

**The Development of Civic Education in the United States, 1880-1930:
Continuity and/or Change (Bilingual edition: English/Portuguese)**

O desenvolvimento da educação cívica nos EUA, 1880-1930: Continuidade e/ou mudança

El desarrollo de la educación cívica en los EUA, 1880-1930: continuidad e/o rupturas

J. SPENCER CLARK¹

Abstract:

Developing civic education in the United States was a complex curricular project, which captured the interest of many economic, social, political, and educational entities. One of civic education's earliest defining periods was during the American Progressive-era. During this period, American cities and schools had to adapt to an influx in population, with immigrants coming from all over the world. This population influx caused fervor and debate over the curriculum, and provided impetus for making civic education a cornerstone of the primary and secondary social science curriculum. The debate over the civic education curriculum included primarily assimilationist and culturally pluralistic views regarding immigrant students. This article will consider these two views of civic education, with examples of two civic educators who represented each view and who forever shaped civic education in the United States. Implications for this article will focus on the lasting contributions of one of these educators, Laura Donnan.

Keywords: Civic Education, Americanization, Cultural Pluralism, Social Studies Education, Citizenship

¹ Doctor of Philosophy in Education: Emphasis in Curriculum Theory, Civic Education, and the History of Education from the Indiana University - Bloomington. Assistant Professor of Social Studies Education in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership at Utah State University. E-mail: spencer.clark@usu.edu

Resumo:

O desenvolvimento da educação cívica nos Estados Unidos foi um projeto curricular complexo que capturou o interesse de muitas entidades econômicas, sociais, políticas e educacionais. Um dos primeiros períodos em que se definiu a educação cívica ocorreu durante a chamada Era Progressista Americana, quando as cidades e as escolas tiveram que se adaptar ao influxo populacional, com a vinda de imigrantes, que provocou fervor e debate a respeito do currículo e possibilitou que a educação cívica se tornasse uma pedra angular no currículo de estudos sociais nos ciclos primário e secundário. O debate envolvendo o currículo da educação para o civismo contemplou primordialmente visões assimilacionistas e culturalmente pluralistas com relação aos estudantes imigrantes. O presente artigo abordará essas duas perspectivas da educação cívica, com exemplos de dois educadores dessa temática como representantes de cada visão, os quais moldaram para sempre a educação cívica nos Estados Unidos. As implicações deste artigo focalizarão as contribuições duradouras de um desses educadores, a saber, Laura Donnan.

Palavras-chave: Educação Cívica, Americanização, Pluralismo Cultural, Ensino de Estudos Sociais, Cidadania

Resumen:

El desarrollo de la educación cívica en los Estados Unidos fue un proyecto curricular complejo que capturó el interés de muchas entidades económicas, sociales, políticas y educacionales. Un de los períodos en que se definió la educación cívica ocurrió durante la llamada Era Progresista Americana, cuando las ciudades y las escuelas norteamericanas tuvieron que se adaptar al flujo populacional, con la vida de imigrantes provenientes del mundo entero. Tal flujo populacional provocó fervor y debate al respecto del currículo y permitió que la educación cívica se tornase una piedra angular en el currículo de estudios sociales en los ciclos primario y secundario. El debate envolviendo el currículo de la educación para el civismo contempló primordialmente visiones asimilacionistas y culturalmente pluralistas con relación a los estudiantes imigrantes. El presente artículo abordará estas dos perspectivas de la educación cívica, con ejemplos de dos educadores de esta temática como representantes de cada visión, los cuales transformaran para siempre la educación cívica en los Estados Unidos. Las implicaciones de este artículo focalizarán las contribuciones duradoras de un de esses educadores, a saber, Laura Donnan.

Palabras-clave: Educación Cívica, Americanización, Pluralismo Cultural, Enseñanza de Estudios Sociales, Ciudadanía

Recebido em: outubro de 2015

Aprovado para publicação em: dezembro de 2015

Introduction

The development of civic education in the United States is a complex and continuous curricular project, which has captured the interest of an array of economic, social, political, and educational entities. While the development of civic education is a continuing project, it has several defining periods when the American society and population were rapidly changing. One of civic education's earliest defining periods was during the American Progressive-era. During this period, American cities and schools had to adapt to an influx in population, with immigrants coming from all over the world. This influx in population during this period caused fervor and debate over the curriculum, and provided impetus for making civic education a cornerstone of the primary and secondary social science curriculum. Historians have characterized these curriculum debates among stakeholders as "struggles" (Kliebard, 2004), and specifically in the social sciences (the social studies) as "wars" (Evans, 2004). This chapter will discuss the development of civic education during this period, and move the discussion away from the combative metaphors. This chapter will also provide an example of how civic education took shape in one American city high school to highlight both the continuity and change of civic education curriculum in the Progressive-era.

As the attendance in American high schools rose in the late 19th century and early 20th century, more and more individuals and entities became interested in the purpose, format, and curriculum of schools in general. This interest in schools gave rise to national committees, which were composed of a variety of stakeholders and were given the task of defining the curriculum (Evans, 2004; Kliebard, 2004). Between 1892 and 1916, six different committees of educators made recommendations concerning the social studies curriculum in American schools. One of those committees was the Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education consisted of sixteen different committees and each published at least one report on some aspect of the curriculum or administration of secondary education in the United States (Lybarger, 1981). Historians of education agree that the final reports of the Committee on Social Studies, *The Teaching of Community Civics* and *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* were among the most successful documents produced by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The recommendations of the Committee on Social Studies established the scope and sequence of social studies instruction, which has remained virtually unchanged into the 20th century.

The increased attendance in school also signaled a shift in American society and lifestyle. Many adult Americans were leaving small rural towns for the American cities, which had implications for their children as students. Once in the city, students would spend more time at school than they would in their smaller agricultural communities because education had more relevance for finding jobs in the city. This change in society led to an increase in the schools' obligations, and civic education programs became an integral part of the expansion of school responsibilities (Uriebel, 1996). The school, rather than the family, church, or social group to which one belonged became the primary source of civic training. This shift in society is why civic education as a curriculum subject was not a trend isolated in the Progressive-era, but has become an ongoing curricular project. Many individuals viewed civic education as a means to cultivate the ideal American citizen; however, the question has always been: What are the attributes of an ideal American? And, furthermore who decides? In the urbanization of America during the Progressive-era, many Americans found themselves living in close proximity with people distinctly different from themselves, and thus, they encountered new values, beliefs, and attitudes in regard to economic, political, and social issues.

The influx of immigrants in the late 19th and early 20th century challenged the dominant views held by many "nativist" Americans, who considered fellow countryman narrowly as white, protestant, and of Teutonic or Anglo-Saxon heritage (Smith, 1997). This narrow perspective of what constituted an American citizen was the basis that many used for documenting changes in the demographics of society. White, Protestant, and Teutonic, as well as male, also described the background of most of the educational policymakers and stakeholders in this period. Since the social studies and civic education curriculum held potential to shape young citizens' perceptions of society and the world, there has always been pressure from various stakeholders to preserve certain aspects of American culture and change other aspects through civic education curriculum. Thus, when we are examining the history of civic education curriculum, or any type of curriculum, it is important to think about how we account for continuity and change because it depends on how one defines what one wants to preserve or change (Thornton, 2006). Furthermore, it depends on how deeply one wants to examine below the level of policy to look for continuity or change. It could also be that continuity, which may lack obvious drama, attracts less attention than change (Cuban, 1979, p. 175). This lack of drama does not mean that continuity is any less significant in looking at the development of civic education; however, it could mean that important changes happened before they were reflected in the committee work and national policies.

The following sections will first examine the views regarding immigration in the late 19th and early 20th century. More specifically, this section will look at how views of immigration were articulated into views about American citizenship. The next section will examine how national initiatives to reform curriculum encompassed these views on immigration and citizenship, and developed into a national civic education curriculum. And the last section will provide an example of civic education in one high school to demonstrate a sense of continuity and change.

Immigration and the Impetus for Civic Education

In the first three decades of the twentieth century, the country saw great economic and social changes. These changes in society served as a catalyst for many influential segments of the American population to seek a secure sense of civic identity, in order to protect the existing social order and their distinctive American character. Thus, these changes led to the establishment of citizenship laws that excluded those who did not fit a predetermined ideal American. During this period, urban school enrollments climbed along with the number of immigrants that attended urban schools. Educational policy makers realized that schools were vital spaces in the effort to shape new democratic citizens, both domestic and foreign-born. A majority of these efforts could be viewed as part of the movement that emphasized Americanization curriculum and activities.

Under the broad category of Americanization there were several different views in regard to what Americanization should entail in schools. This was partly tied to the differing notions of what attributes were required to be an American citizen. Jeffrey Mirel (2010) identified three distinct views on Americanization: Assimilationists, Cultural Pluralists, and Amalgamationists. Each of these views comprised differing degrees of foreign-born individuals discarding aspects of their own culture, and then adopting or contributing to a distinctive American culture. These views are important to consider as we examine the development of civic education in the United States. Mirel (2010) characterized assimilationists as Americans who thought that immigrants should leave behind all of their own culture and adopt a sort of “anglo-american” culture (p. 26). Many educators and civic leaders agreed with this view, none more notable than President Theodore Roosevelt who stated, “We must Americanize them in every way, in speech, in political ideas and principles, and in their way of looking at church and state” (Roosevelt in Mirel, 2010, p. 26). The

assimilationists were described as wanting to create cultural uniformity and to eliminate anything that seemed foreign to American culture. Thus, schools were a logical place to push these assimilationist ideals and begin the process by assimilating immigrant children. However, the assimilationists did not stop there, many urban high schools during this period opened evening sessions, or Night School, for adults to be educated and assimilated.

There were a couple of Americanization groups that did not believe in the strict assimilationist perspective, one of which was the cultural pluralists. As Mirel (2010) characterized the cultural pluralists, they viewed the assimilationist perspective as a “narrow, ethnocentric vision of American culture and identity” (p. 28). The cultural pluralists, as the name implied, wanted to preserve the immigrants’ native culture within the context of American society. Many cultural pluralists believed that it was the differentiation of culture that made America capable to progress as a nation. People such as Horace Kallen viewed America like an orchestra with many different instruments, which all contributed to one symphony (Mirel, 2010). Cultural pluralists also believed that assimilationist efforts would fail to pry the immigrants’ culture from them, and viewed the diversity of cultures as enriching the nation. While the cultural pluralists did not want to take the immigrants culture from them, in terms of citizenship, they also thought that immigrants should have “knowledge of and support for American democratic institutions and principles” (Mirel, 2010, p. 30). Jane Addams could be seen as an example of a practicing cultural pluralist and she thought that the schools could help immigrants, especially if teachers were respectful of the immigrant cultures and brought their cultures into the classroom (Mirel, 2010). In this same vein, many cultural pluralists felt it was counterproductive to force immigrant children into schools to learn about anglo-american culture. Overall, the cultural pluralists wanted Americanization education to be a cultural exchange that could enrich not only the immigrants’ lives, but also the American students’ lives.

A third perspective on Americanization education came from a group that Mirel (2010) describes as the amalgamationists. The amalgamationists were responsible for the idea of America as a “melting pot,” not necessarily the way we think of melting pot today, but in the sense that the mixing and remixing of various immigrant groups would create a strong new nation (Mirel, 2010, p. 33). In terms of schools, the amalgamationist vision was similar to that of the cultural pluralists. Amalgamationists wanted schools to teach about the various cultural backgrounds of all immigrants that were comprised in this new nation and people. They thought that the best attributes of each culture should be taught to students, with the

intention of creating a new dynamic culture that would not have a narrow cultural perspective. It should be noted that even leaders of specific immigrant groups were opposed to the amalgamationists' vision. This opposition was mainly because they were concerned about promoting intermarriage, just as many assimilationists. Regardless, the amalgamationists provide the most cosmopolitan vision for American schools among the Americanization movement during the Progressive-era.

The three views of Americanization provide a glimpse of what the Americanization advocates wanted social studies and civic education to promote in schools. While they differed in many respects, they believed that immigrants could become Americans, both in terms of culture and citizenship, one way or another. This distinction is important to consider because there were other Americans who felt that certain groups of immigrants could never become genuinely American. These views were reflected in much of the restrictive immigration legislation of the late 19th and early 20th century. These views are what Mirel (2010) called Ethnic Nationalistic views, which were opposed to the Civic Nationalistic views that were comprised of the Americanization efforts.

The Americanization efforts in schools drew upon several nationalistic ideals to attempt to clarify what exactly constituted an American citizen. Policy makers used these ideals, and they were in constant contention to determine which specific immigrant groups would be included and excluded as American citizens. Gary Gerstle (2001) identified two nationalistic ideologies that contended for social prevalence in the Progressive-era: Civic Nationalism and Racial Nationalism (p.4). Civic nationalism, similar to Mirel's (2010) conceptualization, embodied a more liberal stance in regard to citizenship. A civic nationalist would see the nation "as a community of equal, rights-bearing citizens united in patriotic attachment to a shared set of political practices and values" (Gerstle, 2001, p. 45). This ideal held the goals shared by many of the Americanization movement groups and they thought that most immigrant groups would be capable of achieving these goals. However, there were also many groups of immigrants that Americans thought were unfit for American citizenship, and thus civic education for these immigrant groups would be a futile endeavor.

The extreme of this view is what Gerstle (2001) called racial nationalism. A racial nationalist would view the nation in "ethnoracial terms, as a people held together by common blood and skin color and by an inherited fitness for self-government"(Gerstle, 2001, p. 4). Racial nationalists took the views of assimilationists to another level because they did not want all immigrants to adopt anglo-american culture, and they felt there were only certain

immigrant groups capable of adopting anglo-american culture. The racial nationalist avoided explicit racialist terms and used social-Darwinist rationales to declare certain immigrant groups unfit for self-government. This idea that Americans had developed a modern self-government, and were capable of sustaining it, was attributed to their Teutonic or Anglo-Saxon heritage. Many racial nationalists thought that other European groups were capable of self-government, but only with strict assimilationist civic education.

Gerstle (2001) argued that the pursuit of the contradictory ideals of the civic and racial nationalist views shaped American history, especially in the Progressive-era (p. 5). The contradiction was best evinced in the politics of President Theodore Roosevelt – a politician that many Americans respected for a variety of reasons, regardless of their own political views. President Roosevelt believed in the principles of civic nationalism, but he also had deeply seeded reservations about certain races and nationalities gaining American citizenship. For example, Gerstle wrote:

Roosevelt simply argued that certain races—notably Asians and African Americans—could not meet the fundamental requirements of American citizenship. ‘Only the very highest races have been able’ to make success of self government, and it would be foolish, even contemptible, to assume that “utterly undeveloped races” could function on an even footing with whites in a democracy. (p. 59)

Burkholder (2011) and Clark (2012) have demonstrated that both the civic and racial ideologies were present in schools among administrators, teachers, and students. They used aspects of these ideologies to justify their beliefs about which groups were fit and unfit for citizenship. Most, if not all, of these administrators, teachers, and students were white anglo-americans and they felt they were able to judge who was fit or unfit for American citizenship, due to their inherent ability to self-govern.

This signification of fit or unfit for self-government was a popular way for people to discriminate against immigrants during the Progressive-era. Smith (1997) considered many of the same issues and ideologies as Gertsle (2001) and Mirel (2010), but goes further to look at the roots of these ideologies and how they contributed to the Progressive-era American identities. Smith (1997) identified three different conceptions of American identity in relation to citizenship: liberalism, republicanism, and ethnocultural Americanism. Smith noted that

these conceptions have never appeared in isolation and are nearly always in combination when asserted in American society. Smith (1988) viewed liberalism as:

Properly identified with the emancipating aspirations of the Enlightenment and its concerns for universal human rights, religious toleration, the promotion of commerce and the sciences, and rejection of the theocratic and martial medieval ethos. . . . The distinctive feature of this moderate liberal persuasion is its insistence that the state must permit private as well as public pursuits of individual happiness, and must therefore be limited to enforcing personal rights and promoting external goods thought to benefit all. (p. 229)

This conception of citizenship can be seen especially in discussion of European immigrants' fitness for citizenship in the Progressive-era. It is commonly identified in the discussions of "opportunity," in that European immigrants come here to America to better themselves and take advantage of the opportunities not available in their countries. Many Americans also used liberalism to discuss and rationalize the rights of Black citizens, especially in terms of education and the right to vote. This American identification with Liberalism was also the basis for the Americanization movement discussed above. Republicanism, according to Smith (1988), is an extension of liberalism (p. 230). Smith (1988) identified two distinguishing points of republicanism:

Two aspects of republican thought on how free popular government could be sustained had special importance for America's citizenship laws: the insistence that a successful republic had to be characterized by considerable social homogeneity, and the related claim that a viable republic must have a relatively small body of citizens, bound to other peoples, if at all, via a loose confederation or imperial domination. (p. 231)

Republicanism, as Smith characterized it, meshes more with assimilationist-Americanization views common during this period. The goal of many assimilationists was to maintain social homogeneity by all means necessary.

The goal of social homogeneity could especially be seen in the Smith's (1988) last conception of citizenship, ethnocultural Americanism. While the previous two conceptions of citizenship may have been rooted in distinct historical traditions, ethnocultural Americanism was distinctly American, as Smith defines it. Ethnocultural Americanism at its extreme was

“nativism,” and advocates inevitably utilized aspects of the other two conceptions of citizenship, liberalism and republicanism, to justify their claims. As Smith (1988) wrote:

From the revolutionary era on, many American leaders deliberately promoted the popular notion that Americans had a distinctive character, born of their freedom-loving Anglo-Saxon ancestors and heightened by the favorable conditions of the new world. This character made them the last hope to preserve human freedom once the English had become corrupt - and it also set them above blacks and truly Native Americans, and later Mexicans, Chinese, Filipinos, and others who were labeled unfit for self-government. (p. 233)

This self-proclaimed ability to judge who was fit for self-government was seen throughout the Progressive-era literature regarding immigrants, especially regarding each of the specific groups that Smith identified. This ability to judge other ethnic groups was part of a distinct American character that was used to subtly categorize immigrants and other citizens vying for the distinction of full citizenship.

Smith (1997) identified four hierarchal types of citizenship that characterized the Progressive-era and clarified which groups were seen as fit and unfit for self-government when compared to the distinct American character. Smith (1997) wrote:

This structure included: *first*, the excluded status of people denied entry to and subject to expulsion from the U.S., generally owing to their ethnic or ideological traits; *second*, colonial subjectship, reserved chiefly for territorial inhabitants declared racially ineligible for citizenship; *third*, second-class citizenship, usually understood as required by improvident grants of formal citizenship to races not capable of exercising it, and as the proper status for women; and *fourth*, full citizenship, including voting rights. (p. 429)

For example, most Asian immigrants (especially Chinese immigrants), Middle Eastern immigrants, and Latin American immigrants were considered to be in the first category; the second category included individuals from places like Guam and Samoa; Puerto Ricans, Black citizens, Native Americans; Women were in the third category; and the fourth category included citizens in Hawaii, Alaska, and European immigrants (Smith, 1997, p. 430). These categories demonstrated the nativists' views of many Americans during the Progressive-era

because the most excluded groups were in many cases the most racially distinct from the American character with which nativists associated themselves.

Many Americanization efforts, then, used this distinctive American character as a means of assessing the attributes of possible citizens, and utilized nationality and race to justify a group's perceived capabilities for democratic citizenship and self-government. These notions of citizenship, along with Progressive-era state-building efforts, contributed to curricular efforts to Americanize students from other cultures (Gerstle, 2001; Mirel, 2010; Rueben, 1997), to at the very least instill an appreciation for the distinct American character, if not fully adopt the distinct American character. As Rueben (1997) noted, these efforts were the result of Progressive-era debates that attempted to clarify exactly what constituted an American citizen and more specifically who was capable of democratic self-government. These debates were important because they considered the citizenship not only of new immigrants, but also of previously excluded and disenfranchised groups. Many policy makers and social reformers looked to history and civic education courses, which in 1916 would collectively become known as the social studies, to undertake a major role in shaping young citizens. Many of these stakeholders hoped to preserve American progress, and provided continuity by simply promoting and implementing educational curricular changes.

The Educational Response to Immigration and Americanization Efforts

As mentioned in the introduction, there were six different committees of educators, which made recommendations concerning the social studies curriculum, including civic education curriculum, between 1892 and 1916. The most important committee report, for the purposes of this chapter, was the 1916 Report of the Social Studies Committee of the NEA Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (referred to from here on as The 1916 Report and The 1916 Committee). These committees were part of larger efforts to reorganize the school curriculum across the United States because of the increased enrollments and the changing population. These committees were given the task of modernizing the curriculum and making it more uniform across the country. These committees also wanted to create unified requirements for entrance into colleges and universities, and thus wanted to make high school curriculum across the country more cohesive.

Among all of the educational controversies and committee reports that emerged by 1912, there were a couple of criticisms about the school curriculum, which owed much to the work of one of the committees, the Committee of Ten (1894). First, the outmoded subjects, such as Ancient History, were identified because they kept subjects, such as civics, out of the curriculum even though they were considered to be of more immediate utility. Second, the committee found that public schools were not providing even the most basic moral training for students, which they felt was important for decision-making as citizens. These two identifications opened the door for advocates of civic education to begin their campaigns to make social studies courses more civics focused, and less focused on history. Probably in response to the increased criticism about schooling and the results of the committees, the National Education Association at its 1912 meeting appointed another committee to examine and make recommendations about the school curriculum. This committee, the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, produced reports, which made recommendations about every high school subject area.

In 1913, when the National Education Association appointed the committees, there were several national and international issues that were at the forefront, and would have influenced the committees' conduct and outcomes. First, there was the threat of the United States joining World War I in Europe. At the time of the Committee's appointment (1913), tension was high in Europe, but war had not begun. Unlike World War II, it was common for many Americans to feel indifference toward the war in Europe. This affected the school curriculum very mildly until the United States entered into the war, which was after the completion of the influential Committee Report in 1916. Nevertheless, European affairs dominated the major newspapers, and this may have affected the 1916 Committee as it met from 1914 to 1916 (Mirel, 2010), especially in thinking about history curriculum and certain immigrant groups, such as the Germans.

World War I also contributed to the influx of immigrants, especially the great wave of Eastern and Southern European immigrants. Many Americans viewed these immigrants very differently than Western Europeans who had constituted the previous great wave of immigrants (Gerstle, 2001). Overall, the Eastern and Southern European immigrants had less access to education or proper health care, and little power or wealth. These immigrants flooded America's shores and crowded America's large cities. The 1916 Committee, with sociologist and school officials, was acutely aware of the supposed problems caused by the arrival and settlement of these immigrants, and the 1916 Report reflects that awareness and

concern. Just as today, availability and vulnerability of unskilled immigrants made it easy for United States business to exploit workers. The new immigrants provided the manpower for the sweatshops and factories, which eventually grew into larger powerful corporations. Working conditions were poor and dangerous, with children and adults losing their lives working long hours. Thus, a background focus for the committee was creating a curriculum that could impact young students before they became working age.

The urban slums were so overcrowded that diseases spread rapidly, which presented many social problems for the rapidly growing cities. Settlement houses and other private social welfare agencies arose to meet the needs of this exploited under class. Education about hygienic living was considered an important part of civic education, which you can find in civics textbooks of the time (Dunn, 1907). Several of the members of the 1916 Committee were also members of a socially concerned private organization, which was in most major cities, called the Municipal League. The Municipal League members were typically white men who were businessmen, politicians, lawyers, and academics. Their charge was to sanitize the cities and initialize “beautification projects” which were also popular in this period. Thus, the 1916 Committee members were certainly aware of the poor conditions that many immigrants lived in and they were committed to making the cities better places to live for some members of society. Civic education provided one means for contributing to these sanitization projects.

These national issues all translated into issues for schools because of the immigrant children who migrated with their parents and lived in the same conditions. Many believed that the immigrant children had to be schooled not only for their own benefit, but also in hopes that it would influence their parents and greater communities. This is where the Americanization movements influence contributed to the 1916 Committee’s Report as many felt in order to preserve and instill the proper American civic virtue immigrants needed to be Americanized. Thus, the schools would need to provide immigrant students with the “knowledge of language, custom, health practices, and economic consumerism” (Nelson, 1994). The young immigrants needed to be taught this knowledge and behaviors so that they would come to understand their civic duties as both citizens and immigrants. These social issues provided the impetus for the 1916 Committee to change the focus of course offering from history to more socially and civically based courses, which are now known as the social studies.

In consideration of these issues and many more facing the growing urban school systems, the 1916 Report of the Social Studies Committee of the NEA Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education had to consider a lot of goals, and accommodate many interests. The 1916 Report is generally given credit for the creation of the national sequence of social studies courses, which have remained generally unchanged for almost a century. Many credit the 1916 Committee with the creation of what we now refer to as the social studies, while others have suggested that the committee was just responding to the trends already in motion (Clark, 2011; Evans, 2004). As Evans (2004) noted:

The 1916 report proposed a new synthesis of social studies subjects and suggested a pattern of courses that was different from what existed in most schools prior to that time. In its report, the committee recommended greater emphasis on current issues, social problems, and recent history and a greater emphasis on the needs and interests of students. (p. 21)

This new focus on current issues, social problems, and recent history was a sharp contrast from what was taught in most schools and what the previous committees had recommended. The traditional history curriculum, which had been advocated by previous committees, had become unpopular because it focused on the individual. In 1913, trends called for “social centered education;” an approach that grew out of psychology, the social sciences and philosophy (Saxe, 1991, p. 110). While there is much evidence of the influence of various social sciences, which had become popular at this time, which included ideas of social efficiency, social welfare, and a progressive version of history teaching, Evans (2007) suggested that “the work of the committee was a compromise, influenced by multiple camps, all of which were represented in the final report” (p. 22). A compromise signaled that there was not a successive shift or change in the curriculum, instead there was some change and some continuity.

Many of the early analyses of the 1916 Report tout a definitive shift in social science curriculum and even views of society (Lybarger, 1981; Saxe, 1991). However, Evans (2004) partially dissented and wrote “Commission reports are almost always an expression of change already under way” (p. 22). The school efficiency movement and the school progress movement were consistently influencing a majority of schools in the United States by 1912 (Evans, 2004; Kliebard, 2004). The focus of attention was to make schools more efficient, eliminate waste, and reform the teaching of subject matter that lacked practical value. Evans

(2004) noted that the most substantial influence on the 1916 Committee was John Dewey. Namely it was Dewey's belief that focus should be on the needs of the students instead of focusing so heavily on the subject matter. Dewey ideally would have wanted history to be more functional for the student, as he wrote "past events cannot be separated from the living present and retain meaning. The true starting point of history is always some present situation with its problems" (Dewey in Saxe, 1991, p. 124). The 1916 Report defined a clear focus on "present interests and needs of the pupil" (Dunn, 1916); which was clearly a Deweyan position. The authors of the report also made it clear that they were not interested in the development of both the individual and the group, "but that individual interests and needs were secondary to the needs of society as a whole" (Evans, 2004, p. 23). This focus on society was a major departure from the previous reports, which focused on individual intellectual development of students. This new focus was possibly the best philosophical indication that the 1916 Committee wanted to focus more on the civic knowledge and skills of students, and furthermore indicated that civic education was not only for the individual citizen, but also for the purpose of reforming society.

Another major indication of the 1916 Committee's shift toward a focus on civic education was two new courses they introduced, which they suggested should be part of the school curriculum. One such course was *community civics*, which emerged as a direct product of discussions at the turn of the century that focused on the need to improve and expand citizenship education in schools. Advocates of this focus intended to purify American politics and solve social problems by developing students' skills to be citizens. Advocates of community civics distinguished the new class from the older civics instruction by its audience, its pedagogy, and its subject matter. The goal was to have community civics taught at the very least in the eighth grade because in this period many students did not finish high school. Thus, the committee members believed the course would have its greatest impact on the community and society if taught at this point in the curriculum.

The teaching of civics had been advocated for and taught in some high schools since at least the mid 1880's (Donnan, 1889). This will be discussed specifically in the next section of this chapter. However, the designers of community civics believed that their new course was a drastic improvement on traditional civics instruction. As mentioned above, it was to be taught to younger students. In many high schools, civics had typically been offered in the senior year of high school. This was because many believed that learning about the functioning of government required a more mature mind, not to mention older students would soon be

assuming political responsibilities. Arthur W. Dunn was one of the main advocates of this course on the 1916 committee, and also one individual who developed a textbook to support the course called *The Community and the Citizen* (1907). Dunn and other advocates of community civics also emphasized the benefits of the courses' pedagogy, which resembled many progressive reforms. Their prescribed pedagogy moved away from the recitation method, in which the teacher asked a student a question and the student responded with an answer. Instead, Dunn and others advocated more student-centered activities based on inquiry. Dunn and others argued, "that teaching civics through recitation undermined the goals of civics because it did not train students to reflect upon social and political problems (Rueben, 1997, p. 404). The advocates of community civics wanted to incorporate various methods to engage students actively in the subject matter.

Dunn believed that stimulating students' interest in the material was the main goal of the course. "It is the individual's interest, and not his knowledge," Dunn wrote, "that leads to action. The right kind of interest behind a very few facts will lead to good citizenship, while any number of facts without the interest will fail to do so" (Dunn, 1907, p. vi). The prompts for teachers in community civics suggested that they experiment with a range of activities, "including open-ended discussions that incorporated students' personal experiences, class visits by police and firemen, field trips, student studies of local agencies and 'community surveys,' participation in civic activities, reading newspapers and 'quality' magazines, creating scrapbooks dealing with issues of local concern, and student self-government" (Rueben, 1997, p. 404). The goal of the community civics curriculum was to focus on the interests and everyday lives of the students, so that they could seek ways to improve their lives for the betterment of society.

Pedagogical innovations were just part of the new curriculum, Dunn also rejected the subject matter of the civics course that had preceded the 1916 Committee. It was the perception that civics courses prior to community civics had focused primarily on the Constitution and the structure of the federal and state governments. Again, Dunn and other advocates of the community civics curriculum "thought that this focus undermined the ultimate goals of citizenship education" (Rueben, 1997, p. 404). Instead, the community civics curriculum would focus on the services of the government and take a more practical approach. Thus, the community civics curriculum would be organized around the betterment and welfare of the community. The welfare of the community could be seen in some of the frequent topics of Dunn's (1907) textbook and included health, protection of life and property,

recreation, education, civic beauty, wealth, communication, transportation, migration, and charities. Therefore, a major part of the curriculum was to help students understand how government helped citizens meet their basic needs.

Dunn and other creators of community civics decided to redirect the focus of the content. Community civics courses would begin with the students' local community rather than the state or national government. Community civics started with the local community because of its focus on students' experiences, which also fit in with broader goals of social education during this period (See Barton, 2009). Also students could more easily see themselves as members of their community, and would be more likely to take responsibility for, and get involved in, their community. The goal of community civics was still to get students to be civically engaged nationally, but Dunn and other advocates thought that once the course helped students grapple with the responsibilities of community membership, it could also help students understand themselves as part of the larger national community.

The 1916 Committee also recommended another new course, which was called *problems of democracy*. This course was apparently invented by the 1916 Committee to replace the civics courses already in place at the last year of high school. The problems of democracy course was also an attempt to fuse several of the social science together into one course. The 1916 Committee wanted to utilize the students' knowledge they had gained from other history and social studies courses and focused on developing curriculum centered on social problems (Evans, 2004). The course represented a compromise for all of the social science interests in the new social studies curriculum, and the curriculum advocated social science inquiry methods to engage students in the social problems of their community and country. This was a radical departure from the typical methods and practices in schools. The problems of democracy course content would be selected based upon student interest and importance to society. The textbooks of the course demonstrated that "the course tended to fuse content from three main disciplines, government, economics, and sociology, with a smattering of historical backgrounds or other contents" (Evans, 2004). Regardless, the new problems of democracy course represented the culmination of interests in education for social betterment, and fused subject matter from several social science disciplines, to focus on the process of reflective thinking.

Many of the creators of social studies and civic education were older, not recent immigrants, and they had small-town roots. Their pedigree and social status reflected the distinctive American character described by Smith (1997), and in part, the impetus for social

studies reform during the Progressive-era came from a desire to Americanize the masses, spurred by fear of foreign ideologies and cultures. Educational leaders hoped that schools could help address modern problems of the urban areas, industrialization, and immigration while supporting the general status quo of liberal capitalist democracy. This would create allegiance to the state and the appearance of progress. Even though it was aimed at social betterment and improvement, the 1916 Report on Social Studies was created by white middle-class men of northwest European descent who generally assumed the hegemony of their own group, and ignored race or ethnicity as an issue (Evans, 2004; Watkins, 2001). The members of the 1916 Committee wanted to develop a practical and flexible curriculum that would prove useful to teachers. The report appeared to be developed from educators concerns for social improvement and for improving the teaching of social studies subjects in schools. Beyond appearance, the report attempted to reconcile competing visions (Lybarger, 1981) between social efficiency and traditional history instruction. This reconciliation resulted in curricular recommendations that were progressive, socially motivated, and civically focused. While this compromise signaled a shift in national policy, many of its components were already being implemented in schools.

An Example of Civic Education Before the 1916 Report:

Laura Donnan and Shortridge High School

Laura Donnan was well known in her community as a civic educator, activist, and devout advocate of democracy. Donnan's career as an educator spanned more than forty-five years, over two centuries, and coincided with foundational changes in the American high school. Donnan taught primarily civics course in a time when recitation of the constitution was a common classroom practice; however, Donnan's classroom practice involved much more than recitations of the constitution and emphasized the development of knowledge and skills she thought her students would need as active citizens (Donnan, 1889a). Donnan's career spanned the period of intense curricular debate discussed above. She taught amid a contention between what we now know as the social studies curriculum and its history laden precursor; a contention that saw some level of compromise in the 1916 Report of the Social Studies Committee on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. By providing insight into classroom practice prior to the 1916 Report, Donnan's career illustrates some of the "trends"

that “were well in motion” preceding the committee meeting, and the apparent creation of the social studies (Evans, 2004, p.21).

Donnan’s career also provides insight into the struggles over the curriculum, struggles seemingly over curricular continuity and change (Thornton, 2008). Donnan began teaching in 1883 and by many accounts implemented curriculum and methodology that resembled much of what was prescribed in the 1916 Report, published over thirty years later. This makes sense in considering that “Commission reports are almost always an expression of change already under way” (Evans, 2004, p. 22). The continuity of Donnan’s practice may be less dramatic than the apparent change resulting from the ideological battles over the curriculum; however, the significance of her career is vital to the history of the social studies and specifically civic education.

Donnan’s Life and Career at Shortridge High School

Laura Donnan was born to abolitionist parents in 1854. Spending most of her life in Indianapolis, Donnan grew-up just down the street from the state capitol. She graduated from Indianapolis High School, which in 1900 became Shortridge High School upon a second high school opening in the city. Donnan attended the Normal School at Indianapolis and then received her master's degree from the University of Michigan. At the University of Michigan her major was the Constitutional History of the United States and her master's thesis was titled “Duties of a Private Citizen in a Republic” (Cox, 1936). Donnan taught elementary school in two small communities before heading to the University of Michigan, and then returned to Indianapolis to teach at her alma mater, where she would be remembered as one of the “Shortridge Immortals,” teaching there for forty-five years and retiring in 1929 (Bowers, 2000; Cox, 1936; Gaus; 1985). Donnan lived in the same house where she was raised, never married, and shared the house with her siblings. Donnan devoted her life to the political and social education of Indianapolis students, and to the civic service of her community.

At Shortridge High School, Donnan quickly became very popular with her students. Her popularity could be attributed to the classes she taught and her pedagogy, the extracurricular activities she initiated and sponsored, and her presence at most school functions. Donnan had sponsored nearly every school activity over the span of her career and her efforts were very apparent (Gaus, 1985), as noted in the school newspaper, “I need not tell you what Miss Donnan is doing for the Echo, Oratorical Association and the Senate”

(Editorial Staff, 1899a, p. 2). Among these, Donnan was most famous for her creation, the Shortridge Senate, which existed at the school for nearly one hundred years, starting in 1883 in her classroom, and then becoming an extracurricular activity in 1887. The popularity of the Senate spread, and schools across the country eventually duplicated its format (Gaus, 1985).

Beyond the Senate, Donnan was also founder and longtime sponsor of the Shortridge Oratorical Society; the John Quincy Adams Club, which provided a forum to debate school and governmental issues pertinent to students in an impromptu manner; the Keyes Association, which discussed patriotic topics and coordinated patriotic events and activities in the community; and the Shortridge *Daily Echo*, which was the first daily high school newspaper in the country. Donnan was also involved with nearly every field trip, and chaperoned the girls because “she did not want the girls to miss out on anything,” while she could be seen at nearly every sporting event and other school activity, showing her support (Gaus, 1985, p. 30).

Donnan was regarded as a feminist and early advocate for woman’s suffrage. She was very outspoken in advocating equality for all citizens, as a former student remembers, “She was a strong advocate for the rights of blacks” (Hendrickson, 1983, p. 131). The only racial incident that happened at Shortridge during its integrated period, prior to the 1927 segregation, was in Donnan's civil government classroom in the spring of 1904. The incident involved a white male student who did not want to take his newly assigned seat next to a black female student. Upon the student disobeying her in front of the entire class, Donnan dismissed the white student. When the white student appealed to the principal and the school board, both supported and upheld Donnan's decision and authority. The incident resulted in both students transferring out of the class due to embarrassment, while the white student eventually dropped out of school (Gaus, 1985, p. 74). Donnan was known for her equal treatment of all students, as Cox (1936) wrote:

It made no difference to Laura Donnan from what part of the city a child came. She often made the remark that children who lived on the ‘boo-lee-ward’ [boulevard] need not expect any partiality. She neither upheld nor discriminated against those who lived either in poverty or wealth. (p. 2)

All of Donnan's activities at Shortridge were inclusive of students regardless of their age, race, or sex. This included her most popular activity, the Senate, as Cox (1936) wrote, "The Senate was very inclusive, barring none on account of race or color...The equality of persons that is so sought for in governments was prevalent in the Senate" (p. 5).

Donnan was also a member of the Shortridge faculty that founded the Shortridge Night School in 1899, and served as its principal. As mentioned above, the night schools were popular during the Progressive-era and served as a means to educate, or Americanize, teenage and adult immigrants. The Shortridge Night School was open to anyone, as there was "no limitation in regard to age, race, or sex" ("The Free Night High School," 1900, p.1). The enrollment fluctuated from around fifty to one hundred students, from 1899-1902. The Night School had its first graduate in 1902, which Donnan celebrated with a party at her house, inviting students from her civil government classes (Cox, 1936; "The Free Night School," 1900; Editorial Staff, 1899c; Gaus, 1985). There was no compensation for her work at the Shortridge Night School, which was not surprising, as it seems she truly viewed teaching as a means of social change, for which she was passionate, as former student Claude Bowers (1962) remembered:

She was vigorous and vivid in her teaching...One instinctively felt that she was not only a teacher, she was a personality...she encouraged argument, and, since she had powerful convictions and some prejudices, the student trying to curry favor and escape her sarcasm by simulating agreement had her contempt. (p. 34)

Another student remembered Donnan not only as a good teacher, but also different in method from the rest of his teachers:

Most of the teachers were strong personalities, as was Laura Donnan. She taught American Constitutional History.... On the first day of her class she directed that all notebooks be placed on the left side of the students' desks with name and seat number clearly marked. Then she would produce a market basket, walk up and down the aisle and telling the students that the knowledge they acquired in her class was to reside in their minds, not their notebooks. (Elliott in Gaus, 1985, p. 104)

This illustration of Donnan's practice in the classroom provides the basis of civic education at Shortridge High School for forty-five years.

Donnan's NEA Address

In an address to the National Education Association's (NEA) Annual Meeting in 1889, titled "The High School and the Citizen," Laura Donnan stated a purpose for teaching civics in high schools. In schools, she said, "there should be taught some subject whose object is to give pupils a knowledge of the rights and duties of citizenship, and to inspire them with the moral courage to demand their rights and perform their duties" (Donnan, 1889a, p. 515). In 1887, only four years after Donnan had arrived, civil government became a course required for graduation at the only Indianapolis high school (Uriebel, 1996), which was uncommon in the United States. Therefore, in part, Donnan was attempting to justify the place of civil government among a history-dominated curriculum, with her address at the NEA meeting. The value that students held for Donnan's civics course was noted ten years after Donnan's address to the NEA, in an article in the school newspaper the *Echo*:

In the Civil Government classes the germs of good citizenship are instilled into the minds of the young people upon whose shoulders will sometime rest the responsibility of deciding the questions which are continually perplexing our government. And what better training is there in the settlement of difficult social problems than in the debates held every Friday in these classes. ("The Civil Government Debates," 1899, p. 3)

This student's account of the civics course could have in many ways been inserted into many of the reports created by committees concerned with history, civics, and social studies curriculum, precisely because it identified the goal of "good citizenship" for the purpose of addressing "social problems" (Jones, 1913; Dunn, 1914a; Dunn, 1915a; Dunn, 1915d; Dunn, 1916).

In her address to the NEA, Donnan provided a framework to demonstrate how the objective in her address could be realized, essentially outlining her civics course and providing examples to illustrate her methods. She first advocated extensive study of the constitution, and wanted students to memorize certain sections of the document. She advocated in part the recitation that was common in schools at this time, but also advocated moderation to allow for other methods of instruction:

To instruct in the rights and the duties of citizenship is one of the chief aims in the study of civil government...In a course on civil government...the constitution should have the most prominent place. Too much time should not be spent studying about the constitution.... (Donnan, 1889a, p. 516)

It is here in her address that Donnan begins to discuss the other methods of instruction, which she thought would build on the students' foundational knowledge of the constitution, by developing skills that would allow for her students to fulfill their duties as active participatory citizens.

Donnan begins first by strongly advocating for the discussion of issues comprised in the constitution and set aside days in the class primarily for the discussion of such "questions as taxation, representation, protection, free trade, and suffrage" (Donnan, 1889a, p. 515). Donnan believed that in the discussion of these questions, sparked by the study of the constitution, that "the pupils should be encouraged to express fully their opinions, however unusual or unpopular they may be" (Donnan, 1889a, p. 515). Donnan's intention for students to develop questions and express their opinions through discussion would also be expected when students engaged with the assigned readings of other important government documents and famous speeches. The impact of Donnan's persistence on discussion can be seen in an editorial article in the school newspaper that considered the relevance of discussion in the classroom:

The question came up the other day of the good and the real benefit that is derived from arguments in class. We think most assuredly that discussions about a subject in class are helpful in many respects—as we are sure to get our own ideas enlarged by other people's views, and have new light thrown upon some subject that we were rather in the shade about. ("About Discussions," 1900, p. 1)

This student account of Donnan's civics course seems to imply that discussion was possibly innovative as a methodology, suggesting that Donnan was not only trying to justify a new course in civics, but also the use and frequency of methodology, such as discussion.

Donnan's intention for students to express their opinions would then be further facilitated through weekly debates over contemporary constitutional questions, at both the local and national levels. Donnan conducted debates in her civil government classroom and in the Shortridge Senate. The classroom debates were less formal than the deliberations in the Senate, but the interactions were equally heated. They were so heated at times that visitors

wanted to observe the discussions and frequented these debates. In the classroom, many controversial topics were discussed and debated, along with more commonly debated constitutional questions. Some of the controversial topics covered were lynching, immigration, women's suffrage, annexation, and vivisection. Controversial issues were at the center of Donnan's pedagogy, and she identified issues that required citizens to make difficult decisions, while also promoting the development of deliberative skills in speaking about those issues.

The Shortridge Senate, in comparison, had slightly different goals than the debates in the civics classroom; however, the Senate was still centered on discussing the controversial constitutional issues of the times. Donnan outlined these goals in her 1889 address:

The purpose of the senate should be three-fold: to teach them the duties of a legislator; to keep them informed as to who are the United States Senators; to interest them in what is being done in the United States Senate. (Donnan, 1889a, p. 517)

Despite the senate being an extracurricular activity, students still recognized its value within their school experience, as one student writes in the *Echo*, "The Senate is a place for learning and debate, and is decidedly an educational feature of our school" ("Order in the Senate, 1899, pp. 2-3). Donnan created a mock legislative body in which students had the experience of administering themselves in the process of deliberation, where they could understand the legislative process as part of democracy in a republic.

Donnan also advocated for engaging her students in one mock trial per semester, and one per year in the senate, to further contribute to her students understanding of processes vital to democracy. Donnan believed staunchly in the value of the trial, from the student preparation to the justification of a verdict, and stated "No more real work is done in any branch of study in the same time, than is accomplished in preparing and conducting the trial" (Donnan, 1889a, p. 518). Donnan provided an account of the popularity of the mock trial, explained the environment in which the trial took place, and commented "that it is no unusual thing for fifty or a hundred pupils who are not studying civil government, but who have a vacant hour at the time of the trial, to be in attendance" (Donnan, 1889a, p. 518). For Donnan, it seemed that understanding the processes and procedures of democracy were important, but more importantly she wanted students to understand their role in their democracy and have the skills to effectively undertake their role.

In her address, Donnan described the importance of promoting students' awareness of government entities within their communities and state. Donnan took her civics classes on field trips to visit various civic offices to meet the officials and gain a better understanding of their government roles. The civics classes visited the city jail, police headquarters, state offices, city offices, the waterworks, and various other city entities ("A Second Trip," 1901; "At the State House," 1902; "Civics I Classes Visit Atkins Saw Works," 1906; "Civil Government Tour," 1901; "In Jail," 1901; "Police Headquarters," 1901; "State Officers," 1902; "Visit the Mayor," 1901). These visits acquainted students with their communities and contributed to their broader understanding of how social issues are dealt with in practice, at the city and state level.

Donnan identified three other classroom strategies in her address to the NEA, which were common practices in her classroom and practices that are common in today's civics classrooms. First, Donnan highlighted the importance of reading the newspaper and discussing what we currently think of as current events:

A very profitable part of the supplemental work in civil government is a paper [newspaper], read once a week. This is a compilation of clippings from the various newspapers, and confined to the political and governmental affairs of our country. As all the pupils contribute to this paper, clippings expressing the views of the different political parties will be found in it. The two greatest benefits derived from this work are that the pupils are encouraged to read the daily papers, and that they become accustomed to hear both sides of a question presented. (Donnan, 1889a, p. 518)

Despite her strong convictions, Donnan was persistent in making sure that students understood the multiple perspectives involved in the issues. Next, Donnan described what today we would call independent reading:

In regard to books, someone has said: 'One should give his works the greatest possible variety and excellence, so that each reader may be able to select something for himself, and thus, in his own way, become a participant.' (Donnan, 1889a, p. 516)

Here, Donnan wanted to develop unique perspectives to contribute to the discussions by allowing students to choose their own readings. Lastly, Donnan illustrated several

activities that engage students in inquiry with the issues or questions they are discussing, and then inquiring for further information and presenting their findings. For example:

If you live in a State where the citizen is practically disfranchised by the existence of the gerrymander, take a map of the Congressional districts and let the class redistrict the State on the basis of justice. If you are so fortunate as to live in a State in which the Congressional districts are laid off on an honest basis, then borrow a map of one of your less fortunate neighbors, and by contrast show the evil influence of the gerrymander. (Donnan, 1889a, p. 516)

The strategies identified by Donnan provide important insight into practice inside and outside the classroom prior to the committee reports. These strategies focused on developing good citizens concerned with social problems and their resolutions.

Donnan's concluding remarks at the NEA address hint at the portentous education milieu. She demonstrated an acute awareness of her unique pedagogy, and the possibility that her colleagues would reject her pedagogy as merely theoretical. Donnan stated "That the course in civil government traced in this paper is not mere theory, is proven by the fact that in at least one city in the United States it is realized in its minutest detail" (Donnan, 1889a, p. 518). This undoubtedly highlighted the tension between committees that prescribed policy based on theory and the practice of teachers such as Donnan, and more importantly their awareness of each other.

Civic Education in the Progressive Era: Continuity and/or Change

Laura Donnan's acknowledgement of the dissension between theorist and practitioners in her address to the NEA illustrated a tension that has remained relevant in education. The title of Donnan's master's thesis was "Duties of a Private Citizen in a Republic" (Cox, 1936), and this title in way defines how Donnan viewed her development of citizens at Shortridge High School. Donnan prepared students to be individually minded, and well-reasoned citizens that understood the process of democracy, and how to promote social change through this process. A student noted Donnan's work and wrote about her purpose in the yearbook, "Miss Donnan, never has lost sight of the primary purpose—to develop boys and girls into reasoning citizens" (Weber, 1909). The development of a well-reasoned individual meant cultivating their ideas about social and civic issues through their own thinking. Donnan's

civic education framework was designed to develop students into well-informed individuals and citizens, so that they could in fact, develop their own ideas about the issues being debated. Donnan's civic education framework and goals for her students associated her most closely with the cultural pluralists views on Americanization education and civic nationalism. Thus, Donnan was different from most of the stakeholders on the 1916 Committee, who have typically been portrayed as assimilationists in their views regarding Americanization.

Donnan's civic education framework, however, resembled many of the recommendations made by the 1916 Committee in their Report. Donnan's civic education framework resembled the 1916 committee's recommendations especially in regard to the two new courses they created: community civics and problems of democracy. Donnan had been implementing the main aspects of these new courses, in her own courses at Shortridge, for over thirty years. The main difference between Donnan's courses and the courses proposed by the 1916 Committee was the purpose behind the courses. The stakeholders who were part of the 1916 Committee were interested in controlling society through social efficiency, and ultimately Americanizing all students who attended US schools. Donnan, however, was more concerned with exposing students to different perspectives and hoped that each student could develop their unique perspective as a private citizen of the country. When Donnan started teaching at Shortridge the majority of her students were male, white, and Teutonic. As she continued teaching, her students became increasingly female with more diversity in terms of ethnicity. Donnan's cultural pluralist views were realized by her students more and more, and not just as different from the normative views, but also rational and well justified.

From the cultural pluralist perspective, Donnan responded to the increasing diversity of her classrooms and wanted to utilize her students' different backgrounds to develop all of her students understanding of society. By creating a civic education course in 1883 and then requiring it to be mandatory for all 9th grade students, Donnan was clearly aware of the civic nationalistic trends and perspectives. She had the foresight to understand education as a nation-building endeavor, and that citizenship in a "self-governing" nation required a specialized form of civic education. This is no surprise considering the extent to which she was politically active throughout her life, her education, and devotion to the betterment of society. Donnan's constant advocacy of women's rights, and even Black citizens rights, fit well with the cultural pluralist perspective and civic nationalistic views. Donnan's perspective as a politically active female, who did not have voting rights, gave her keen insight into the challenges of her future citizens. This insight informed much of Donnan's teaching goals and outcomes. If Donnan was informed

of the civic nationalistic trends and able to implement them into her practice, then what delayed educational policy makers recommendations in the committees?

An interesting side story to the development of civic education in the US is the relationship between Arthur W. Dunn, one of the main contributors to the 1916 Committee and Report, and Laura Donnan. In 1900, seventeen years after Donnan began teaching at Shortridge High School, Dunn arrived to teach American history and become head of the history and civics department at Shortridge High School. While in Indianapolis, Dunn was called upon to coordinate the development of civics education for all of the Indianapolis public schools. Dunn's work with civics education in Indianapolis provided a path for his career, which upon leaving Indianapolis in 1910 eventually led him to Washington D.C., where he became a civic education specialist for the U.S. Bureau of Education. Dunn's devotion to reforming civic education, and his apparent success in reforming civics education in Indianapolis, led to his role as secretary on the 1916 Committee to reform social studies, where he authored, most, if not all of the 1916 Report.

Much of Dunn's success and innovative ideas in regards to civic education are attributed to his study with the sociologists Albion Small and George Vincent at the University of Chicago, where he received his masters in 1896 (Evans, 2004; Lybarger, 1981; Reese, 1998, Saxe, 1991; Struncis, 1992; Uriebel, 1996). This influence accounted for his devotion to societal betterment and social efficiency, advocated for in his civics text *The Community and the Citizen* (1907), published during his time at Shortridge High School. This text, along with a study of its use in Indianapolis schools, becomes the basis for his campaign to develop a new curriculum focused on civic education, while grounded in learning about society and rooted in the student's own community. Dunn's textbook is the first glimpse we have in regards to his new curriculum, and despite being one of the lesser known progressive theorizer's of this era, Dunn is viewed as responsible for developing into classroom practice many of the emerging theoretical ideas of the social sciences (Lybarger, 1981; Reese, 1998, Saxe, 1991; Struncis, 1992; Uriebel, 1996).

Dunn's time at Shortridge High School was his only K-12 teaching experience before moving on to be a civic education specialist. In the ten years that Dunn spent at Shortridge High School he worked as Donnan's immediate administrator, co-sponsored a couple clubs with Donnan, and was immersed in a school environment that was interested and engaged in civic matters seemingly, due to the toil of Donnan. However, in all of Dunn's speeches and

writings as a civic education specialist and advocate for civic education there is no mention of Donnan, her practices, or Shortridge High School.

Dunn's time at Shortridge High School is not as prominently evident as Donnan's from 1900-1910. Dunn taught American history I and II, along with ancient history. He coached the male debate team, co-sponsored the Shortridge Senate at times, and started the history club. In one instance, recorded in the Shortridge yearbook, Dunn's debate team competed in a debate against some of Donnan's senate members. It was regarded as one of the best debates that Shortridge High School had ever had, with Donnan's Senators slightly edging Dunn's debaters (Gaus, 1985, p. 78).

The most revealing references to Dunn's time at Shortridge are scattered in the school newspaper, the *Echo*. Most are student accounts of his teaching in the classroom, which are interesting only because in practice he seemed to be a facilitator of recitations and uninteresting lectures. For example:

Jennifer Schaub is so frightened when Mr. Dunn calls on her that it is with the utmost difficulty that she is able to regain sufficient composure to stand and recite. ("Just Trifles," 1906, p. 2)

For someone who was considered a progressive educator, his practice of using recitations appeared to be contrary to his theory. It also seemed that Dunn could not escape being compared to Donnan. For example, Dunn's teaching was compared to Donnan's teaching by a student in the *Echo* who wrote, "He wishes to stimulate discussion among the students, as a means of arousing interest as is done in the Miss Donnan's Civil Government classes" ("American History II," 1901, p. 2). This instance suggested Donnan's practice had a basic level of influence on Dunn, or at the very least that he was aware of her popular pedagogy during his short time in Indianapolis.

While teaching at Shortridge High School, Dunn published two articles and his civics textbook, *The Community and the Citizen* (1907), which was mentioned above. His textbook came seven years after Donnan published her own civics textbook, *Our Governments: Brief Talks to the American Youth on Our Governments General and Local* (1900). The two texts bare only minimal similarities as Donnan's text essentially outlined her civics course. Dunn's textbook was initially developed for coordination with the civics course he designed for Indianapolis school children. This same course was the subject of the study Dunn published in "Bulletin No. 17" titled "Civic Education in Elementary Schools as Illustrated in

Indianapolis” (1915). Interestingly, Donnan wrote an article for a *The Public-School Journal* in 1889, which advocated the teaching of the American civil government history in elementary school through literature. Her advocacy appeared to be for the purpose of enhancing her own course and wanted students to read such works as *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and *Voices of Freedom*, so that “the children become morally stronger and in a fit condition to begin the formal study of civil government” (Donnan, 1889b, p. 111). Thus, many of the recommendations made by the 1916 Committee through their Report had been advocated for by Donnan prior to Dunn’s arrival.

Dunn’s course and textbook would eventually be adopted by school systems across the country (Reece, 1998; Stuncis, 1992; Uriebel, 1996). The textbook was seen as a major departure from the typical civics course subject matter of the time, as a reviewer wrote:

It is interesting to note that the present conception of the subject is quite different from the idea of civil government which formerly prevailed in the schools. The latter treated only of the organization of local, state and national government, together with instruction upon such subjects as qualification of voters, United States constitution and party politics. The present book treats of all the interests of community life. It is essentially a sort of elementary sociology. (Coleman, 1908, p. 99)

Notice in the review, that the author’s conception of prior civil government courses bared no resemblance to Donnan’s practice. Regardless, *The Community and the Citizen* (1907) was a response to Dunn’s repeated claim that the content of civil government courses were too narrow, referring only to the “machinery of government” (Dunn, 1908, p. 175; Dunn, 1916, p. 23) or the “mechanism of government” (Dunn, 1915b, p. 52). Instead, Dunn believed responsible citizenship depended “not only upon knowledge of government, but also upon a broad sociological viewpoint, and a knowledge of the social and economic relations that underlie government” (Dunn, 1914a, p. 412). Dunn's sociological theory was evident in his textbook, and well received. It seemed that the only aspect missing from his curriculum was an application of his theory into practice, which would be equally progressive and distinct from the current practices in a majority of civil government classes.

As mentioned above, the civics course associated with Dunn's textbook would become known as community civics, and it would be intended for what we now consider junior high-level students. In terms of practice, Dunn intended for community civics to move the

pedagogy of civic education away from the tradition of recitation that was so common in schools—and apparently in his own classroom—arguing that the goals of civics were not fully realized through recitative instruction, which ultimately failed to develop students ability to think about political and social problems (Reuben, 1997). It is important to understand that these methods were not new, but different from what was commonly perceived as practice in a majority of schools across the nation, especially if used in combination with each other, just as Laura Donnan implemented them at Shortridge High School.

The combination of methods in the community civics program are remarkably similar to Donnan's methods; however, the mixture of subject matter in Dunn's curriculum, which combined history, geography, and civics, was also similar to Donnan's curriculum. Due to this combination of subject matter Saxe (1992) asserted that Dunn's community civics program "may be the first instance of a true social studies curriculum in the public schools" (p. 269). Furthermore, Saxe (1992) asserted that Dunn's "social studies was conceived as something one does" and that "This focus on active participation was evident in his work at Indianapolis in the early 1900s, and it was evident in the Social Studies Committee report" (p. 269). What is also evident is that by 1889 in Indianapolis, Laura Donnan had developed a curriculum that was also conceived as "something one does," and focused on active participation.

Donnan's practice seems to have been preserved in Dunn's "new" community civics curriculum. The combination of Dunn's textbook and his study that illustrated the program's implementation and impact made his community civics curriculum very marketable to various interest groups and stakeholders in education. As part of the 1916 Report, the theoretical basis of community civics served as currency for broader social trends that sought social intervention in all areas of society. As Evans (2004) noted, one reason for the report's success was because "its emphasis on the broader goals of citizenship education and social efficiency fit the current trends" (p. 43). Simply, then, the change comprised in the 1916 Report in regards to civic education, was "trendy," or more aptly described by Fallace (2009), it comprised a "refashioning of the history curriculum" (p. 469). Thus, Dunn's community civics curriculum capitalized on the current trends in both theory and practice.

Dunn represented an intersection of economic, social, and political influences, as Rueben (1997) pointed out, his career illustrated "the ties between progressive reform organizations, the federal government, university-based social scientists, and educational leaders that shaped the new civics curriculum" (p. 402). The marketing of Dunn's civics

curriculum had to appeal to these influences, and Donnan did not offer subsequent means of appeal. This was due to her more than twenty years as a “low-status” female teacher, who represented the “old way” of teaching civics known as civil government (Crocco, 2005). Thus, Dunn utilized Donnan’s practice—taking the credit for any recognition of innovation—while trafficking in the social efficiency language of the era to indulge his various associations and market his curriculum; while Donnan continued her civic education program at Shortridge High School that resembled, at least in practice, the “new” social studies program that was being disseminated throughout the country.

The relationship between Donnan’s practice and Dunn’s theory illustrated the development of civic education as simply continuity to some educational stakeholders, and change to other stakeholders. Regardless, in this case, a politically marginalized citizen and professional teacher influenced widespread changes to how the United States thought about and educated citizens. This demonstrates the power of practice to stimulate persistent change in educational policy, and should be an example for all educators.

Conclusion

The career of Laura Donnan has two implications for the history of social studies education. First, the accounts of Donnan’s career suggest that classroom practice, at least in terms of civic and social studies education, has not changed dramatically over the last one-hundred and twenty-five years. While Donnan may have been an exceptional case and possible innovator of civic education, it is difficult to conclude or think that she was an isolated practitioner, developing her pedagogy apart from influence, mentors, or colleagues. Regardless, Donnan’s career provides a thread of continuity in the history of social studies education, a history which has often been portrayed as a series of power struggles between theorists’ competing conceptions of how to best educate citizens.

Second, the recommended curricular changes that are comprised in the 1916 Report do not seem as significant in consideration of the practice that had existed for more than twenty-five years in Donnan’s classroom. This specific case suggests that practice may have in fact influenced theory, but more than likely the trends in both theory and practice were coalesced, by a social craftsman Dunn, into what we know as community civics. During his time in Indianapolis, Dunn certainly observed Donnan’s practice and how it shaped the civic engagement of her students, and he hoped that through experimentation and transference

similar practices would achieve similar engagement, but for specified social ends. The social studies education classroom has always been cast by theorists as a site of possibility and presumed to be the gateway to accommodating, contesting, or manipulating social changes or assimilation. While theorists like Dunn may have viewed social studies education as a means to control society, educators like Donnan seemingly employed social studies education as a means of developing individual agency to impact society.

In closing, an excerpt represents how Donnan was aptly remembered by the Indianapolis community, one week after her death in the Indianapolis Evening World newspaper. This remembrance demonstrates in part her effect on the community, and more importantly her vision of civic education in the Progressive-era:

For almost half of a century a teacher of civil government, she created in thousands a fine civic consciousness.... A woman of intense convictions on the civic and political problems of the time, she welcomed hot opposition to her views. She knew that democracy means debate and free speech. No student ever suffered by disagreeing with her. All she asked was that he or she be honest in his or her opinion and be able to submit reasons for it. She thought more of one who always disagreed than of one who always agreed. The latter she expected. ("A Woman Who Served The Nation," 1930).

References

- A Second Trip. (1901, October 28). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- A Woman Who Served The Nation. (1930, August 25). *The Evening World*, p. 6.
- About Discussions. (1900, March 19). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- American History II. (1901, January 4). *The Daily Echo*, p. 2.
- Another Senate. (1900, February 1). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- At the State House. (1902, January 20). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- Barr, R. D., Barth J. L., & Shermis, S. S. (1977). *Defining the social studies*. Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Barton, K.C. (2005). Mary G. Kelty: The most important social educator no one has heard of? In L.M. Burlbaw & S. L. Field (Eds.), *Explorations in curriculum history* (pp. 193-200). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

- Bowers, C. G. (1962). *My life: The memoirs of Claude Bowers*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Bowers, C. G. (1964). *Indianapolis in the gay nineties: High school diaries of Claude G. Bowers* (H. Hamilton & G. Thornbrough, eds.). Indianapolis: Indiana State Library.
- Civics I Classes Visit Atkins Saw Works. (1906, October 22). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- The Civil Government Debates (1899, March 28). *The Daily Echo*, p. 3.
- Civil Government Tour. (1901, June 10). *The Daily Echo*, p. 2.
- Coleman, C. B. (1908). Review of books. *Indiana Magazine of History*, 4: 99-101.
- Conniff, K. (1903). *The Annual*. Shortridge High School Collection, 1870-1981, 1995 (Catalogued Separately, LD7501 .I4647 A5). Indiana State Historical Society, Indianapolis, IN.
- Cox, V. P. (1936). *Laura Donnan* (Biographical essay). Indianapolis: Indiana State Library.
- Crocco, M.S. (1999). Introduction. In M.S. Crocco & O.L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.) "*Bending the future to there will*": *Civic women, social education, and democracy*. (pp. 1-16). New York: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Crocco, M.S., Munro, P, & Weiler, K. (1999). *Pedagogies of resistance: Women educator activists, 1880-1960*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Crocco, M.S. (2005). Mary G. Kelty: An ironic tale of remembrance. In L.M. Burlbaw & S. L. Field (Eds.), *Explorations in curriculum history* (pp. 193-200). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Cuban, L. (1979). Determinants of curriculum change and stability, 1870–1970. In J. Schaffarzick & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Value conflicts and curriculum issues: Lessons from research and experience* (pp. 139–196). Berkeley: McCutchan.
- Cuban, L. (1991). History of teaching in social studies. In JP Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning* (pp. 197–209). New York: Macmillan.
- Debates. (1899, May 9). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- Donnan, L. (1889a). The high school and the citizen. *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association Annual Meeting*, 28, 512-520.
- Donnan, L. (1889b). Teaching civil government below the high school. *The public-school journal*, 9 (3), 111-112.
- Donnan, L. (1900). *Our governments: Brief talks to the American youth on our governments, general and local*. Indianapolis: The Bowen-Merrill Company.
- Donnan, L. (1904). Civil government in the high school. *The educator-journal*, 4, 446-449.
- Dunn, A. W. (1903). Aids to one year of American history in high school. *The educator-journal*, 4, 508-512.

- Dunn, A. W. (1907). *The community and the citizen*. Boston: DC Heath.
- Dunn, A. W. (1908). The civic value of local history. *Indiana magazine of history*, 4, 170-196.
- Dunn, A. W. (1914a). *Chapter XVIII: The trend of civic education*. Report of the Commissioner of Education, Volume I. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Dunn, A. W. (1914b). Civic education. *National municipal review*, 3, 227-230.
- Dunn, A. W. (1915a). *Civics education in elementary education as illustrated in Indianapolis*. Bulletin no. 17. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Dunn, A. W. (1915b). Community civics --what it means. *The history teacher's magazine*, 5, 52-53.
- Dunn, A. W. (1915c). By what standards shall we judge the value of civic education? *The history teacher's magazine*, 6, 99-103.
- Dunn, A. W. (1915d). Report on civic education, on the work of the committee during the past year. *The national municipal review*, 4, 178-179.
- Dunn, A. W. (1916). *The social studies in secondary education*. Bulletin no. 28 of the Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- The Echo. (1902). *Senate student records, 1900-1902*. Shortridge High School Collection, 1870- 1981, 1995 (Bound Volume BV2395). Indiana State Historical Society, Indianapolis, IN.
- Editorial Staff. (1899a, March 6). *The Daily Echo*, p. 2.
- Editorial Staff. (1899b, April 28). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- Editorial Staff. (1899c, October 18). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- Editorial Staff. (1901, February 8). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- Evans, R. W. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach our children?* New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fallace, T.D. (2009). Did the social studies really replace history in the local curriculum? The case of Elyria, Ohio and the north central states. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 37 (4): 458-483.
- The Free Night High School. (1900, October 1). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.
- Gaus, L. S. (1985). *Shortridge high school, 1864-1981: In retrospect*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society.
- Gerstle, G. (2001) *American Crucible*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hawley, J. R. (1902). *Senate student records, 1900-1902*. Shortridge High School Collection, 1870-1981, 1995 (Bound Volume BV2395). Indiana State Historical Society, Indianapolis, IN.

Hendrickson, W. B. (1983). *The Indiana Years 1903-1941*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society.

In Jail. (1901, November 11). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.

Just Trifles. (1906, October 22). *The Daily Echo*, p. 2.

Kliebard, H. M. (1992). Constructing a history of the American curriculum. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.) *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp.157-184). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958*. (3rd ed.) New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Levstik, L. (2005). Women as force in social education: The gendering of social studies in the 20th century. In L.M. Burlbaw & S. L. Field (Eds.), *Explorations in curriculum history* (pp. 193-200). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Lybarger, M. (1981). *Origins of the social studies curriculum* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Mirel, J. (2010) *Patriotic Pluralism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mr. Dunn Speaks on City Planning. (1909, October 14). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.

National Education Association.(1994). The social studies in secondary education. In M.R. Nelson (Ed.), *The social studies in secondary education: A reprint of the seminal 1916 report with annotations and commentaries*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Order in the Senate. (1899, March 15). *The Daily Echo*, p. 2-3.

Police Headquarters. (1901, November 18). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.

Reese, W. J. (1998). *Hoosier schools: Past and present*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Rueben, J. A. (1997). Beyond politics: Community civics and the redefinition of citizenship in the progressive era. *History of Education Quarterly*, 37, 399-420.

Saxe, D.W. (1991). *Social studies in schools: A history of the early years*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Saxe, D.W. (1992). Framing a theory for social studies foundations. *Review of Educational Research*, 62 (3), pp. 259-77.

The Senate. (1894). *The Annual*. Shortridge High School Collection, 1870-1981, 1995 (Catalogued Separately, LD7501.I4647 A5). Indiana State Historical Society, Indianapolis, IN.

Senatorial Proceedings. (1900, October 29). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.

Shortridge Senate Holds Interesting Meeting. (1911). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.

Singleton, H.W. (1980). Problems of Democracy: The revisionist plan for social studies education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 8, 89–104.

State Officers. (1902, January 13). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.

Struncis, S. P. (1992). *The career of Arthur Dunn and his contributions to citizenship education* (Master thesis). Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Thornton, S.J. (2008). Continuity and change in social studies curriculum. In L.S. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 15-32). New York: Routledge.

Uriebel, A. (1996). *The making of citizens: A history of civic education in Indianapolis, 1900-1950* (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

van Hover, S.D. (2003). Deborah Partridge Wolfe and education for democracy. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 31 (1): 105-131.

Visit the Mayor. (1901, October 21). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.

The Wanderings of Two Senators. (1899, March 21). *The Daily Echo*, p. 1.

Warren, H. C. (1913). Budget making. In S. Mathews (Ed.), *The woman citizens library* (2350-3400). Chicago; The Civics Society.

Weber, M. I. (1909). *The Annual*. Shortridge High School Collection, 1870-1981, 1995 (Catalogued Separately, LD7501.I4647 A5). Indiana State Historical Society, Indianapolis, IN.

Woyshner, C. (2003-2004). Women's Associations and the Origins of the Social Studies: Volunteers, Professionals, and the Community Civics Curriculum, 1890-1920. *International Journal of Social Education*, 18: 15-32.

Cadernos de História da Educação, v.15, n.1, p.08-68, jan.-abr. 2016
ISSN: 1982-7806 (On Line)

DOI:

ARTIGOS

EDIÇÃO BILÍNGUE: INGLÊS/PORTUGUÊS

O desenvolvimento da educação cívica nos EUA, 1880-1930: Continuidade e/ou mudança² (Edição bilíngue: inglês/português)

The Development of Civic Education in the United States, 1880-1930: Continuity and/or Change

El desarrollo de la educación cívica en los EUA, 1880-1930: continuidad e/o rupturas

J. SPENCER CLARK³

Resumo:

O desenvolvimento da educação cívica nos Estados Unidos foi um projeto curricular complexo que capturou o interesse de muitas entidades econômicas, sociais, políticas e educacionais. Um dos primeiros períodos em que se definiu a educação cívica ocorreu durante a chamada Era Progressista Americana, quando as cidades e as escolas tiveram que se adaptar ao influxo populacional, com a vinda de imigrantes, que provocou fervor e debate a respeito do currículo e possibilitou que a educação cívica se tornasse uma pedra angular no currículo de estudos sociais nos ciclos primário e secundário. O debate envolvendo o currículo da educação para o civismo contemplou primordialmente visões assimilacionistas e culturalmente pluralistas com relação aos estudantes imigrantes. O presente artigo abordará essas duas perspectivas da educação cívica, com exemplos de dois educadores dessa temática como representantes de cada visão, os quais moldaram para sempre a educação cívica nos Estados Unidos. As implicações deste artigo focalizarão as contribuições duradouras de um desses educadores, a saber, Laura Donnan.

Palavras-chave: Educação Cívica, Americanização, Pluralismo Cultural, Ensino de Estudos Sociais, Cidadania

² Tradução realizada por Luiz Ramires Neto, com revisão técnica realizada pela Profa. Dra. Mirian Jorge Warde.

³ Doutor em Filosofia da Educação: Teoria do currículo, Educação Cívica e História da Educação pela *Indiana University*, em Bloomington, Estados Unidos. Professor Assistente de *Social Studies Education* na *School of Teacher Education and Leadership* da *Utah State University*. E-mail: spencer.clark@usu.edu

Abstract:

Developing civic education in the United States was a complex curricular project, which captured the interest of many economic, social, political, and educational entities. One of civic education's earliest defining periods was during the American Progressive-era. During this period, American cities and schools had to adapt to an influx in population, with immigrants coming from all over the world. This population influx caused fervor and debate over the curriculum, and provided impetus for making civic education a cornerstone of the primary and secondary social science curriculum. The debate over the civic education curriculum included primarily assimilationist and culturally pluralistic views regarding immigrant students. This article will consider these two views of civic education, with examples of two civic educators who represented each view and who forever shaped civic education in the United States. Implications for this article will focus on the lasting contributions of one of these educators, Laura Donnan.

Keywords: *Civic Education, Americanization, Cultural Pluralism, Social Studies Education, Citizenship*

Resumen:

El desarrollo de la educación cívica en los Estados Unidos fue un proyecto curricular complejo que capturó el interés de muchas entidades económicas, sociales, políticas y educativas. Un de los períodos en que se definió la educación cívica ocurrió durante la llamada Era Progresista Americana, cuando las ciudades y las escuelas norteamericanas tuvieron que se adaptar al flujo populacional, con la vida de inmigrantes provenientes del mundo entero. Tal flujo populacional provocó fervor y debate al respecto del currículo y permitió que la educación cívica se tornase una piedra angular en el currículo de estudios sociales en los ciclos primario y secundario. El debate envolviendo el currículo de la educación para el civismo contempló primordialmente visiones asimilacionistas y culturalmente pluralistas con relación a los estudiantes inmigrantes. El presente artículo abordará estas dos perspectivas de la educación cívica, con ejemplos de dos educadores de esta temática como representantes de cada visión, los cuales transformaran para siempre la educación cívica en los Estados Unidos. Las implicaciones de este artículo focalizarán las contribuciones duradoras de un de esses educadores, a saber, Laura Donnan.

Palabras-clave: *Educación Cívica, Americanización, Pluralismo Cultural, Enseñanza de Estudios Sociales, Ciudadanía*

Recebido em: outubro de 2015

Aprovado para publicação em: dezembro de 2015

Introdução

A educação cívica (EC) nos EUA é um projeto curricular contínuo e complexo, que tem capturado o interesse de diversas entidades econômicas, sociais, políticas e educacionais. Embora a EC tenha vários períodos definidores de quando a sociedade e a população norte-americana estavam mudando rapidamente, um dos primeiros períodos da EC ocorreu durante a era Progressista Norte-Americana⁴. Nessa ocasião, as cidades e escolas dos EUA tiveram que se adaptar a um influxo populacional, com a chegada de imigrantes vindos de todas as partes do mundo. A afluência populacional nesse período provocou um debate fervoroso sobre o currículo, impelindo a transformação da EC em pedra angular do currículo dos Estudos Sociais no primário e no secundário. Os historiadores caracterizaram esses debates sobre o currículo como “lutas” (KLIEBARD, 2004), e nos Estudos Sociais especificamente como “guerras” (EVANS, 2004).

Este artigo discutirá o desenvolvimento da EC naquele momento e deslocará a discussão para fora das metáforas de combate. O presente capítulo também fornecerá um exemplo de como a EC tomou forma numa escola de uma cidade norte-americana a fim de destacar tanto a continuidade quanto a mudança do currículo de EC na Era Progressista.

À medida que as matrículas nas escolas norte-americanas aumentavam no final do século XIX e início do século XX, um número cada vez maior de indivíduos e entidades passou a interessar-se pela finalidade, formato e currículo das escolas em geral. Tal interesse fez surgir comitês nacionais compostos de uma variedade de membros com a tarefa de definir o currículo (EVANS, 2004; KLIEBARD, 2004). Entre 1892 e 1916, seis diferentes comitês de educadores fizeram recomendações concernentes ao currículo de EC nas escolas dos EUA. Um desses foi o Committee on Social Studies (CSS) da Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE)⁵. O CRES era formado por dezesseis diferentes comitês sendo que cada um publicou ao menos um relatório sobre algum aspecto do currículo ou administração da educação secundária nos EUA (LYBARGER, 1981). Os historiadores educacionais concordam que os relatórios finais do CES, intitulados *The Teaching of Community Civics* e *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*⁶ estavam entre os mais

⁴ Nota do revisor (NR). “American Progressive-era”: o autor está se referindo ao período de reformas modernizadoras entre fins do século XX e anos de 1920, consagrado nos Estados Unidos como “era progressista”.

⁵ NR. Comitê de Estudos Sociais (CES) da Comissão de Reorganização da Educação Secundária (CRES).

⁶ NR. *O ensino do engajamento cívico e Os Estudos Sociais na educação secundária* “.

bem-sucedidos documentos produzidos pelo CRES. As recomendações do CES estabeleceram o escopo e a sequência da instrução dos Estudos Sociais, que permaneceu praticamente inalterada no século XX.

O aumento da frequência às escolas também assinalou uma mudança na sociedade e no estilo de vida norte-americanos. Muitos adultos estavam deixando as pequenas cidades rurais rumo às grandes cidades, o que trazia implicações para seus filhos na condição de estudantes. Uma vez na cidade, os alunos passavam mais tempo na escola do que o faziam em suas comunidades agrícolas de menor porte porque a educação tinha mais relevância para a obtenção de um emprego na cidade grande. Essa mudança na sociedade conduziu a um aumento nas obrigações das escolas e os programas de EC tornaram-se parte integrante da expansão das responsabilidades escolares (URIEBEL, 1996). A escola, mais do que a família, a igreja ou o grupo social ao qual a pessoa pertencia tornou-se a fonte primordial de formação cívica. Essa mudança social se deu porque a EC como componente curricular não era uma tendência isolada na Era Progressista, pois havia se tornado um projeto curricular permanente. Na urbanização dos EUA durante a Era Progressista, muitos norte-americanos encontravam-se vivendo em estreita proximidade com pessoas distintivamente diferentes deles próprios, e assim, deparavam com novos valores, crenças e atitudes em relação a questões econômicas, políticas e sociais. Muitas pessoas viam a EC como um meio de cultivar o cidadão norte-americano ideal; entretanto, as questões sempre foram: Quais são os atributos de um norte-americano ideal? E, além disso, quem os decide?

O influxo de imigrantes no final do séc. XIX e no início do séc. XX desafiava as visões predominantes mantidas por muitos norte-americanos “nativistas”, que consideravam seu compatriota como sendo estritamente branco, protestante e de ascendência teutônica ou anglo-saxã (SMITH, 1997). Essa estreita perspectiva do que constituía um cidadão norte-americano era a base que muitos utilizavam para documentar as mudanças na demografia da sociedade. Branco, protestante e teutônico, além de masculino, também descrevia o *background* da maioria dos gestores educacionais e outros envolvidos nesse período. Uma vez que o currículo de EC tinha o potencial de formatar as percepções dos jovens cidadãos sobre a sociedade, sempre houve pressão vinda de várias partes para se preservar certos aspectos da cultura norte-americana e alterar outros aspectos por meio do currículo de EC. Assim, ao examinar a história do currículo de EC, ou qualquer outro tipo de currículo, é importante refletir sobre o modo como explicamos a continuidade e as mudanças porque dependem de como definimos o que se deseja preservar e o que se deseja mudar (THORNTON, 2008).

Além disso, depende da profundidade com a qual se examina o assunto, abaixo do nível da política, para observar a continuidade ou a mudança. Poder ser que a continuidade, por falta de dramaticidade óbvia, atraia menos atenção que a mudança (CUBAN, 1979). A ausência do caráter dramático não significa que a continuidade seja menos significativa ao se observar o desenvolvimento da EC; contudo, pode significar que importantes mudanças aconteceram antes que se refletissem no trabalho do comitê e nas políticas nacionais.

As seções a seguir irão, primeiramente, examinar as visões relativas à imigração em fins do séc. XIX e nos primórdios do séc. XX. Mais especificamente, essa seção tratará de que maneira as visões de imigração se articularam com as visões de cidadania nos EUA. A seção seguinte examinará de que modo as iniciativas nacionais de reforma do currículo abrangeram essas visões sobre imigração e cidadania, desenvolvendo-se num currículo nacional de EC. E a última seção fornecerá um exemplo de EC numa escola regular a fim de demonstrar um sentido de continuidade e mudança.

A imigração e o ímpeto para a EC

Nas três primeiras décadas do séc. XX, o país testemunhou grandes transformações econômicas e sociais. Essas mudanças serviram de catalizador para muitos segmentos influentes da população dos EUA na busca de um sentido seguro de identidade cívica, a fim de proteger a ordem social existente e seu distintivo caráter norte-americano. Assim, tais mudanças levaram ao estabelecimento de leis de cidadania que excluía as pessoas que não preenchessem um predeterminado ideal norte-americano. Durante esse período, as matrículas nas escolas urbanas dispararam juntamente com o número de imigrantes que frequentavam as escolas públicas. Os gestores educacionais perceberam que as escolas eram espaços vitais no esforço de moldar os novos cidadãos democráticos, fossem eles nacionais ou de origem estrangeira. A maioria desses esforços pode ser observada como parte do movimento que enfatizava um currículo destinado à americanização.

Sob a ampla categoria da americanização surgiram muitas e diversas visões com relação ao que esse processo deveria implicar nas escolas. Isso em parte se ligava às diferentes noções de quais atributos eram necessários para considerar alguém um cidadão norte-americano. Jeffrey Mirel (2010) identificou três visões distintas sobre a americanização: os assimilacionistas, os pluralistas culturais e os amalgamacionistas. Cada uma dessas visões situava os indivíduos estrangeiros em diferentes níveis, desprezando aspectos de sua própria

cultura, os quais então passavam a adotar ou a contribuir com uma distintiva cultura norte-americana. É preciso considerar essas importantes visões ao se examinar o desenvolvimento da EC nos EUA.

Mirel (2010) caracterizou os assimilacionistas como norte-americanos que pensavam que os imigrantes deveriam deixar para trás sua própria cultura e adotar uma espécie de cultura “anglo-americana” (p. 26). Muitos educadores e líderes cívicos concordavam com essa visão, nenhum deles mais notável que o Presidente Theodore Roosevelt que afirmou, “Devemos americanizá-los de todas as maneiras, na fala, nos princípios e nas ideias políticas e em seu modo de encarar a igreja e o estado” (Roosevelt *apud* MIREL, 2010, p. 26). Os assimilacionistas eram descritos como desejosos de criar uma uniformidade cultural e eliminar qualquer coisa que parecesse estrangeira à cultura norte-americana. Assim, as escolas eram um lugar lógico para se impulsionar esses ideais assimilacionistas e iniciar o processo pela assimilação das crianças imigrantes. Entretanto, os assimilacionistas não pararam ali, muitas escolas urbanas durante esse período abriram turnos no fim da tarde, ou a chamada Escola Noturna, para que adultos fossem educados e assimilados.

Alguns grupos voltados à americanização não acreditavam na perspectiva assimilacionista estrita, entre os quais os pluralistas culturais. Conforme Mirel (2010, p. 28) caracterizou esse grupo, eles encaravam a perspectiva assimilacionista como sendo uma “versão etnocêntrica, estreita, da cultura e da identidade norte-americanas”. Os pluralistas culturais, como o próprio nome já anunciava, queriam preservar a cultura nativa dos imigrantes no contexto da sociedade norte-americana. Muitos pluralistas culturais acreditavam que era a diferenciação da cultura que conferia aos EUA a capacidade de progredir como nação. Pessoas tais como Horace Kallen⁷ viam a América como uma orquestra com muitos instrumentos diferentes, os quais contribuíam todos para uma única sinfonia (MIREL, 2010). Os pluralistas culturais também acreditavam que os esforços assimilacionistas não conseguiriam retirar dos imigrantes a sua cultura própria, encarando a diversidade de culturas como enriquecedora da nação. De um lado, os pluralistas culturais não queriam privar os imigrantes de sua cultura de origem, em termos de cidadania; por outro

⁷ NR. Horace Meyer Kallen (1882 – 1974) filósofo norte-americano nascido na Silésia, filho de um rabino ortodoxo. Kallen foi para os EUA ainda criança, em 1887; estudou Filosofia em Harvard onde foi aluno de George Santayana, de quem se tornou assistente. Nessa universidade obteve também os títulos de mestre e doutor. Foi o primeiro professor judeu de Princeton University, depois da Harvard University, em seguida a University of Wisconsin-Madison e por fim em The New School na cidade de Nova York. Ver, por exemplo, GILBERT, J. *Redeeming Culture: American Religion in an Age of Science*, University of Chicago Press; 1997; MENAND, L. *The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America*. New York: Farrar, Staus and Girroux, 2001.

também pensavam que os imigrantes deveriam “conhecer e apoiar os princípios e as instituições democráticas norte-americanas” (MIREL, 2010, p. 30). Jane Addams poderia ser vista como exemplo de um pluralismo cultural posto em prática já que ela achava que as escolas poderiam ajudar os imigrantes, especialmente se os professores fossem respeitosos para com as culturas imigrantes e as trouxessem para a sala de aula (MIREL, 2010). Nesta mesma vertente, muitos pluralistas culturais sentiram que era contraproducente forçar crianças imigrantes a frequentarem as escolas para aprender sobre a cultura anglo-americana. De modo geral, os pluralistas culturais queriam que a educação para a americanização fosse um intercâmbio cultural que pudesse enriquecer não apenas a vida dos imigrantes, mas também a vida dos estudantes norte-americanos.

Uma terceira perspectiva quanto à educação pró-americanização vinha de um grupo que Mirel (2010) caracteriza como os amalgamacionistas. Esses eram responsáveis pela ideia dos EUA como um “caldeirão”, não necessariamente da maneira como o pensamos hoje, mas no sentido de que a mistura e remistura de vários grupos imigrantes criaria uma nação nova e forte (MIREL, 2010, p. 33). No tocante às escolas, a visão amalgamacionista era semelhante à dos pluralistas culturais. Os amalgamacionistas queriam que as escolas ensinassem as diversas heranças culturais de todos os imigrantes que eram abrangidos por essa nova nação e seu povo. Achavam que os melhores atributos de cada cultura deveriam ser ensinados aos estudantes, no intuito de criar uma nova cultura dinâmica que não adotaria uma perspectiva cultural estreita. Deve-se destacar que mesmo os líderes de grupos imigrantes específicos se opunham à visão dos amalgamacionistas que estavam fundamentalmente preocupados com a promoção da miscigenação, tanto quanto muitos assimilacionistas. Não obstante, os amalgamacionistas propiciavam a visão mais cosmopolita para as escolas norte-americanas no seio do movimento pró-americanização durante a Era Progressista.

As três visões da americanização propiciaram um vislumbre do que os defensores desse processo gostariam que a EC promovesse nas escolas. Se por um lado diferiam em muitos aspectos, acreditavam, porém, que os imigrantes poderiam vir a tornar-se norte-americanos, tanto em termos de cultura quanto de cidadania, de uma maneira ou de outra. Essa distinção é importante de se ter em conta porque havia outros norte-americanos que achavam que certos grupos de imigrantes jamais poderiam assumir genuinamente essa condição. Essas visões se refletiam muito nas restrições impostas à imigração de fins do séc. XIX e início do séc. XX. Elas compreendiam o que Mirel (2010) chamou de “nacionalismo

étnico”, as quais se opunham às visões do “nacionalismo cívico” que compunham os esforços de americanização.

Os esforços de americanização nas escolas baseavam-se em diversos ideais nacionalistas que buscavam esclarecer no que exatamente consistia um cidadão norte-americano. Os gestores lançavam mão desses ideais e debatiam-se constantemente a fim de determinar quais grupos imigrantes específicos deveriam ser incluídos e excluídos do rol de cidadãos. Gary Gerstle (2001, p. 4) identificou duas ideologias nacionalistas que disputavam a prevalência social na Era Progressista: o “nacionalismo cívico” e o “nacionalismo racial”. O primeiro, semelhante à conceituação de Mirel (2010), incorporava uma situação mais liberal com relação à cidadania. Esses objetivos do nacionalismo cívico consideravam a nação “como uma comunidade de cidadãos iguais e portadores de direitos unidos por um elo patriótico a um conjunto compartilhado de práticas e valores políticos” (Gerstle, 2001, p. 45). Os grupos do movimento de americanização partilhavam esses objetivos e achavam que a maioria dos grupos imigrantes seria capaz de alcançá-los. Contudo, os norte-americanos achavam que também havia muitos grupos de estrangeiros inaptos à cidadania de seu país, e sendo assim a EC destinada a esses imigrantes seria um esforço inútil.

O extremo dessa visão é o que Gerstle (2001) chamou de “nacionalismo racial”. Um defensor dessa corrente veria a nação em termos “étnico-raciais, como pessoas que se mantêm juntas por terem um sangue comum e a mesma cor da pele e por uma aptidão herdada de autogoverno” (GERSTLE, 2001, p. 4). Os nacionalistas raciais levaram as visões dos assimilacionistas a outro patamar porque não queriam que todos os imigrantes adotassem a cultura anglo-americana, e achavam que havia apenas determinados grupos estrangeiros capazes de abraçar aquela cultura. O nacionalista racial evitava termos racialistas explícitos e usava argumentos social-darwinistas para declarar que certos grupos eram inaptos ao autogoverno. Essa ideia de que os norte-americanos haviam desenvolvido um autogoverno moderno e que eram capazes de sustentá-lo, era atribuída à sua herança teutônica ou anglo-saxã. Muitos nacionalistas raciais acreditavam que outros grupos europeus tinham capacidade de se autogovernar, mas somente mediante estrita EC assimilacionista.

Gerstle (2001) argumenta que a busca dos ideais contraditórios das visões nacionalistas cívica e racial moldaram a história norte-americana, especialmente na Era Progressista. A contradição foi melhor evidenciada na política do Presidente Theodore Roosevelt – um político que muitos norte-americanos respeitavam por uma série de razões, independentemente de suas próprias opiniões políticas. O Presidente Roosevelt acreditava nos

princípios do nacionalismo cívico, mas também difundia profundas reservas quanto à possibilidade de certas raças e nacionalidades acederem à cidadania norte-americana. Por exemplo, Gerstle (2001, p. 59) escreveu:

Roosevelt simplesmente argumentava que certas raças – notavelmente os asiáticos e os afro-americanos – não tinha condições de atender aos requisitos fundamentais da cidadania norte-americana. ‘Somente as mais elevadas raças são capazes’ de atingir o sucesso no autogoverno, e seria tolice, até mesmo desprezível, assumir que “as raças absolutamente subdesenvolvidas” pudessem funcionar em pé de igualdade com os brancos numa democracia.

Burkholder (2011) e Clark (2012) demonstraram que tanto as ideologias cívicas quanto as raciais estavam presentes nas escolas entre administradores, docentes e estudantes, e valiam-se de aspectos dessas ideologias para justificar suas crenças a respeito de quais grupos eram aptos ou inaptos para a cidadania. A maioria, se não a totalidade, desses administradores, docentes e estudantes eram brancos anglo-americanos e sentiam-se em condições de julgar quem estava apto ou inapto para exercer a cidadania norte-americana, devido à inerente capacidade de autogoverno.

A significação de apto ou inapto para o autogoverno era uma maneira popular de discriminar os imigrantes durante a Era Progressista. Smith (1997), que tinha em conta muitas das mesmas questões e ideologias de Gerstle (2001) e Mirel (2010), vai além para chegar às raízes dessas ideologias e o modo como contribuíram para as identidades norte-americanas da Era Progressista. Smith (1997) identifica três diferentes concepções de identidade norte-americana com relação à cidadania: o liberalismo, o republicanismo e o americanismo étnico-cultural. Smith observa que essas concepções nunca aparecem isoladas e estão sempre articuladas quando afirmadas na sociedade norte-americana. Para Smith (1988), o liberalismo pode ser especialmente visto na discussão da aptidão dos imigrantes europeus à cidadania na Era Progressista. Identifica-se comumente nas discussões sobre “oportunidade” em que os imigrantes europeus viriam para os EUA para melhora de vida e aproveitar as oportunidades das quais não dispunham em seus países de origem. Muitos norte-americanos também utilizaram o liberalismo para discutir e explicar racionalmente os direitos dos cidadãos negros, especialmente em termos de educação e direito ao voto. Essa identificação norte-americana com o Liberalismo foi também a base para o movimento de americanização abordado acima. O republicanismo, de acordo com Smith (1988, p. 230), é “uma extensão do liberalismo”. O

republicanismo, tal como o Smith o caracterizou, enreda-se mais com as visões assimilacionistas e de americanização, bastante comuns neste período. O objetivo de muitos assimilacionistas era manter a homogeneidade social a qualquer custo. A meta da homogeneidade social podia ser vista especialmente na última concepção de cidadania de Smith (1988), o americanismo étnico-cultural. Enquanto as duas concepções anteriores de cidadania devem ter se enraizado em tradições históricas distintas, o americanismo étnico-cultural era tipicamente norte-americano, tal como Smith o define. O americanismo étnico-cultural em seu extremo era o “nativismo” e seus defensores inevitavelmente utilizavam aspectos das outras duas concepções de cidadania, o liberalismo e o republicanismo, para justificar suas demandas. Smith (1988, p. 233) assim escreveu:

Desde a era revolucionária, muitos líderes norte-americanos deliberadamente promoveram a noção popular de que tinham, como povo, um caráter distintivo, nascido de seus ancestrais anglo-saxões que eram amantes da liberdade e haviam elevado as condições favoráveis do novo mundo. Esse caráter fez deles a última esperança de preservação da liberdade humana uma vez que os ingleses haviam se corrompido – e também os havia posicionado acima dos negros e dos americanos genuinamente nativos, e posteriormente dos mexicanos, dos chineses, dos filipinos e outros povos que eram rotulados como inaptos para o autogoverno.

Essa autoproclamada habilidade para julgar quem era apto para se autogovernar foi encontrada em toda a literatura da Era Progressista relativa aos imigrantes, especialmente com relação a cada um dos grupos específicos identificados por Smith. Essa habilidade em julgar outros grupos étnicos era parte de um típico caráter norte-americano que foi sutilmente utilizado para categorizar imigrantes e outros cidadãos que disputavam a distinção da cidadania plena.

Smith (1997) identifica quatro tipos hierárquicos de cidadania que caracterizaram a Era Progressista e esclarece quais grupos eram vistos como aptos ou inaptos para o autogoverno quando comparados ao distintivo caráter norte-americano. Smith (1997, p. 429) escreveu:

Essa estrutura abrangia: *primeiro*, o status de excluído de pessoas a quem era negada a entrada e que estavam sujeitos à expulsão dos EUA, em geral devido a seus traços étnicos ou ideológicos; *segundo*, sujeição colonial,

reservada principalmente a habitantes territoriais declarados racialmente inelegíveis para a cidadania; *terceiro*, cidadania de segunda classe, geralmente entendida como necessária por concessões imprudentes de cidadania formal a raças incapazes de exercê-la e o próprio status das mulheres; e *quarto*, cidadania plena, incluindo o direito ao voto.

Por exemplo, a maioria dos imigrantes asiáticos (especialmente os chineses), do Oriente Médio e da América Latina eram considerados como estando na primeira categoria; a segunda categoria incluía indivíduos de lugares como Guam e Samoa; na terceira estavam portorriquenhos, cidadãos negros, americanos nativos e as mulheres; e a quarta classificação dizia respeito a cidadãos do Havaí, do Alaska e imigrantes europeus (SMITH, 1997). Essas categorias demonstravam as visões nativistas de muitos norte-americanos durante a Era Progressista porque os grupos mais excluídos eram em muitos casos os mais racialmente diferenciados do caráter norte-americano que os nativistas associavam a si mesmos.

Muitos esforços de americanização, então, utilizaram esse distinto caráter norte-americano como meio para aferir os atributos de possíveis cidadãos, e lançaram mão da nacionalidade e da raça para justificar as capacidades percebidas de um grupo quanto à cidadania democrática e ao autogoverno. Essas noções de cidadania, juntamente com os empenhos de construção do Estado na Era Progressista, contribuíram para as iniciativas curriculares destinadas a americanizar estudantes provenientes de outras culturas (GERSTLE, 2001; MIREL, 2010; RUEBEN, 1997), para no mínimo instilar uma valorização do distinto caráter norte-americano, quando não, adotá-lo integralmente.

Como observou Rueben (1997), essas iniciativas eram o resultado dos debates da Era Progressista que tentavam esclarecer exatamente o que constituía um cidadão norte-americano e, mais especificamente, quem era capaz de exercer o autogoverno democrático. Esses debates eram importantes porque consideravam a cidadania não apenas dos novos imigrantes, mas também a dos grupos previamente excluídos e desprovidos de direitos. Muitos gestores e reformadores sociais voltaram-se para o currículo da EC a fim de desempenhar um papel de destaque no amoldamento dos jovens cidadãos. Muitos dos envolvidos nesses empreendimentos tinham a esperança de preservar o progresso norte-americano e propiciavam a continuidade pela simples promoção e implementação de mudanças educacionais curriculares.

A Resposta Educacional à Imigração e aos Esforços de Americanização

Tal como mencionado na introdução, entre 1892 e 1916, foram constituídos seis diferentes comitês de educadores com a tarefa de apresentar recomendações referentes ao currículo de Estudos Sociais, dentre eles o currículo de Educação Cívica (EC). Esses comitês eram parte de esforços mais amplos para reorganizar o currículo escolar nos EUA por causa do aumento das matrículas e das mudanças populacionais. Esses tinham como tarefa modernizar o currículo e torná-lo mais uniforme em todo o país. Pretendiam também criar requisitos unificados para a admissão nas faculdades e universidades e, assim, almejavam conferir uma maior coesão ao currículo da escola básica em nível nacional.⁸

Muitos acreditavam que as crianças imigrantes tinham que ser escolarizadas não apenas em seu próprio benefício, mas também na esperança que de isso influenciaria seus pais e suas comunidades de origem. Esse foi o ponto em que a influência dos movimentos pela americanização contribuiu para o Relatório do SSCR como era a opinião de muitos no sentido de conservar e instilar a virtude cívica americana apropriada aos imigrantes que precisavam ser americanizados. Assim, as escolas teriam que fornecer aos alunos imigrantes o “conhecimento da língua, os costumes, as práticas de saúde bem como o consumismo econômico” (NELSON, 1994). Era preciso ensinar aos jovens imigrantes esse conhecimento e os comportamentos para que viessem a compreender seus deveres cívicos tanto como cidadãos quanto como imigrantes. Essas questões sociais proporcionaram o ímpeto para que a SSCR mudasse o foco do curso ofertado passando de história para cursos com maior fundamentação social e cívica, os quais são atualmente conhecidos como Estudos Sociais.

Em consideração a essas questões e muitas outras relativas aos sistemas escolares urbanos em expansão, a SSCR levou em conta uma série de objetivos e acomodou muitos interesses. Muitos creditam à SSCR a criação do que hoje denominamos Estudos Sociais, ao passo que outros sugeriram que o comitê estava apenas respondendo às tendências que estavam postas (CLARK, 2011; EVANS, 2004). Esse novo foco sobre as questões atuais, os problemas sociais, e a história recente eram um agudo contraste em relação ao que era ensinado em muitas escolas e ao que havia sido recomendado por comitês anteriores. O currículo tradicional de história, que tinha sido defendido pelos comitês anteriores, havia se

⁸ NR. Para o propósito deste capítulo, o mais importante relatório desses comitês é o Relatório do Comitê de Estudos Sociais de 1916 da Comissão da NEA para a Reorganização da Educação Secundária (SSCR). No original: Report of the Social Studies Committee of the NEA Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (SSCR)

tornado impopular porque se concentrava no indivíduo. Em 1913, as tendências clamavam por uma “educação centrada no social”; uma abordagem que derivava da Psicologia, das Ciências Sociais e da Filosofia (SAXE, 1991, p. 110). Se por um lado há muita evidência da influência das várias ciências sociais, que haviam se popularizado naquela época, abrangendo ideias de eficiência social, bem-estar social e uma versão progressista do ensino de história, Evans (2007, p. 22) sugeriu que “o trabalho do comitê era um meio-termo, influenciado por múltiplos campos, todos eles representados no relatório final”. Um meio-termo que sinalizava que não se tratava de uma alteração ou mudança sucessiva no currículo, mas sim que havia um tanto de mudança e um tanto de continuidade.

Muitas das análises iniciais da SSCR propagandeavam uma mudança definitiva no currículo das ciências sociais e mesmo visões da sociedade (LYBARGER, 1981; SAXE, 1991). Entretanto, Evans (2004, p. 22) discorda parcialmente: “Relatórios de comissão são quase sempre a expressão de uma mudança que já está em curso”. O movimento pela eficiência escolar e o movimento pelo progresso escolar estavam consistentemente influenciando maioria das escolas dos EUA por volta de 1912 (EVANS, 2004; KLIEBARD, 2004). O foco da atenção era tornar as escolas mais eficientes, eliminar o desperdício e reformar o ensino de matérias que não tinham valor prático. Evans (2004) observou que a influência mais substantiva sobre a SSCR veio de John Dewey. A SSCR definiu um ponto claro nos “interesses e necessidades atuais do aluno” (DUNN, 1916); o que era claramente uma posição deweyana. Os autores do relatório deixaram claro que não estavam interessados no desenvolvimento simultâneo do indivíduo e do grupo, “mas que os interesses e necessidades individuais eram secundários em relação aos interesses da sociedade como um todo” (EVANS, 2004, p. 23). Esse foco sobre a sociedade era um importante afastamento dos relatórios anteriores, que centravam no desenvolvimento intelectual individual dos alunos. Esse novo ponto de atenção era possivelmente a melhor indicação filosófica de que a SSCR queria dedicar-se mais ao conhecimento e habilidades cívicas dos alunos, e além disso indicava que a EC não se destinava somente ao cidadão individual, mas também ao propósito maior de reforma da sociedade.

Outra importante indicação de mudança da SSCR na direção da EC foram dois novos cursos sugeridos como parte do currículo escolar. Um desses cursos era o *Community Civics Engajamento cívico*, que emergia como um produto direto das discussões na virada do século e que se centravam na necessidade de aprimorar e ampliar a educação para a cidadania nas escolas. Defensores dessa ideia tinham a intenção de purificar a política norte-americana e

resolver os problemas sociais desenvolvendo nos alunos habilidades que os tornassem cidadãos. Defensores do engajamento cívico distinguiam a nova aula da antiga instrução cívica por seu público, sua pedagogia e seu conteúdo. O objetivo era ensinar um engajamento cívico pelo menos na oitava série porque naquela época muitos estudantes não completavam o ensino médio. Assim, os membros do comitê acreditavam que o curso teria maior impacto sobre a comunidade e sobre a sociedade se fosse ministrado naquele ponto do currículo.

O ensino do civismo havia sido defendido e ensinado em algumas escolas pelo menos desde meados da década de 1880 (DONNAN, 1889). Isto será discutido especificamente na próxima seção. Contudo, os idealizadores do civismo comunitário acreditavam que seu novo curso era um drástico aperfeiçoamento com relação à instrução cívica tradicional. Como acima mencionado, deveria ser ministrado aos alunos mais jovens. Em muitas escolas, o civismo havia sido tipicamente oferecido no último ano do ensino secundário. Isto se devia ao fato de que muitos acreditavam que a aprendizagem sobre o funcionamento do governo exigia uma mente mais amadurecida, sem esquecer que os alunos mais velhos iriam logo assumir responsabilidades políticas. Arthur W. Dunn foi um dos principais defensores desse curso na SSCR e também a pessoa que elaborou um livro didático para dar suporte ao curso, denominado *The Community and the Citizen* (1907)⁹. Dunn e outros defensores do civismo comunitário também enfatizaram os benefícios da pedagogia dos cursos, que se assemelhava a muitas das reformas progressistas. A pedagogia que prescreviam afastava-se do método da recitação, no qual o professor fazia ao aluno uma pergunta e este lhe dava uma resposta. Ao invés disso, Dunn e outros defendiam que houvesse atividades mais centradas no aluno baseadas na pesquisa. Argumentavam “que ensinar civismo por meio da recitação minava os objetivos do civismo porque não formava os alunos para refletir sobre os problemas sociais e políticos (RUEBEN, 1997, p. 404). Os defensores do civismo comunitário queriam incorporar vários métodos de modo a envolver os alunos mais ativamente com a matéria.

Dunn acreditava que estimular o interesse dos estudantes no material era o principal objetivo do curso. “É o interesse do indivíduo e não o seu conhecimento”, escreveu, “que leva à ação. O tipo correto de interesse por detrás de alguns poucos fatos conduzirá a uma boa cidadania, ao passo que um grande número de fatos desinteressantes não logrará fazê-lo” (DUNN, 1907, p. vi). Os apelos aos professores em civismo comunitário sugeriam que experimentassem uma série de atividades,

⁹ NR. *A comunidade e o cidadão*.

inclusive discussões em aberto que incorporassem as experiências pessoais dos alunos, aulas com convidados da polícia ou dos bombeiros, viagens a campo, estudos pelos alunos das agências locais e "levantamentos na comunidade" participação em atividades cívicas, leitura de jornais e revistas "de qualidade", criação de álbuns de recortes sobre questões de interesse local, bem com o autogoverno por parte dos alunos" (RUEBEN, 1997, p. 404).

O objetivo do currículo de civismo comunitário era centrar nos interesses e na vida diária dos alunos, de modo que pudesse buscar maneiras de aprimorar suas vidas para o aperfeiçoamento da sociedade.

Dunn e outros criadores do civismo comunitário decidiram redirecionar o foco do conteúdo. Tais cursos começariam com a comunidade local dos alunos ao invés do governo estadual ou federal, porque seu foco eram as experiências dos alunos, que também se enquadravam, durante esse período, em objetivos mais amplos de educação social (BARTON, 2004). Além disso, os estudantes poderiam mais facilmente ver a si mesmos como integrantes da comunidade e haveria maior probabilidade de se responsabilizarem e se envolverem com os assuntos comunitários. O objetivo do civismo comunitário ainda era fazer com que os alunos se engajassem civicamente em nível nacional, mas Dunn e outros proponentes achavam que, uma vez que o curso ajudava os alunos a assumir as responsabilidades do pertencimento à comunidade, também ajudaria os estudantes a compreenderem-se a si mesmos como parte da comunidade nacional mais ampla.

A SSCR também recomendava outro novo curso, que era chamado de *Problemas da Democracia*. Esse curso foi aparentemente inventado pela SSCR para substituir os cursos de civismo já existentes no último ano do ensino básico. O curso sobre os problemas da democracia também era uma tentativa de fundir diversas ciências sociais numa única matéria. A SSCR queria utilizar o conhecimento que os estudantes haviam adquirido nos cursos de Estudos Sociais e então desenvolveu um currículo centrado nos problemas sociais (EVANS, 2004). O curso representou um meio-termo em relação a todos os interesses das ciências sociais no novo curso de Estudos Sociais e o currículo propunha métodos de investigação das Ciências Sociais de modo a envolver os alunos nos problemas sociais de sua comunidade e do país. Esse era um abandono radical dos métodos e práticas típicos adotados nas escolas. O conteúdo do curso sobre problemas da democracia seria selecionado com base no interesse dos alunos e sua importância para a sociedade. Os livros didáticos demonstravam que "o

curso tendeu a fundir o conteúdo de três disciplinas principais: Governança, Economia e Sociologia, com um punhado de dados históricos ou outros conteúdos” (EVANS, 2004). Não obstante, o novo curso sobre problemas da democracia representou o ápice dos interesses na educação voltada ao aprimoramento social, tendo fundido matérias de diversas disciplinas das Ciências Sociais para se concentrar no processo de pensamento reflexivo.

Muitos dos criadores do currículo de EC eram mais velhos, não eram imigrantes recentes e suas raízes provinham de pequenas cidades. Seu pedigree e status social refletiam o típico caráter norte-americano descrito por Smith (1997), e em parte, o ímpeto pelo desenvolvimento de EC durante a Era Progressista veio de um desejo de americanizar as massas, estimulado pelo medo de culturas e ideologias estrangeiras. Os líderes educacionais tinham a esperança de que as escolas poderiam ajudar a tratar dos problemas modernos das áreas urbanas, a industrialização e a imigração ao mesmo tempo em que apoiavam o *status quo* geral da democracia capitalista liberal; o que criaria uma lealdade ao Estado e a aparência de progresso. Embora tivesse por intuito a melhoria e o aperfeiçoamento social, a SSCR foi criada por homens brancos de classe média com ancestrais da Europa nórdica e ocidental que de modo geral assumiam a hegemonia de seu próprio grupo e que ignoravam as questões de raça ou etnia (EVANS, 2004; WATKINS, 2001). Os membros da SSCR queriam desenvolver um currículo prático e flexível que se mostrasse útil aos professores. O relatório parecia ser desenvolvido a partir de preocupações dos educadores quanto ao aprimoramento social e à melhoria do ensino de EC nas escolas. Por detrás da aparência, o relatório tentava reconciliar visões rivais (LYBARGER, 1981) entre a eficiência social e instrução em história tradicional. Essa reconciliação resultou em recomendações curriculares que eram progressistas, socialmente motivadas e com foco no civismo. Enquanto essa acomodação sinalizava uma mudança na política nacional, muitos de seus componentes já estavam sendo implantados nas escolas.

Um Exemplo de EC antes da SSCR: Laura Donnan e a *Shortridge High School*

Laura Donnan era bastante conhecida em sua comunidade como uma educadora cívica, uma ativista e uma devota defensora da democracia. A carreira de Donnan como educadora durou mais de 45 anos, recobrando dois séculos, e coincidiu com mudanças fundacionais na escola básica norte-americana. Donnan lecionava basicamente o curso de civismo numa época em que a recitação da Constituição era uma prática comum em sala de

aula; contudo. Donnan fazia muito mais do que recitações da carta magna, enfatizando o desenvolvimento de saberes e habilidades que imaginava que seus alunos iriam necessitar como cidadãos ativos (Donnan, 1889a). A carreira de Donnan se estendeu justamente pelo período de intenso debate curricular, como visto acima. Através de seus *insights* quanto à prática em sala de aula, anteriores a SSCR, a carreira de Donnan ilustra algumas das “tendências” que “estavam em marcha” antes da reunião do comitê, e a aparente criação dos Estudos Sociais (EVANS, 2004, p.21).

A carreira de Donnan também nos permite esclarecer as disputas sobre o currículo, aparentemente relativas à continuidade ou à mudança curricular (THORNTON, 2008). Donnan começou a lecionar em 1883 e, sob muitos aspectos, implementou um currículo e uma metodologia que se assemelhava bastante àquela prescrita pela SSCR, publicada mais de 30 anos depois. A continuidade da prática de Donnan pode ser menos dramática do que a aparente mudança resultante de batalhas ideológicas sobre o currículo; contudo, o significado de sua carreira é vital para a história da EC.

A Vida e a Carreira de Donnan na *Shortridge High School*

Laura Donnan nasceu de pais abolicionistas em 1854. Tendo passado a maior parte de sua vida Indianápolis, Donnan cresceu na mesma rua onde ficava o capitólio estadual. Formou-se na *Indianapolis High School*, que se tornou a *Shortridge High School* em 1900, a segunda escola de ensino médio a abrir na cidade. Donnan frequentou a Escola Normal em Indianápolis e então recebeu o grau de mestre da Universidade de Michigan; seu tema principal foi a História Constitucional dos EUA e sua dissertação tem como título *Duties of a Private Citizen in a Republic*¹⁰ (COX, 1936). Donnan foi professora de escola primária em duas pequenas comunidades antes de ir para a Universidade de Michigan, e então retornou a Indianápolis para lecionar na sua *alma mater*, onde seria lembrada como um dos “Imortais de Shortridge”, exercendo a docência por 35 anos e aposentando-se em 1929 (BOWERS, 1962; COX, 1936; GAUS; 1985).

Na *Shortridge High School*, Donnan rapidamente se tornou muito popular entre seus alunos. Sua popularidade podia ser atribuída às aulas que lecionava e à sua pedagogia, às atividades extracurriculares que iniciou e patrocinou bem como sua presença na maioria das

¹⁰ NR. *Deveres de um Cidadão Privado numa República.*

solenidades escolares. Donnan havia patrocinado praticamente toda e qualquer atividade escolar ao longo de sua carreira e seus esforços eram muito evidentes (GAUS, 1985), como observava o jornal escolar: “Não é preciso dizer o que a Srta. Donnan está fazendo pelo *Echo*, Oratorical Association and the Senate¹¹” (EDITORIAL STAFF, 1899a, p. 2). Entre eles, Donnan era famosa pela criação do Senado da Shortridge, que funcionou na escola por quase 100 anos, tendo iniciado em 1883 em sua sala de aula e depois vindo a ser uma atividade extracurricular em 1887. A popularidade do Senado se espalhou e escolas do país inteiro acabaram por replicar seu formato (GAUS, 1985).

Donnan era vista como uma feminista e uma defensora preambular do sufrágio feminino. Era muito sincera na defesa da igualdade entre todos os cidadãos, como relembra um ex-aluno: “Ela era uma forte defensora dos direitos dos negros” (HENDRICKSON, 1983, p. 131). O único incidente racial que aconteceu na Shortridge durante o período em que lá esteve, anterior à segregação de 1927, foi na sala de aula de Donnan sobre governo civil na primavera de 1904. O incidente envolveu um estudante branco que não queria tomar seu o assento a ele designado ao lado de uma aluna negra. Em função da desobediência daquele aluno diante de toda a classe, Donnan dispensou o aluno branco. Quando ele apelou ao diretor e ao conselho escolar, ambos apoiaram e mantiveram a decisão de Donnan preservando sua autoridade. O incidente resultou na transferência dos dois alunos para outra classe devido ao constrangimento, mas no fim das contas o estudante branco acabou evadindo (GAUS, 1985, p. 74). Donnan era conhecida por tratar todos os seus alunos com igualdade, como escreveu Cox (1936, p.2):

Para Laura Donnan, não fazia diferença de que região da cidade vinha uma criança. Ela sempre comentava que as crianças que viviam no ‘bu-le-var’ [bulevar] não precisam esperar nenhum tipo de parcialidade. Não defendia nem discriminava quem vivesse na pobreza ou na riqueza.

Todas as atividades de Donnan na escola Shortridge eram inclusivas a todos os alunos independente de idade, raça ou sexo. Isso abrangia sua atividade mais popular, o Senado, como escreveu Cox (1936, p. 5), “O Senado era bastante inclusivo, não barrava ninguém por conta de raça ou cor [...]. A igualdade entre as pessoas, a ser buscada pelos governos, prevalecia no Senado”.

¹¹ NR. Associação de Retórica e Senado.

Donnan também foi a integrante do corpo docente da Shortridge que fundou a respectiva Escola Noturna em 1899, tendo atuado como sua diretora. Como mencionado acima, as escolas noturnas foram populares durante a Era Progressista e serviram como meio para educar, ou americanizar, imigrantes adolescentes e adultos. A Free Night School. Editorial Staff¹² estava aberta a qualquer pessoa, pois não havia “qualquer limitação com relação a idade, raça ou sexo” (THE FREE NIGHT HIGH SCHOOL, 1900, p.1). As matrículas oscilavam entre 50 e 100 alunos, de 1899 a 1902. A Escola Noturna teve seu primeiro formando em 1902, fato que Donnan comemorou com uma festa em sua casa, convidando os alunos dos seus cursos de EC (COX, 1936; THE FREE NIGHT SCHOOL, 1900; EDITORIAL STAFF, 1899c; GAUS, 1985). Os estudantes recordavam Donnan não apenas como uma boa professora, mas também como alguém diferente do restante dos docentes quanto ao método:

Ela lecionava História Constitucional Norte-Americana [...]. No primeiro dia de sua aula, mandava colocar todos os cadernos no lado esquerdo da carteira dos alunos com o nome e o assento claramente assinalado. Então, apresentava uma cesta de mercado, percorria o corredor entre as carteiras e dizia aos alunos que o conhecimento que iriam adquirir em sua aula era para estar em suas mentes e não nos seus cadernos. (Elliott *apud* GAUS, 1985, p. 104)

Discurso da Donnan na NEA

Em seu discurso à Reunião Anual da Associação Nacional de Educação (NEA) em 1889, intitulado “A Escola e o Cidadão”, Laura Donnan fez uma declaração quanto ao propósito do ensino de civismo nas escolas. Nelas, disse ela, “dever-se-ia ensinar alguma matéria cujo objeto fosse dar aos alunos um conhecimento sobre os direitos e deveres da cidadania, e inspirá-los com coragem moral a exigir seus direitos e a cumprir seus deveres” (DONNAN, 1889a, p. 515).

Em 1887, apenas quatro anos após a chegada de Donnan, o curso de governo civil tornou-se um requisito para obter o diploma na única escola secundária de Indianapolis (URIEBEL, 1996), o que era incomum nos EUA. Portanto, em parte, com seu discurso na reunião da NEA, Donnan estava tentando justificar o lugar do governo civil em meio a um currículo dominado pela abordagem histórica. O valor que os alunos davam ao curso de civismo de Donnan foi observado 10 anos após seu discurso na NEA, num artigo publicado no jornal da escola, o *Echo*:

¹² NR. Escola Noturna Shortridge.

Nas aulas sobre Governo Civil, os germes da boa cidadania são instilados nas mentes dos jovens sobre cujos ombros em algum momento repousará a responsabilidade de decidir as questões que são continuamente motivo de perplexidade para nosso governo. E que treinamento melhor existe na resolução de difíceis problemas sociais do que os debates que ocorrem toda sexta-feira nas aulas. (THE CIVIL Government Debates, 1899, p. 3)

Esse relato de um aluno sobre o curso de civismo poderia, de muitas maneiras, ter sido inserido em muitos dos relatórios criados pelos comitês preocupados com os currículos de história, civismo e estudos social, precisamente porque identifica o objetivo da “boa cidadania” com a finalidade de tratar "problemas sociais" (JONES, 1913; DUNN, 1914a; 1915a; 1915d; 1916).

Em seu discurso à NEA, Donnan forneceu um quadro de referência para demonstrar de que maneira o objetivo contido em sua fala poderia ser concretizado, essencialmente definindo seu curso de civismo e dando exemplos para ilustrar seus métodos. Donnan começa defendendo vigorosamente a discussão de questões compreendidas na constituição, e separa dias na aula basicamente para a discussão de “questões como impostos, representação, proteção social, livre comércio e o sufrágio” (DONNAN, 1889a, p. 515). Ela acreditava que na discussão de tais questões, disparadas pelo estudo da constituição, “os alunos deveriam ser incentivados a expressar integralmente suas opiniões, não importando quão estranhas ou impopulares pudessem ser” (DONNAN, 1889a, p. 515). A intenção de Donnan de que os alunos desenvolvessem questões e expressassem suas opiniões através da discussão também era de se esperar quando os alunos se envolvessem com as leituras designadas de outros importantes documentos governamentais e discursos famosos. O impacto da persistência de Donnan na discussão pode ser visto num editorial do jornal da escola que considerava a relevância da discussão na sala de aula:

A questão surgiu outro dia quanto ao bom e real benefício que deriva dos debates em classe. Acreditamos, com mais segurança, que as discussões sobre um assunto em sala são úteis em muitos aspectos — tal como estamos certos de que nossas próprias ideias se ampliam com as visões de outras pessoas e temos uma nova luz lançada sobre o tema que para nós estava ainda na penumbra. (ABOUT DISCUSSIONS, 1900, p. 1)

Este relato de um aluno do curso de civismo de Donnan parece dar a entender que a discussão era possivelmente algo inovador como metodologia, sugerindo que Donnan estava não apenas tentando justificar um novo curso de civismo, mas também o uso e a frequência de uma metodologia, como era o caso da discussão em sala.

A intenção de Donnan ao fazer os estudantes expressarem suas opiniões seria então facilitada através de debates semanais sobre questões constitucionais contemporâneas, tanto no nível local quanto no nacional. Donnan conduzia os debates em sua aula sobre o governo civil e no Senado da Shortridge. As discussões em sala de aula eram menos formais que as deliberações no Senado, mas as interlocuções eram igualmente acaloradas. Eram tão animadas, às vezes, que os visitantes pediam para observar esses debates. Em sala, muitos pontos controversos eram abordados e debatidos, juntamente com as questões constitucionais mais comumente discutidas. Dentre esses assuntos controversos estavam questões tais como linchamento, imigração, sufrágio feminino, anexação de territórios e vivissecção. A controvérsia estava no centro da pedagogia de Donnan, sendo que ela identificava as questões que exigiam dos cidadãos escolhas difíceis, ao mesmo tempo em que promovia o desenvolvimento de habilidades deliberativas ao se falar sobre esses assuntos.

O Senado da Shortridge Senate, por sua vez, tinha objetivos ligeiramente distintos do que os debates nas aulas de civismo; entretanto, o Senado concentrava-se na discussão das questões constitucionais controversas de cada momento. Donnan esboçou esses objetivos em seu discurso de 1889:

A finalidade do Senado deve ser tripla: ensinar [aos alunos] os deveres de um legislador; mantê-los informados sobre quem são os senadores dos EUA; despertar seu interesse pelo que está sendo feito no Senado dos EUA. (DONNAN, 1889a, p. 517)

Apesar de o Senado ser uma atividade extracurricular, os alunos ainda assim reconheciam seu valor no âmbito de sua experiência escolar, como escreveu um dos estudantes no *Echo*, “O Senado é um lugar de aprendizagem e debate, sendo inegavelmente um recurso educacional de nossa escola” (ORDER IN THE SENATE, 1899, pp. 2-3). Donnan simulava um corpo legislativo no qual os alunos vivenciavam a experiência de se autoadministrarem no processo de deliberação, podendo assim compreender o processo legislativo como parte da democracia numa república.

Donnan também defendia envolver seus alunos num julgamento simulado por semestre, e um a cada ano no Senado, com vistas a contribuir ainda mais na compreensão de processos vitais à democracia. Ela acreditava piamente no valor do julgamento, desde a preparação dos alunos até a justificativa de um veredito, e afirmava que “Nenhum trabalho adicional se faz em qualquer ramo de estudos ao mesmo tempo do que esse que se realiza na preparação e na realização de um julgamento” (Donnan, 1889a, p. 518). Em seu discurso, Donnan relata a popularidade do julgamento simulado, explica o ambiente no qual o mesmo se realizava e comenta: “não é raro que 50 ou 100 alunos que não estavam estudando governo civil, mas que tinham uma hora livre no momento do julgamento, para poder estar presente” (DONNAN, 1889a, p. 518). Para Donnan, parecia que compreender os processos e procedimentos da democracia era algo importante, mas mais relevante ainda era que ela queria que os alunos compreendessem seu papel naquela democracia que era deles e que tivessem as habilidades necessárias para efetivamente assumir seu papel.

Em seu discurso, Donnan descreveu a importância de conscientizar os alunos quanto às entidades que compõem o governo nos âmbitos municipal e estadual. Donnan lecionava as aulas de civismo através de viagens a campo a fim de visitar diversos órgãos públicos e conhecer os funcionários responsáveis, proporcionando um melhor entendimento dos respectivos papéis no governo. Nas aulas de civismo ocorriam visitas à cadeia municipal, ao quartel da polícia, aos órgãos estaduais e municipais, aos sistemas de distribuição de água e diversas outras entidades públicas (A SECOND Trip, 1901; AT THE STATE House, 1902; CIVICS I Classes Visit Atkins Saw Works, 1906; CIVIL Government Tour, 1901; IN JAIL, 1901; POLICE Headquarters, 1901; STATE Officers, 1902; VISIT the Mayor”, 1901). Essas visitas familiarizavam os alunos com suas comunidades e contribuíam para alargar sua compreensão quanto à maneira de se lidar com questões sociais na prática, tanto no nível municipal quanto no estadual.

Donnan identificava três outras estratégias de sala de aula em seu discurso à NEA, que eram práticas comuns em sua atividade pedagógica e que hoje se veem nas aulas de civismo. Primeiro, Donnan destacava a importância da leitura do jornal e da discussão do que se pensa correntemente sobre os eventos atuais (Donnan, 1889a, p. 518). A seguir, descrevia o que atualmente chamaríamos de leitura independente (Donnan, 1889a, p. 516). Ela desejava desenvolver perspectivas únicas de modo a contribuir com as discussões permitindo aos alunos que escolhessem suas próprias leituras. Finalmente, Donnan ilustrava diversas

atividades que envolvem os alunos na pesquisa de assuntos ou questões que estejam discutindo e então buscam mais informações e apresentam os seus achados. Por exemplo:

Se você mora num Estado no qual o cidadão é praticamente destituído de seu poder de voto pela existência de divisões arbitrárias nos distritos eleitorais, pegue um mapa dos distritos em que o Congresso se divide e deixe a classe redistribuir os distritos do Estado de maneira justa. Se você tiver a sorte de viver num Estado no qual os distritos congressionais são definidos honestamente, então pegue emprestado um mapa de um de seus vizinhos menos afortunados e, por contraste, mostre a má influência da divisão arbitrária dos distritos eleitorais. (DONNAN, 1889a, p. 516)

As estratégias identificadas por Donnan nos trazem importantes pistas da prática tanto dentro quanto fora da sala de aula anteriores aos relatórios dos comitês. Essas estratégias centravam-se no desenvolvimento de bons cidadãos preocupados com os problemas sociais e suas soluções.

Nos comentários finais de seu discurso na NEA, Donnan faz insinuações sobre o prodigioso meio educacional. Demonstra uma aguda consciência de sua pedagogia exclusiva e a possibilidade de que suas colegas rejeitariam sua visão como sendo meramente teórica. Donnan afirmou “que o curso sobre governo civil delineado neste texto não é mera teoria, é comprovado pelo fato de que pelo menos em uma cidade dos EUA ele acontece nos seus mínimos detalhes” (DONNAN, 1889a, p. 518). Sem dúvida, isso põe em evidência a tensão entre os comitês que prescreviam uma política baseada na teoria e prática de professores como Donnan, e mais importante, a consciência recíproca.

EC na Era Progressista: Continuidade e/ou Mudança

O reconhecimento por Laura Donnan do dissenso entre teóricos e praticantes em seu discurso à NEA ilustrou uma tensão que tinha permanecido relevante na educação. O título da dissertação de mestrado de Donnan era “Deveres de um Cidadão Privado numa República” (COX, 1936), e este título de certa forma define como Donnan encarava seu trabalho de desenvolvimento da cidadania entre seus alunos da *Shortridge High School*. Ela preparava os estudantes para que tivessem seu próprio entendimento, e para serem cidadãos racionais que compreendem o processo da democracia e o modo de promover a mudança social por

intermédio desse processo. Um estudante observou o trabalho de Donnan e escreveu sobre suas atitudes no anuário, “Srta. Donnan, nunca perdeu de vista o propósito primordial— desenvolver meninos e meninas para se tornarem cidadãos racionais” (WEBER, 1909). O desenvolvimento de indivíduo lógico, racional significava cultivar suas ideias sobre questões sociais e cívicas através do próprio pensamento. O referencial de EC de Donnan foi planejado para fazer dos alunos indivíduos e cidadãos bem informados, de modo que pudessem de fato desenvolver suas próprias ideias sobre as questões que estivessem sendo debatidas. Os objetivos e referências para EC que Donnan aplicava a seus alunos a associaram muito intimamente às visões dos pluralistas culturais sobre a educação para a americanização e o nacionalismo cívico.

Assim, Donnan era diferente da maioria das pessoas envolvidas com a SSCR, que foram tipicamente retratadas como assimilacionistas em suas visões com relação à americanização. O referencial para EC de Donnan, contudo, assemelhava-se a muitas das recomendações feitas pela SSCR. O seu referencial guarda semelhanças com as recomendações da SSCR especialmente com relação aos dois novos cursos que haviam sido criados: civismo comunitário e problemas da democracia. Donnan havia implementado os aspectos centrais desses novos cursos em suas aulas na Shortridge, durante mais de 30 anos. A principal diferença entre os cursos de Donnan e aqueles propostos pela SSCR era o propósito que havia por trás deles. Os envolvidos que participavam da SSCR estavam interessados em controlar a sociedade através da eficiência social e, ao fim e ao cabo, americanizar todos os estudantes que frequentavam as escolas dos EUA. Donnan, contudo, estava mais preocupada em expor seus alunos a diferentes perspectivas e tinha esperança que cada um deles poderia desenvolver seu próprio ponto de vista como um cidadão privado do país. Quando Donnan começou a lecionar na Shortridge, maioria de seus estudantes eram do sexo masculino, brancos e teutônicos. Com os anos de docência, seus alunos foram se tornando cada vez mais do sexo feminino com mais diversidade em termos de etnia. A visão pluralista cultura de Donnan foi cada vez mais posta em prática por seus alunos, sendo não apenas diferente das visões normativas, mas também racional e bem justificada.

A partir da perspectiva pluralista cultural, Donnan respondeu à crescente diversidade de suas turmas e se propôs a utilizar a origem e formação prévia de seus alunos para desenvolver em todos eles o entendimento da sociedade. Ao criar um curso de EC em 1883, e depois exigindo que o mesmo fosse obrigatório para todos os alunos do 9º ano, Donnan estava claramente ciente das tendências e perspectivas nacionalistas cívicas. Ela teve o presságio de

compreender a educação como um esforço capaz de construir a nação e que a cidadania numa nação “que se autogoverna” exigia uma forma especializada de EC. Isso não surpreende, considerando-se o quanto Donnan foi politicamente ativa durante toda sua vida, sua formação e devoção pelo aperfeiçoamento da sociedade. A defesa incessante de Donnan pelos direitos das mulheres, e mesmo dos direitos dos cidadãos negros, encaixava-se bem com a perspectiva pluralista cultural e com as visões nacionalistas cívicas. O ponto de vista de Donnan como uma mulher politicamente ativa, que não tinha o direito ao voto, conferiu-lhe um agudo *insight* quanto aos desafios dos futuros cidadãos que passavam por suas mãos. Esse *insight* informava muito dos objetivos didáticos de Donnan bem como seus resultados. Se Donnan estava informada a respeito das tendências nacionalistas cívicas e tinha condições de implementá-las em sua prática, o que retinha os gestores educacionais a fazerem recomendações nos comitês?

Uma interessante história paralela ao desenvolvimento da ECA nos EUA é a relação entre Arthur W. Dunn, um dos principais colaboradores da SSCR, e Laura Donnan. Em 1900, 17 anos após Donnan ter começado a lecionar na *Shortridge High School*, Dunn chegou para dar aulas de História norte-americana e tornou-se o chefe do departamento de História e Civismo na mesma escola. Durante o tempo em que esteve em Indianápolis, Dunn foi chamado a coordenar o desenvolvimento da educação cívica para todas as escolas públicas da cidade. O trabalho de Dunn com a educação cívica abriu uma vereda para sua carreira, que, após sair de Indianápolis em 1910, finalmente o levou para Washington D.C., onde se tornou um especialista em EC no Departamento de Educação dos E.U.A. O empenho de Dunn para reformar a EC e seu aparente sucesso na reforma da educação cívica em Indianápolis o levaram à função de secretário na SSCR, onde foi autor da maioria, senão de toda, a SSCR.

Muito do sucesso de Dunn e de suas ideias inovadoras com relação a EC são atribuídas a seu estudo com os sociólogos Albion Small e George Vincent na Universidade de Chicago, onde se tornou mestre em 1896 (EVANS, 2004; LYBARGER, 1981; REESE, 1998, SAXE, 1991; STRUNCIS, 1992; URIEBEL, 1996). Essa influência justifica sua devoção pela melhoria da sociedade e da eficiência social, defendida em seu texto sobre civismo *The Community and the Citizen* (1907)¹³, publicado durante o período que esteve na *Shortridge High School*. Esse texto, juntamente com um estudo de seu uso nas escolas de Indianápolis, tornou-se a base de sua campanha para desenvolver um novo currículo focado em EC, ao

¹³ NR. *A comunidade e o cidadão*.

mesmo tempo em que fundado na aprendizagem sobre a sociedade e enraizado na própria comunidade do aluno. O livro de Dunn é o primeiro vislumbre que temos em relação a seu novo currículo, e apesar de ser um dos menos conhecidos teóricos progressistas de sua época, Dunn é visto como responsável pela elaboração da prática em sala de aula de muitos conceitos teóricos emergentes nas ciências sociais (LYBARGER, 1981; REESE, 1998, SAXE, 1991; STRUNCIS, 1992; URIBEL, 1996).

A passagem de Dunn pela *Shortridge High School* foi sua única experiência docente como K-12¹⁴ antes de avançar e vir a ser um especialista em EC. Nos 10 anos em que esteve em *Shortridge High School*, Dunn trabalhou como gestor imediato de Donnan, copatrocinou clubes com Donnan e fez uma imersão num ambiente escolar interessado e engajado em assuntos cívicos, aparentemente devido ao trabalho árduo de Donnan. Contudo, em todos os discursos e escritos de Dunn como defensor e especialista em EC, não há nenhuma menção a Donnan, suas práticas ou à *Shortridge High School*.

O tempo que Dunn passou na *Shortridge High School* não é tão proeminentemente evidente quanto o período de Donnan, de 1900 a 1910. Dunn lecionou História norte-americana I e II, juntamente com História Antiga. As referências mais reveladoras à época de Dunn na *Shortridge* estão espalhadas no jornal da escola, o *Echo*. Muitas são relatos de estudantes sobre sua docência em sala de aula, as quais são interessantes apenas porque na prática ele parecia ser um facilitador de recitações e seminários desinteressantes. Por exemplo: “Jennifer Schaub fica tão assustada quando o Sr. Dunn a chama e é com máxima dificuldade que ela consegue recuperar a compostura para ficar de pé e recitar”. (JUST TRIFLES, 1906, p. 2)

Para alguém que era considerado um educador progressista, sua prática de utilizar recitações parecia ser contrária à sua teoria. Também parecia que Dunn não pôde escapar da comparação com Donnan. Por exemplo, a docência dele foi comparada com a dela por uma aluna no *Echo* que escreveu, “Ele deseja estimular a discussão entre os estudantes, como forma de despertar o interesse tal como acontece nas aulas sobre Governo Civil da Srta. Donnan” (AMERICAN History II, 1901, p. 2). Esse caso sugere que a prática de Donnan tinha um nível básico de influência sobre Dunn, ou pelo menos que ele estava ciente, durante sua curta estada em Indianápolis, da pedagogia popular de Donnan.

¹⁴ NR. K-12: sigla utilizada nos EUA e em outros países para se referir ao ensino do kindergarten à décima segundo série, ou seja, ao período da gratuidade escolar.

O curso e o livro didático de Dunn seria finalmente adotado pelos sistemas escolares em todo o país (REECE, 1998; STUNCIS, 1992; URIBEL, 1996). O livro foi visto como um importante distanciamento do curso típico de civismo como disciplina daquela época (COLEMAN, 1908, p. 99). O livro de Dunn foi uma resposta à repetida alegação de que o conteúdo dos cursos sobre governo civil era estreito demais, referindo-se apenas à “maquinaria do governo” (DUNN, 1908, p. 175; DUNN, 1916, p. 23) ou ao “mecanismo de governo” (DUNN, 1915b, p. 52). Ao contrário, Dunn acreditava que a cidadania responsável dependia “não apenas de conhecer o governo, mas também de um amplo ponto de vista sociológico e de um conhecimento das relações sociais e econômicas que são subjacentes ao governo” (DUNN, 1914a, p. 412). A teoria sociológica de Dunn era evidente em seu livro didático, e era bem recebida. Parecia que o único aspecto faltante em seu currículo era uma aplicação de sua teoria na prática, que seria igualmente progressista e distinta das práticas correntes na maioria das aulas de governo civil.

Em termos de prática, a de Donnan parece ter sido preservada no “novo” currículo de civismo comunitário de Dunn. A combinação do livro didático de Dunn com sua pesquisa que ilustrava a implementação e o impacto do programa fez com esse seu currículo recebesse um bom marketing junto aos diversos grupos de interesse e outros envolvidos com a educação. Como parte da SSCR, a base teórica do civismo comunitário serviu como moeda de troca para tendências sociais mais amplas que buscavam intervenção social em todas as áreas da sociedade. Como observou Evans (2004, p. 43), uma razão para o sucesso da SSCR se deveu ao fato de que “sua ênfase nos objetivos mais amplos da educação para a cidadania e eficiência social se adequava às tendências correntes”. Simplesmente, então, a mudança abrangida pela SSCR com relação à EC, estava “na moda”, ou mais habilmente descrita por Fallace (2009, p. 469), abrangia um “remodelamento do currículo de História”. Assim, o currículo de civismo comunitário de Dunn capitalizou as tendências em curso tanto na teoria quanto na prática.

Dunn representou a intersecção de influências econômicas, sociais e políticas, como apontou Rueben (1997, p. 402); sua carreira ilustrava “os laços entre as organizações de defesa de reformas progressistas, o governo federal, os cientistas sociais atuando nas universidades e os líderes educacionais que moldaram o novo currículo de civismo”. O marketing do currículo de civismo de Dunn tinha que apelar a essas influências, cujos meios Donnan não tinha condições de oferecer. Isso se deveu a seus mais de 20 anos de como professor “de baixa categoria”, que representava o “velho modo” de lecionar civismo

conhecido como governo civil (CROCCO, 2005). Assim, Dunn utilizou a prática de Donnan — levando o crédito por qualquer reconhecimento de inovação — ao mesmo tempo em traficava na linguagem da eficiência social da época para satisfazer as suas várias associações e comercializar o seu currículo; enquanto Donnan continuava seu programa de EC na *Shortridge High School* que se assemelhava, ao menos na prática, ao “novo” programa de Estudos Sociais que estava sendo disseminado por todo o país.

A relação entre a prática de Donnan e a teoria de Dunn ilustrava o desenvolvimento da EC simplesmente como continuidade para alguns atores do campo educacional, e mudança para outros. De modo mais amplo, o caso de Donnan e Dunn retrata a embate inicial entre assimilacionistas e pluralistas culturais, bem como seus primeiros esforços para moldar estudantes estrangeiros e nacionais de origem multiétnica tornando-os cidadãos. Não obstante, este artigo demonstrou a possibilidade de um cidadão politicamente e sexualmente marginalizado e uma docente profissional, Donnan, desenvolvessem a EC para milhões de estudantes norte-americanos marginalizados e não marginalizados. Donnan influenciou mudanças abrangentes quanto ao modo de os EUA pensarem a educação de seus cidadãos baseada na avaliação que ela fazia da marginalização dos direitos civis no âmbito da democracia norte-americana. Desse modo, pode-se inferir que a atuação de Donna oferece elementos para se pensar que as práticas docentes, quando persistentes, estimulam mudanças nas políticas educacionais

Referências

- A SECOND Trip. **The Daily Echo**, [S.l], p. 1, 1901, October 28
- ABOUT DISCUSSIONS. **The Daily Echo**, [S.l], p. 1, 1900, March 19.
- AMERICAN History II. **The Daily Echo**, [S.l], p. 2, 1901, January 4.
- AT THE STATE House. **The Daily Echo**, [S.l], p. 1, 1902, January 20.
- BARTON, K.C. Mary G. Kelty: The most important social educator no one has heard of? In BURLBAW L.M.; FIELD, S. L. (Eds.), **Explorations in curriculum history**. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2004, p. 193-200.
- Bowers, C. G. **My life**: The memoirs of Claude Bowers. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1962.
- BURKHOLDER, Z. **Color in the classroom**: How American schools taught race, 1900-1954. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011.

- CIVICS I Classes Visit Atkins Saw Works. **The Daily Echo**, [S.l.], p. 1, 1906, October 22.
- THE CIVIL Government Debates. **The Daily Echo**, [S.l.], p. 3, 1899, March 28.
- CIVIL Government Tour. **The Daily Echo**, [S.l.], p. 2, 1901, June 10.
- CLARK, J.S. **Notions of Citizenship**: Discussing race in the Shortridge High School Senate, 1900–1928. In WOYSHNER, C.; Bohan, C.H. (Eds.), **Histories of Social Studies and Race: 1865-2000**. <http://dx.doi.org/10.10547/97811370076505.0008>
- CLARK, J.S. Cultivating individual agency in progressive times: The civic education program at Shortridge High school 1883-1928. **American Educational History Journal**, v. 38 n. 1, p. 1-19, 2011.
- COLEMAN, C. B. Review of books. **Indiana Magazine of History**, n. 4, p. 99-101, 1908.
- COX, V. P. **Laura Donnan** (Biographical essay). Indianapolis: Indiana State Library, 1936.
- CROCCO, M.S. Mary G. Kelty: An ironic tale of remembrance. In BURLBAW, L.M.; FIELD, S. L. (Eds.). **Explorations in curriculum history**. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2005, p. 193-200.
- CUBAN, L. Determinants of curriculum change and stability, 1870–1970. In SCHAFFARZICK, J.; SYKES, G. (Eds.). **Value conflicts and curriculum issues: Lessons from research and experience** (pp. 139–196). Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.
- DONNAN, L. The high school and the citizen. **The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association Annual Meeting**, n. 28, P. 512-520, 1889a.
- DUNN, A. W. Aids to one year of American history in high school. **The educator-journal**, [S.l.], n. 4, p. 508-512, 1903.
- DUNN, A. W. **The community and the citizen**. Boston: DC Heath, 1907.
- DUNN, A. W. The civic value of local history. **Indiana magazine of history**, n. 4, p. 170-196, 1908.
- DUNN, A. W. **Chapter XVIII**: The trend of CE. Report of the Commissioner of Education, Volume I. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1914a.
- DUNN, A. W. **National municipal review**, n. 3, p. 227-230, 1914b.
- DUNN, A. W. **Civics education in elementary education as illustrated in Indianapolis**. Bulletin no. 17. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1915a.
- DUNN, A. W. Community civics --what it means. **The history teacher's magazine**, n. 5, p. 52-53, 1915b.
- DUNN, A. W. By what standards shall we judge the value of CE? **The history teacher's magazine**, n. 6, p. 99-103, 1915c.
- DUNN, A. W. Report on CE, on the work of the committee during the past year. **The national municipal review**, n. 4, p. 178-179, 1915d.

- DUNN, A. W. **The social studies in secondary education**. Bulletin no. 28 of the Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1916.
- EDITORIAL STAFF. **The Daily Echo**, p. 2, 1899a, March 6.
- EDITORIAL STAFF. **The Daily Echo**, p. 1, 1899c, October 18.
- EVANS, R. W. **The social studies wars: What should we teach our children?** New York: Teachers College Press, 2004.
- FALLACE, T.D. Did the social studies really replace history in the local curriculum? The case of Elyria, Ohio and the north central states. **Theory and Research in Social Education**, v. 37, n. 4, p. 458-483, 2009. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2009.10473407>
- THE FREE Night High School. **The Daily Echo**, p. 1, 1900, October 1.
- GAUS, L. S. **Shortridge high school, 1864-1981: In retrospect**. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1985.
- GERSTLE, G. **American Crucible**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- HENDRICKSON, W. B. **The Indiana Years, 1903-1941**. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1983.
- IN JAIL. **The Daily Echo**, p. 1, 1901, November 11.
- JUST TRIFLES. **The Daily Echo**, p. 2, 1906, October 22.
- KLIEBARD, H. M. **The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958**. (3rd ed.) New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004.
- LYBARGER, M. **Origins of the social studies curriculum**. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin, (1981).
- MIREL, J. **Patriotic Pluralism**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Order in the Senate. **The Daily Echo**, p. 2-3, 1899, March 15.
- POLICE Headquarters. **The Daily Echo**, p. 1, 1901, November 18.
- REESE, W. J. **Hoosier schools: Past and present**. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998).
- RUEBEN, J. A. Beyond politics: Community civics and the redefinition of citizenship in the progressive era. **History of Education Quarterly**, n. 37, p. 399-420, 1997. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/369872>
- SAXE, D.W. **Social studies in schools: A history of the early years**. Albany, NY: Suny Press, 1991.
- SMITH, R.M. **Civic Ideals: Conflicting visions of citizenship in U.S. history**. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.

SMITH, R.M. The "American Creed" and American identity: The limits of liberal citizenship in the United States. **The Western Political Quarterly**, v. 41 n. 2, p. 225-251, 1988.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/448536>

STATE OFFICERS. **The Daily Echo**, p. 1, 1902, January 13.

STRUNCIS, S. P. **The career of Arthur Dunn and his contributions to citizenship education**. (Master thesis). Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1992.

THORNTON, S. J. Continuity and change in social studies curriculum. In LEVSTIK, L.S.; TYSON, C. A. (Eds.), **Handbook of research in social studies education**. New York: Routledge, 2008, p. 15-32.

URIEBEL, A. **The making of citizens: A history of CE in Indianapolis, 1900-1950**. (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 1996.

VISIT the Mayor. **The Daily Echo**, p. 1. 1901, October 21.

WEBER, M. I. **The Annual**. Shortridge High School Collection, 1870-1981, (Catalogued Separately, LD7501. I4647 A5). Indiana State Historical Society, Indianapolis, IN, 1909.