (implied in the 1916 Social Studies program) was missing at Hampton, and, indeed, would hardly have been acceptable to the sponsors of this institution. Jones's Hampton social studies is an example of theory clashing with social reality. On the one hand, the Hampton program sought to educate students outside the prevailing practice of history instruction (thus linking it to the emerging social studies movement); while on the other hand, the Hampton program remained strictly within the bounds of the status quo limits to educating blacks and Amerindians (thus linking it to the status quo itself). This contradiction in the Hampton social studies (being both liberal and repressive) was, however, worked out by the 1916 Social Studies. With the later social studies program, limits where not suggested or implied for any group of children; active participation and skepticism were encouraged with all children.

Contrary to conventional mythology on the origins of social studies,[64] the 1916 Social Studies Committee did not coin the term "social studies." The inaugural use of the term "social studies" in the United States can be found in the title of an 1887 book on the conditions and prospects of urban workers.[65] Drawing heavily from his membership in the American Social Science Association, author Heber Newton spoke of social study that was specifically selected from the social sciences for the purpose of improving the lot of the poor and suffering urban workers. Newton was reacting to problems he perceived to be caused by or related to the rapid urbanization and industrialization of the nation. Again, like Jones's "social studies," the contents of Newton's book centered on data generated largely from the emerging fields of political science, sociology, and economics. History and geography were not considered in Newton's vision of social study and reform.

From Newton and Jones we find that the initial use and shaping of the term "social studies" was directly tied to the utilization of social science data as a force in the improvement of human welfare. In Newton's case, the new-age urban industrial worker was the target for uplifting; for Jones, blacks and Amerindians were instructed to "improve" themselves by learning and accepting their role in society. In reference to Newton's and Jones's base in social science, there was a strong association between the message given in Newton's book and Jones's work at Hampton. Furthermore, Newton spe-

Copyrighted Material

cifically noted the contribution of Hampton Institute in the cause of "industrial education,"[66] a cause that Jones later came to champion at Hampton and as the chair of the 1913–1916 Social Studies Committee. Both the Newton and Jones concepts illustrate an evolutionary shift in the use of the term "social studies." Beginning with social studies as rooted in the social sciences for the purpose of attending to social welfare, the term evolved into social studies grounded in the social sciences for the purpose of directly educating future citizens.

Beyond Newton's book, two other texts used the term "social studies" in their titles before 1913, *Social Studies in England* by Sarah Bolton (1883)[67] and *Social Studies* by Lady Jane Wilde (1893).[68] Both Bolton and Wilde were members of the British National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. The subject matter of each text, however, did not address schools or schooling specifically. Bolton, like Newton and Jones, sought to promote the use of the social sciences to serve urban workers—that is, for social welfare. Wilde also argued, in a much broader manner, for the "elimination" of the human evils of "poverty and degradation and misery." Yet, in this effort she chose to emphasize the value of all sciences (without stressing the social sciences).[69] Taken as a whole, writers on both sides of the Atlantic worked to fashion an educational program that drew upon the social sciences for their content and purpose.

The phrase "social studies" or "social study" did make appearances in other forms of print prior to 1913, along with a seemingly never-ending list of words prefaced by the term "social" that connected social education to citizenship education. The first outline of "a programme for social study" was published by sociologist Ira Howerth in May 1897.[70] Howerth claimed, however, that the work was "practically adapted from [Albion] Small and [George] Vincent's *Introduction to the Study of Society*."[71] Howerth presented a "Constitution" for the development of "Social Study Club[s]," where, according to the constitution, the expressed object was for members to conduct "actual investigations of social conditions and institutions . . . and the study of social questions, with a view to the improvement of local conditions and the advancement of the members of the club in the knowledge and art of true social life."[72]

Howerth suggested to his colleagues that in the effort to attend to the "present widespread discontent in regard to social conditions" (ca. 1890s), interested parties drawn from the public at large should organize themselves into "study clubs to pursue local social

Copyrighted Material

investigations."[73] Howerth's invitation that any citizen could and should study "social life" was to sociology what Carl Becker's suggestion that "every man be his own historian" was to the discipline of history of the next generation. Howerth's notion, credited to Small and Vincent, that individual citizens should organize and become active participants in social welfare issues, although not aimed specifically for the public schools, did become a central tenet of the 1913–1916 social studies program in "community civics."

Howerth via Small and Vincent offered a general program of social study for society. The earliest use of utilizing the term "social study" as a field derived specifically from the social sciences for pedagogical purposes can be found in a paper by Edmund James. Then president of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, he delivered a paper to the membership of the National Herbart Society one month after Howerth's "social study" plan in June 1897.[74] James had made his plea for the entrance of social studies (without using the expression) into the public schools earlier in 1897 in a paper to the membership of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Here James declared, in the spirit of Newton, Bolton, and Wilde before him, that the social sciences reduced in some pedagogical form were to be used for the promotion of "the welfare of modern society in general, and especially to the welfare of modern free societies."[75]

In his Herbart Society paper James made the point, perhaps his major contribution to the history of the social studies, that the natural sciences consisting of "geology, mineralogy, biology, etc." were successfully introduced in schools under the generic rubric of "nature studies." The political and social sciences could also be introduced under a common title. James noted:

> Of course that does not mean necessarily that we shall put into the primary grades a subject which we shall call politics, and which we shall call economics, and which we shall call sociology. . . . [But rather, as with the use of the] term "nature study," which is simple, intelligible, and comprehensive, and which may include all that is possible or feasible to utilize for the purposes of instruction in the lower schools, gives us a hint of what may be accomplished under the head of "social study," if we choose to use such a term, or indeed of what may be done without the use of any term at all, to delimit the work in which we are engaged from other useful work in the schools.[76]

Copyrighted Material

Thus, "social study," according to James, was purely an expedient term, a way to "delimit" curricular matter. Simply put, social study was a helpful, descriptive phrase like "nature study," employed to describe the use of the social sciences in the schools for the development and nurturing of young citizens. James's definition of social study compares more favorably to the 1913–1916 Social Studies use of the term than does Howerth's broad definition of "social study." Howerth's broad definition was later given a different perspective by his two mentors, Small and Vincent, indicating the maturation of the notion of educational perspective in regard to social theory.

In fact, George Vincent in 1901, although not giving the idea any particular title, made a similar argument to James and not Howerth for a corollary social course for schools comparable to the collection of fields under "nature study."[77] Vincent wrote:

> Those who cultivate history, economics, politics, anthropology, and sociology, and who believe that social science in a large sense has an all-important role to play in education, are naturally concerned to know what relation these studies may sustain to the elementary and secondary schools. . . . This process [the nature study concept from the natural sciences] may well serve as a model to those who are anxious to see the social sciences influence the earlier years of the school.[78]

Arthur W. Dunn

In 1905 Arthur W. Dunn, a former student of Small and Vincent as well as the future chief secretary and compiler of the 1913–1916 Social Studies program, continued the line of reason begun by James and called for a course in "social study" in the manner of the sciences.[79] Then, in 1907, again using the James analogy, David Snedden of Columbia University, a former student of sociologist Edward Ross, suggested, "just as we have 'nature study' so should we have 'social study' or 'society study.'"[80] Earlier, in 1896, Small himself articulated a call for a generic "study of society" for schools that suggested a restricted and reduced use of social science.[81]

Small's advocacy of a "study of society" should not be interpreted as an endorsement for formal sociology study in schools. Despite Small's sociological grounding, he strongly opposed the formal study of sociology below the "senior year in college."[82] Small's distinction between the formal study of a subject field as sociology

Copyrighted Material