S. HRG. 108–272

WHAT IS YOUR CHILD READING IN SCHOOL? HOW STANDARDS AND TEXTBOOKS INFLUENCE EDUCATION

HEARING

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

EXAMINING CONFLICTS TAKING PLACE OVER STATE HISTORY STANDARDS AND HISTORY TEXTBOOKS, FOCUSING ON HOW STANDARDS AND TEXTBOOKS INFLUENCE EDUCATION

SEPTEMBER 24, 2003

Printed for the use of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

89–644 PDF WASHINGTON : 2004

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire, *Chairman*

BILL FRIST, Tennessee
MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri
MIKE DEWINE, Ohio
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
JOHN ENSIGN, Nevada
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, South Carolina
JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JAMES M. JEFFORDS (I), Vermont
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island
JOHN EDWARDS, North Carolina
HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York

SHARON R. SODERSTROM, *Staff Director*
J. MICHAEL MYERS, *Minority Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

C O N T E N T S

STATEMENTS

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2003

	Page
Alexander, Hon. Lamar, a U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee, opening statement	1
Gregg, Hon. Judd, a U.S. Senator from the State of New Hampshire, prepared statement	1
Ravitch, Diane, Research Professor, New York University, New York, NY; Gilbert Sewall, Director, American Textbook Council, New York, NYU; Sandra Stotsky, Former Senior Associate Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Education, Malden, MA; and Robert Hagopian, Teacher, Scotts Valley Middle School, Scotts Valley, CA	9
Prepared statements of:	
Diane Ravitch	13
Gilbert Sewall	18
Sandra Stotsky	22
Robert Hagopian	43

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Statements, articles, publications, letters, etc.:	
Resolution, Boston City Council	25
How Study of the Holocaust is Turning America Into Amerika, Sandra Stotsky	25
Stephen Driesler, Executive Director, Association of American Publishers, School Division, prepared statement	56
Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content (2000 Edition), California Department of Education	58

WHAT IS YOUR CHILD READING IN SCHOOL? HOW STANDARDS AND TEXTBOOKS INFLUENCE EDUCATION

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2003

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:06 a.m., in room SD–430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Lamar Alexander, presiding.

Present: Senators Alexander and Ensign.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR ALEXANDER

Senator ALEXANDER. [presiding]. The committee will please come to order.

I want to welcome the witnesses and the audience. This is the first of a series of hearings planned by Chairman Judd Gregg on intellectual diversity in American education, and the first topic focuses on textbooks as well as standards.

Senator Gregg looks forward to all these hearings. He is not able to join the hearing today because of other commitments, but he has prepared a very good opening statement, and we will include that opening statement in the record.

[The prepared statement of Senator Gregg follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR GREGG

Today's hearing is the first in a series of hearings I intend to hold on intellectual diversity—or rather the lack thereof—in our nation's primary, secondary and postsecondary classrooms.

On the primary and secondary level, there appears to be an ever-increasing tendency to scrub textbooks, State assessments and even State standards of anything that may have the remotest chance of offense. The result is a homogenized curriculum that robs children of a balanced and accurate depiction of both history and the world around them.

We are judging the past through the lens of today's values, standards and norms, and taking historical figures and decisions out of context. This is historically dishonest and distorts students' understanding of time and place.

For example, discussing the inspiring true story of Mary McLeod Bethune—an African American woman who defied the odds to found a school for African American girls in Florida in the early twentieth century—is not allowed. Why? Because she named her

school the "Daytona Educational and Industrial Training School for Negro Girls"—and you can't say "negro" even though it is historically accurate and integral to the story.

We also hear reports of stories about owls being deleted from reading passages because in some cultures the owl is associated with death, and death is scary to children.

The inanity of these examples is just the tip of the iceberg. We learn that many publishers of textbooks and assessments avoid terms such as: "American", "backward", "dogma", "Founding Fathers", "heroine", "early man", and "substandard English."

We learn that classic tales like Aesop's Fables are found to be too controversial because of gender stereotypes embedded in such tales as the "Fox and the Crow."

However, nowhere is this unbalanced perspective demonstrated better or more routinely than in the subject of history—which brings us to the purpose of today's hearing: an examination of the quality of our nation's history textbooks, assessments and standards.

We are here today to shed light on the fact that textbooks, assessments and even some State standards have succumbed to the pressures of the political correctness movement.

Various studies show that our students lack not only raw knowledge of key historical facts and concepts, but also a balanced view of the world, and for that matter, an appreciation for American and Western contributions to society.

There is empirical evidence that we are shortchanging children of a basic knowledge of our nation's past.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress's U.S. History exam (a voluntary national test) confirms the woeful decline in students' knowledge of American history:

• Well over half of twelfth graders scored below the basic level on the most recent exam, indicating little to no comprehension of U.S. History.

• Less than one out of five students scored at or above the proficient level in U.S. History. This tiny fraction of students scoring at the proficient level is smaller in history than any other subject tested by NAEP.

• According to the NAEP Civics exam, nearly ⅓ of students scored below the basic level, indicating no mastery or comprehension of the structures, functions, values and process of our government.

Sadly, the poor performance trend in history and civics extends into college. A recent poll of seniors at the nation's top 55 liberal arts colleges found that less than ¼ could identify James Madison as the "father of the Constitution," and over ⅓ were unable to identify the U.S. Constitution as establishing our government's division of power.

Extensive research documents that textbooks—which often contain bias and inaccuracies—are presenting a distorted picture of America, weakening students' civic engagement, and depressing student achievement by diminishing interest in U.S. and World History.

In Texas alone, over 500 factual errors were found in a study of more than two dozen social studies textbooks used in the State.

Content reviewers discovered hundreds more problems concerning insufficient or distorted discussion of key people, places and events. For example, one textbook devoted four pages to capitalism, while socialism merited 18 pages and communism 45 pages. Another textbook mistook John Marshall for John Jay as the first Supreme Court justice. The list of bias and errors goes on and on.

Historian Diane Ravitch, one of our witnesses, found that textbook publishers and assessment companies "sugarcoat practices in non-western cultures that they would condemn if done by Europeans or Americans."

Our children read textbooks that sanitize the treatment of women in Arab countries today and yet are critical of women being denied admission to a school in New Spain in the 17th century—failing to note that the school was founded to educate priests and clerics.

They learn that slavery was exclusively a practice of Western Europeans, when in reality slavery has been practiced in almost all societies throughout the world.

They read such misleading and denigrating text as "Do you notice that the Chinese seem to have thought of a lot of things before Europeans did? The Chinese were weaving silk and making beautiful artifacts when most Europeans were living in caves and wearing animal skins"—despite historical evidence showing that Europeans wove linen and patterned fabrics as early as the 4th millennium BC, whereas the Chinese weren't weaving silk until the late 3rd millennium BC.

A recent report by one of our witnesses, Gilbert Sewall of the American Textbook Council, examined about 20 commonly used social studies textbooks and found that their content is growing thinner, yet increasingly critical of the U.S. and Western civilization.

In many of these textbooks, other civilizations are glorified, their problems and abuses glossed over, while American struggles and mistakes are highlighted at the expense of our greatest achievements to the degree that many students conclude America is a hopelessly flawed and deeply troubled country.

Examples of the anti-American slant in textbooks are not rare. Veteran history teacher and author Peter Gibbon, who taught American History for many years using a variety of textbooks, writes: "There is much in these texts now about income inequality, environmental degradation, the horrors of immigration, and the hardships of the western frontier. . . . Contemporary history books cover in detail the Vietnam War and our shameful treatment of Native Americans. Little mention is made in them, however, of genius or heroism. . . . From many of our textbooks, one would not know that in the span of human history, the United States has stood for peace, wealth and accomplishment and has made possible millions of quiet and contented lives."

This concern regarding the overemphasis of America's shortcomings is not limited to conservatives.

The American Federation of Teachers' Albert Shanker Institute (hardly known as a bastion of conservative thought) similarly decries the dearth of civic knowledge and pride in our youngsters.

The Shanker report represents a consensus of concern among political right and left, and is notable for the wide range of signato-

ries it attracted, including former President Bill Clinton, and esteemed historian David McCullough.

The Shanker treatise cites a growing body of research confirming a strong bias against America in the U.S. and World History textbooks most widely used in our schools.

According to the report, today's students show little sign of having cultivated the necessary understanding and appreciation for America and its values to enable them to preserve our democracy. "In too many instances," the report notes, "America's sins, slights and shortcomings have become not just a piece of the story but its essence."

If our children are being told such a negative story, it is no wonder that they show such little interest and pride in our national history. And so we must ask ourselves: how did we let this happen?

Compounding this anti-American bias, publishers routinely ban certain words, phrases, topics and images, some of which are offensive but historically accurate, and some of which defy common sense.

Why? Because the content of textbooks has been hijacked by bias committees that review all such materials. These bias committees serve as academic thought police by severely limiting what children encounter in instructional materials.

Dr. Ravitch, in her book, has documented the existence of a voluntary form of censorship in our textbooks, in which the publishers adhere to strict "bias and sensitivity guidelines," taking pains not to offend anyone on the political right or left.

This is a classic case of good intentions gone awry. What began as a worthwhile effort decades ago to ensure that different gender and ethnic groups were portrayed in a balanced way has been taken to extremes, with absolute numerical parity demanded and a litany of words and phrases that are banned.

Publishers and their writers bend to the will of interest groups who demand that no one ever be represented in anything less than an ideal light—regardless of the facts.

This censorship has led to the creation of senseless instructional materials that bear more resemblance to utopia than the world we live in.

The influence of bias committees does not extend just to publishers—it also extends to assessments and even State standards. We asked a handful of States, publishers and assessment companies to provide us with their bias guidelines. Although we have heard from several of the education firms, we have only heard from one of the States we contacted.

We intend to continue to cull through the materials sent to us, as I remain concerned that it is bias committees and sensitivity guidelines in conjunction with the influence of special interests groups that have contributed to the anemic, homogenized and even hostile curriculums to which many of our children are exposed. It is my hope to bring further attention to the problems posed by many of these guidelines and special interests.

Although textbooks and assessments are part of the problem, no discussion of history or civics education can be complete without consideration of State standards. Unfortunately, the influence of

the censorship and political correctness movements extends to this arena, too.

Since the publishers and assessment companies must to some degree mold their products to State standards, those standards impact how history is presented to our students.

Although today 48 States and the District of Columbia have spelled out in some form what children ought to learn in history and civics, many States do not have clear and thoughtful standards in these areas.

A new report from the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, released today, shows we still have a long way to go before all States have established clear and logical curricular frameworks. The report analyzed 48 States' and the District of Columbia's social studies and U.S. History standards for comprehensive historical content, sequential development and balance. Fordham awarded 11 States As and Bs, 7 States Cs, and 31 States Ds or Fs.

The report found that the majority of State standards neglect some of the most important historical figures, and political, social, cultural and economic events, and fall prey either to right-wing glossing over past injustices or left-wing politically correct posturing. Eleventh graders in one State, for example, are instructed to "analyze the reasons the United States is an imperialist nation," while high school standards in another State neglect to cover the rise of the KKK, the disenfranchisement of black voters and the spread of Jim Crow laws following the Reconstruction. Both types of misrepresentation are equally reprehensible and irresponsible.

The report also noted that: "Instead of correcting yesterday's distortions by presenting a balanced and complete national history for American students, State standards and curricula often replace old distortions with new ones . . . today's students can readily identify Sacajawea and Harriet Tubman but often can barely discuss Washington or Jefferson—except as slave owners."

The Fordham study follows on the heels of a report by the Albert Shanker Institute released earlier this year. The Shanker study found most of the States' standards to be inadequate, either stuffed with too many specifics and no clear priorities, or too vague and general to be useful to teachers.

The problem with history and civics education, like so many education issues, is not rooted in lack of money. Rather, the problem is rooted in biased and skewed perspectives promulgated by weak textbooks and standards.

Sadly, we will be unable to improve student knowledge and appreciation of the contributions of the U.S. and Western society if we continue to provide children with textbooks and assessments that lack an accurate, balanced, thought-provoking depiction of both U.S. and World History.

As we know, much of the world is hostile to Western values, and particularly American ideals and institutions. If we fail to demonstrate to our children why those ideals are worth fighting for, and if we fail to offer our children a balanced view of U.S. History and Western civilization, we risk letting those who oppose our ideals define us.

Senator ALEXANDER. We have distinguished witnesses today. Also following the way that Judd Gregg likes to do these so-called

hearings is to make them more of a discussion, because we want to take advantage of the witnesses' scholarship and experience. We want to make that a part of the record. We want people to know about it.

So the way that we will proceed is that I will make an opening statement and then, starting with Dr. Ravitch and moving across the line if that is all right, I will ask each of you to summarize your statements in 5 to 7 minutes and give us a good sense of what is there, make your major points, and then I will begin to ask questions, and as other Senators come, they will have a chance to do that, but I would encourage you to comment on your fellow panel members' comments as we go along.

I want to commend Chairman Gregg for convening what I consider to be a critical hearing on the State of textbooks that are used to teach our children. School textbooks today are in disarray. They have become overly boring, overly sanitized, and at times blatantly inaccurate. Censorship based on political sensitivity is now rampant in the textbook industry, and our children are suffering for it.

Textbooks today are subjected to bias and sensitivity reviews that are so stringent, much of our history and literature is censored. I know that that has been mentioned in your testimony, and I hope we get into a good discussion of these bias and sensitivity committees that Dr. Ravitch has written about especially.

Interestingly, this is not an ideological battle where forces of the left are beating up the right or vice versa. In reality, reviewers have bowed to the extremes of both sides, resulting in unintended conspiracy to deny reality.

In practice, as Dr. Ravitch explains in her new book, "The Language Police"—not too new; it has made a lot of bestseller lists—both the right and the left work to exclude certain topics or phrases that they find objectionable.

This morning, as an example, I visited a project of National History Day and U.S. News and World Report at the National Archives where they were announcing an effort which sounds to me like a lot of fun and a good way to encourage the teaching of American history and civics. They are going to ask school kids to vote on the 10 most important of 100 documents that are important in American history. Then they will report all of that. Well, it will be interesting to see what our students know about those documents and what opinions they have about the documents.

But what is even more interesting is that if you go to the back of Dr. Ravitch's book where she records what the bias and sensitivity committees suggest teachers not say or textbooks not print, most of the documents could not be studied in our schools in America.

I asked the interns in the office this morning just to run through those 100 documents, and they disqualified at least 70 of the 100 from any American history or social studies classroom based upon the advice of the bias and sensitivity committees which govern the textbooks that most classrooms have. Words like "Founding Fathers" out-go about 10 documents. Words like "race" or subjects like race—out goes Plessy v. Ferguson, a couple of Amendments to the Constitution, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Religion—we would not

want to discuss religion in classrooms in America, and of course, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 could therefore not be taught in a classroom because it expressly mentions religion. "In God we Trust," even though it is the national motto approved by Congress, could not be taught in the American classroom if you follow the advice of the bias and sensitivity committees.

So race, religion, and even three of the four major textbook bias and sensitivity committees suggest that using the words "America" or "American" would not be appropriate, which wipes out maybe ⅓ of the important key documents in the United States.

I hope we can talk more about this. I know that your testimony talks about it—but how did these bias and sensitivity committees ever get so much control over what is taught or not taught in our classrooms, leading to ridiculous outcomes?

Textbook publishers, who have a virtual monopoly on the market, are subject to immense pressures to portray life as interest groups wish it were, and they are bowing to these special interests. Not only do textbook companies routinely employ the bias and sensitivity reviews, like acknowledgment of the existence of Mount Rushmore, which might offend certain Lakota Indians, but they also attempt to preempt such reviews by providing guidelines to authors prior to writing textbooks.

The impact of the pressure exerted on publishers reaches further than just banning certain words and phrases. Information can be wildly skewed. For example, in history books, it is now common to read about pre-Columbian civilization in the Americas and their contribution to culture, while ignoring or dismissing some of their backward practices, such as the Aztec practice of human sacrifice. At the same time, the accomplishments of European civilizations are downplayed to the extent that some textbooks are more likely to tell about a university in Timbuktu than one in Oxford or Cambridge.

Sometimes these practices lead to blatant falsehoods which the writings of some of you have detailed. For example, it is not uncommon for American history textbooks to assert that the ideal of American democracy is descended from the practices of Iroquois Indians, yet they produce no evidence that any of the Founding Fathers—a word we could not mention in the classroom—cited the Iroquois as the inspiration for the ideas in the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. Is it possible that some of the members of the Continental Congress knew of Iroquois practices? Yes. Is it clear that it significantly influenced their views? No, so we ought not to present it as a fact.

The last set of examples particularly concerns me. Since September 11, more than at any time in our generation, our country has gone back to school on what it means to be an American, to know our history and the values upon which our Nation was founded. In many American history classrooms, our textbook is the curriculum. Many teachers of American history were not students of history in college and are dependent upon the textbook for material. So if the textbooks are incomplete, misleading, or blatantly wrong, our children are growing up with a skewed view of our national identity or no idea of our national identity. We have to put a stop to this.

Former American Federation of Teachers President Albert Shanker once said at a meeting that I attended in Rochester, NY that "The common school was invented to teach immigrant children the three R's and what it means to be an American, with the hope they would go home and teach their parents." The common school therefore was founded to be one of the principal Americanizing institutions. How can we teach our children the values we share as Americans if words describing them are banned by language police at textbook companies?

For example, Congress made the national motto of our country "In God we Trust" in the 1950's. Yet today, to mention "God" in a textbook would cause a political earthquake.

Teachers must be free to discuss the fundamentally religious nature of our heritage and at the same time acknowledge the separation of Church and State, or at least the fact that we do not want an establishment Church as provided for in the First Amendment.

On the Seal of the United States, a Latin phrase appears: "E pluribus unum"—"Out of many, one." How can we become one people, one America, if we cannot acknowledge our common culture? How can our children understand our country if they do not know the great struggles we face? Most of our political history has been about two things—struggling to achieve the idealistic values we ascribe to and dealing with disappointments when we do not reach them, and then balancing those competing values when they conflict with each other in the discussion of specific issues.

If our history books ignore these conflicts and deny those common values, our children will never know what it means to be an America.

Our witnesses today are four, and I will introduce all four of them and then ask them to proceed. And I will not give them the full introduction that all four deserve; I will do it briefly.

First, Dr. Diane Ravitch is a research professor at New York University School of Education and a nonresident Senior Fellow at The Brookings Institution and one of the most eminent, if not the most eminent, historian of American education. She is the former Assistant Secretary of Education for the United States. She was in charge of educational research and improvement from 1991 to 1993. She has won plaudits from both political parties and from many people in this country. She was appointed, for example, to the National Assessment Governing Board by Secretary Richard Riley in 1997 during the Clinton Administration and was appointed by President Bush as Assistant Secretary of Education.

Her new book, "The Language Police," is almost a sourcebook for this hearing or a discussion like this, in any event.

Gilbert Sewall is the distinguished president of the Center for Education Studies, where he directs the American Textbook Council. He has reviewed a lot of history and social studies textbooks in his time. He has authored many textbook reports. He is a former instructor of history at Phillips Academy and professor at New York University and Boston University. Like Dr. Ravitch, he has written many books. He was education editor of Newsweek.

Dr. Sandra Stotsky was senior associate commissioner in the Massachusetts Department of Education. She has directed complete revisions of the State's standards in English, math, science,

history, geography, civics, and economics. Those standards are recognized by those who work as among the best in America and ones which other States might well emulate.

Finally, Robert Hagopian, a teacher. He has taught eighth grade United States history for more than 32 years, the last 30 of which have been at Scotts Valley Middle School in Santa Cruz County, CA. He is a member of the National Council for History Education. He has a wide variety of academic plaudits, but for our purposes today, his most important credential is that he is an eighth grade teacher of United States history. We especially look forward to his comments about what is happening in the classroom about textbooks and standards.

Dr. Ravitch, why don't we begin with you?

STATEMENTS OF DIANE RAVITCH, RESEARCH PROFESSOR, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, NY; GILBERT SEWALL, DIRECTOR, AMERICAN TEXTBOOK COUNCIL, NEW YORK, NY; SANDRA STOTSKY, FORMER SENIOR ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, MALDEN, MA; AND ROBERT HAGOPIAN, TEACHER, SCOTTS VALLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL, SCOTTS VALLEY, CA

Ms. RAVITCH. Good morning, Senator Alexander.

I must say that I was fortunate to serve under one of the great Secretaries of Education in the United States, so it is a pleasure to be here this morning.

What was particularly appropriate to me was that as I was on the shuttle this morning, I read a front page story in The New York Times that Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton's autobiography has been edited, words have been deleted, in China to remove all references to her comments about her experiences in China. I was fascinated by this because, of course, it echoes so much of what I saw as I was preparing the study that was published as "The Language Police."

I want to make a distinction, which is that many of the restrictions that were described in your opening statement apply more to testing than to textbooks. The testing publishers are very rigorous in that if any complaint comes in from any direction, they are very fast to drop a word or a phrase and take it out. So you will sometimes see those phrases in textbooks. You will see some discussion of religion; if anything, it tends to be almost reverential. One of the problems in the world history textbooks is that they tend to tell the story of each religion as that religion would want it to be told, because the material is not being presented historically; it is being present as its adherents would like to see it presented, which is also misleading, to teach, let us say, creation myths as if they were historically documented.

I have had in my life in education two experiences that have kind of broken me beyond the bounds of academia. One was working in the Department of Education and the other was working over these past several years a member of the National Assessment Governing Board. It was as a member of the NAGB board, or NAGB, that I encountered this process called "bias and sensitivity review." I was astonished when the publisher, who had been selected by a consortium of test publishers, gave us guidelines and

told us, "These are the words, these are the topics, these are the images that cannot be portrayed in any passage on a test."

These were not ethnic slurs or terms that really expressed bias as anyone who would recognize it. These were ordinary words. For example, a child cannot encounter the word "pumpkin." Why can't a child encounter the word "pumpkin"? Well, because that would suggest Halloween, and Halloween would suggest witches, and witches are frightening. Some of these things are just off-the-wall.

One of the stories that was deleted as a test topic was a story about Mount Rushmore because, as you pointed out in the opening statement, Mount Rushmore is offensive to the Lakota Tribe that lives near it, apparently—at least the test publisher thinks so—so Mount Rushmore cannot be portrayed in a standardized test.

The same thing for owls—owls are tabu. They frighten certain children.

It just goes on and on—you cannot have a story about peanuts, because some children are allergic to peanuts. I guess that would carry over to tomatoes and to shrimp and to everything that anyone anywhere is allergic to.

What I did in "The Language Police" was a very carefully-documented study of the way that censorship has changed the content in textbooks and in tests and the impact that it has had particularly in the fields of history and literature. This has happened first of all because States have allowed these pressure groups to make tremendous demands on the publishers, so the publishers now self-censor in order to bring their materials to the marketplace. And as a result of this self-censorship that goes on, I found close to 1,000 common words and phrases and topics and images that are routinely deleted from stories by the educational publishing industry.

Stories by well-known authors have been rewritten or deleted from textbooks and from standardized tests because a bias and sensitivity review committee objects to certain topics or language.

Now, no one can possibly object to the removal of material that expresses bias against a racial group or gender or any specific group, but what few people realize today is that the educational publishing industry is using a new definition of "bias" and "insensitivity" that defies common usage. In most instances that I have found, words and topics that you will find in your daily newspaper are routinely removed from textbooks stories and from tests.

Many of the classic American novels and stories like Mark Twain's "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn" or John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath"—and you could extend this list on and on—would have difficulty and in fact would not get passed a bias and sensitivity review board today.

The result of this process called "bias and sensitivity review," which is now the industry standard—it is done by every State, it is done by every publisher of textbooks and tests—is that it dumbs down educational materials, it reduces the vocabulary that children encounter, and it withholds from students a realistic portrayal of the world today.

Now, in my book, I give lots of examples from tests and also from textbooks of material that has been dropped. I continue to get emails from people in the publishing industry giving me additional examples.

One that came to me just recently was that over this past summer, a bias review committee in New Jersey preparing a test for 11th grade high school students rejected a short story by the famous African American writer Langston Hughes because he used the words "negro" and "colored person." Those were the words that were appropriate when he was writing, and we cannot Langston Hughes' prose or delete the words, so the story was out.

Every mass market publishers of textbooks and tests has what they call "bias and sensitivity guidelines," and these guidelines list the words, topics and images that they will not permit writers or illustrators to use. There is an extraordinary sensitivity to everyone's self-esteem, including the self-esteem, apparently, of many tyrannies. Just today, in fact this morning, I got a delivery by courier from the American Federation of Teachers of the newest issue of The American Educator, in which I have an article called "Leaving Reality Out: How Textbooks Don't Teach about Tyranny." And I reviewed six of the most widely-used world history textbooks and examined how they deal with Cuba, China, fundamentalist Islam, and Africa, and looking at how they deal in particular with tyrants. How they deal with it is to be so even-handed that children are denied knowledge of what tyranny is. Children are supposed to learn all the good things that Castro did in addition to repressing the Cuban people. They are supposed to learn about all the wonderful accomplishments of Mao and of his courage and his daring and how he controlled inflation and reduced taxes—he just sounds like a politician similar to those in our own society, except that he happens to be responsible for the deaths of 30 or 40 million people.

It is this kind of exquisite concern about not offending anybody that reduces the interest level as well as the reality level of what is in the textbooks.

Major publishers today tell their writers that they must be careful about using words like "American," because if you say "American foreign policy," you are referring to the foreign policy of all of Latin America, South America, and North America, and no such policy exists. So you must be careful of this word, because it suggests, quote, "geographical chauvinism."

They advise writers not to use the word "brotherhood." The word "brotherhood" is almost universally banned because it is sexist. Several publishers have banned the term "Middle East." They suggest that it be replaced by "Southwest Asia." How are students to make sense of headlines that refer to the crisis in the Middle East when all they know is about "Southwest Asia"? Of course, what is Southwest Asia south and west of—but that is another question.

Another term that is banned is "Orient." Other terms that are banned are "manpower" and "primitive" and "congressman," heaven forbid.

The pressure groups that demand censorship of textbooks and test passages do not come from one end of the political spectrum. They are right wing, left wing, and every other kind of wing. Anyone with a strong objection is likely to get a passage deleted or a story dropped if they object loudly enough and long enough.

It is not my intention today to blame the textbook publishers or the testing agencies as the primary culprits. They do not want to produce a bad product. They want to sell books and tests. To do

so, they must avoid controversy. They cannot afford to have some group of people, even if it is only a handful, picketing at the State textbooks hearings and stigmatizing their product as racist or sexist or dangerous or extremist. They may not like to have to censor their products, but they have to do it to sell them.

By now, the publishers are so used to excluding stories in which women are nurturing mothers and deleting photographs of poverty in the Third World that they just assume that there is no other way to publish a textbook. This reign of censorship and sensitivity is now the way things are done.

The root cause of this censorship is the current situation in which a score of States screen, select, and buy textbooks for the entire State. The two most important States in this regard, because of their size, are California and Texas. Because of the power of these two States, the entire textbook publishing industry is a warped market. Instead of a marketplace with millions of consumers, the market is dominated by the decisions of these two States.

The consequence of this situation is twofold. First, it has provided a convenient bottleneck where pressure groups from across the spectrum, whether representing feminist, anti-evolutionist, or some other assertive groups, can intimidate publishers and get them to revise their books. To avoid tangling with these groups, publishers have rewritten their textbooks and now routinely censor out what they know will be objectionable to almost anyone.

Second, the very expensive, high-stakes nature of the State adoption process has accelerated the consolidation of the textbook industry. A generation ago, there were many, many American textbook publishing companies. In recent years, small publishers have gone bankrupt or merged with mega-corporations, leaving only four or five big publishing houses dominating a $4 billion industry.

When one corporation owns half a dozen different publishing companies, it does not have much incentive to keep several different competing textbooks in print. In effect, the textbook adoption process has diminished competition.

I would go further and say that the loss of competition has also resulted in a loss of quality. Teachers say the same thing. I hear it from them frequently. The books are huge, stuffed with gorgeous graphics, dazzling to look at, but they are dull, dull, dull.

I do blame the States. The States should abolish the textbook adoption process. They should not choose the textbooks that the State will pay for. To me, this is akin to saying that the Government will give away free tickets to certain movies, will pay for certain newspapers, and will allow you to watch certain approved TV programs, but anyone who wants to see or read something different has to pay for it themselves. I think it is wrong.

The States should abolish this process and allocate the States' resources for materials on a per-pupil basis.

I would like to commend to you today the new review of State U.S. history standards by Dr. Sheldon Stern, which was released this week by the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, of which I am a trustee. I would also like to commend the legislation that was introduced by you, Senator Alexander, to sponsor teacher training academies in history and other related activities.

I think that anything the Federal Government and State governments, as well as universities and private industry, can do to improve our teachers' knowledge of history is a very welcome improvement.

Thank you indeed.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Dr. Ravitch.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Ravitch follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DIANE RAVITCH

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is Diane Ravitch. I am a historian of education at New York University and have held the Brown Chair in Education Policy at the Brookings Institution for the past ten years. I served as Assistant Secretary for the Office of Education Research and Improvement from 1991–1993, during the administration of President George H.W. Bush. Since 1997, I have served as a member of the National Assessment Governing Board, to which I was appointed by Secretary of Education Richard Riley.

I have written or edited many books about American education. My latest, "The Language Police: How Pressure Groups Restrict What Students Learn," was published a few months ago. It is a detailed, closely documented study of the way that censorship has changed the content of textbooks in history and literature, as well as the passages used on standardized tests.

I wrote this book because of what I learned while serving on the National Assessment Governing Board, which oversees national testing in many subjects. I discovered that testing agencies, publishing companies, State education departments, and the Federal Government routinely restrict the use of certain words, phrases, topics, and images. The process for screening materials for tests and textbooks is called "bias and sensitivity review."

As a result of my study, I found that the censorship of words, phrases, topics, and images is widespread throughout the educational publishing industry. Stories by well-known authors have been rewritten or deleted from standardized tests and from textbooks because a bias and sensitivity review committee objects to certain topics or language.

No one can possibly object to the removal of material that expresses bias, but what few people realize today is that the educational publishing industry is using a new definition of bias and insensitivity that defies common usage. In many instances, words and topics that appear in the morning newspaper are routinely removed from tests and textbook stories. Many classic American novels and stories—like Mark Twain's "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn" or John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath"—would have difficulty passing a bias and sensitivity review board today.

The result of the bias and sensitivity review process is to dumb down educational materials, to reduce the vocabulary that children encounter, and to withhold from students a realistic portrayal of the world today.

Let me offer some examples:

As a member of NAGB, I saw test passages eliminated because they allegedly were biased or insensitive. In one case, the bias committee objected to a story because it mentioned Mount Rushmore. The committee said that the Indian tribe that lives in the vicinity of that national monument considers the monument itself offensive; it recommended that the story should be dropped.

In another case, a true story about a blind young man who climbed Mt. McKinley in an ice storm was eliminated. The bias committee said that students who had never lived in the mountains couldn't understand a story that was set in the mountains; that was considered regional bias. They also rejected the story because they said it was demeaning to blind people to treat this young man as an inspiring hero; blindness, they suggested, should not be treated as a handicap to be overcome.

Just this past summer, a bias review committee in New Jersey rejected a short story by the famous African American writer Langston Hughes because he used the words "Negro" and "colored person." Sorry, but those are the words that were appropriate when he was writing. The same committee rejected a story by NPR's Garrison Keillor because it referred to a student whose mother had died of cancer. The committee decided that this comment—set in the middle of an autobiographical story—was too frightening for 11th grade students to see.

Every mass-market publisher of textbooks and tests has compiled what they call "bias guidelines" or "sensitivity guidelines." These guidelines describe the words, topics, and images that they will not permit writers or illustrators to use. The test-

ing agencies are more restrictive than the textbook publishers, but all of them remove words and topics that some pressure group is like to object to.

In Appendix 1 of "The Language Police," I compiled a list of over 500 words that publishers have told writers and editors to avoid.

Major publishers, for example, tell writers to be careful about using the words "America" or "American" because they suggest "geographical chauvinism." They also advise writers not to use the word "brotherhood" because it is sexist. Several publishers ban the word "Orient." And one must never use the words "manpower" or "primitive" or "Congressman."

One constant rule for writers and editors is that any word that begins or ends with the three letters "man" or "-ess" is unacceptable. As a writer, I almost always use gender-neutral words, but I hate the idea that a publisher can tell me that I can never refer to mankind or an actress. That choice should be the writer's. When David Brinkley died recently, the New York Times ran a tribute to him called "David Brinkley, Anchorman," but that headline could not be printed in a textbook. When the Academy Awards offers Oscars for Best Actress, as they do every year, they are violating the rules of the textbook industry.

When a bias committee encounters words like these, they change them or delete them, regardless of the purposes of the author. Textbook publishers and testing agencies fault classic literature because writers of earlier centuries used words that are today considered objectionable. The president of a major testing company told the assessment development committee of NAGB that "Everything written before 1970 was either racially biased or gender biased."

The pressure groups that demand censorship of textbooks and test passages do not come from one end of the political spectrum. They are rightwing, leftwing, and every other kind of wing. Anyone with a strong objection is likely to get a passage deleted or a story dropped if they object loud enough and long enough.

The story gets worse when you consider the topics that are routinely banished from tests and frequently removed from textbooks as well. The test contractor who was preparing the voluntary national test in reading gave our NAGB committee a package of guidelines that told us which topics are unacceptable. Here are a few of them: Scary creatures like rats, mice, snakes, and roaches; disease; evolution; expensive consumer goods; magic and witchcraft; personal appearance, such as height and weight; politics; slavery; racial prejudice; fables; Halloween; religion; social problems; violence; someone losing their job; catastrophes like earthquakes and fires; poverty; or any references to junk food.

The rationale for excluding so many topics—and this is just a sampling—is that unpleasant topics might upset children, and they won't be able to do their best on the test. But, in the absence of any research to demonstrate the need to banish so many topics, the likelier explanation is that these issues upset grown-ups. There are various groups that consider these topics highly controversial, and they don't want children to be exposed to them. As I show in "The Language Police," small groups from very conservative religious backgrounds have objected to any mention of evolution, fossils, dinosaurs, witches, fantasy, or disobedient children in textbooks or tests. They have successfully intimidated publishers and State testing agencies to comply with their wishes.

The Harry Potter books are the most popular books in the United States. But they are also the most banned books in the U.S. because they prominently feature witches, witchcraft, fantasy, disobedient children, and a dysfunctional family. These are themes that publishers avoid. For that matter, a trio of witches appears in Shakespeare's Macbeth, and there is quite a long tradition of fantasy, witches, disobedient children and other forbidden themes in fairy tales and lots of other classic literature.

Yet because of the objections of people who hold strong religious and political views, stories that contain these topics are routinely screened out of textbooks to protect our nation's children. Are they protected? Of course not. They watch television and movies, where they see far worse things than witches and dinosaurs. The net result of this regime of censorship is simply to make the textbooks and tests banal and boring, thus reducing the possibility for getting children excited about what they read.

Now, it is not my intention to blame the textbook publishers or testing agencies as the primary culprits. They don't want a bad product. They want to sell books and tests. To do so, they must avoid controversy. They cannot afford to have some group of people picketing at the State textbook hearing and stigmatizing their product as racist, sexist, dangerous, or extremist. They may not like to censor their books, but they have to do it to sell their books in States that have a State adoption process. By now, the publishers are so used to excluding stories in which women are nurturing mothers and deleting photographs of poverty that they just assume

that there is no other way to publish a textbook. This reign of censorship and sensitivity is now the way things are done.

The root cause of the censorship that I describe is the current situation in which a score of States screen, select, and buy textbooks for the entire State. The two most important States in this regard, because of the size of their student enrollment, are California and Texas. These two States enroll about 20 percent of the nation's student population. They call the tune, and the publishers dance.

Because of the power of these two States, the entire textbook publishing industry is a warped market. Instead of a marketplace with millions of consumers, the market is dominated by the decisions of these two States.

For a textbook publisher even to compete in California or Texas, they must invest millions of dollars upfront in a speculative product. If they don't win a contract, they may go under.

The problem with this situation is two-fold.

First, it has provided a convenient bottleneck where pressure groups from across the political spectrum—whether representing feminists, anti-evolutionists, or some other assertive groups—can intimidate publishers and get them to revise their books. To avoid tangling with these groups, publishers have rewritten their textbooks and now routinely censor out what they know will be objectionable to any of these groups.

Second, the very expensive, high-stakes nature of the State adoption process has accelerated the consolidation of the textbook industry. A generation ago, there were numerous American textbook publishing companies. In recent years, small publishers have gone bankrupt or merged with megacorporations, leaving only four or five big publishing houses dominating a $4 billion industry. When one corporation owns half a dozen different publishing companies, it doesn't have much incentive to keep several different textbooks in print, competing with one another. In effect, the textbook adoption process—whereby the State buys texts for all schools in certain grades—has diminished competition.

I would go further and say that the loss of competition among textbook publishers has also resulted in a loss of quality. Teachers say the same thing. I hear it from them frequently. The books are huge, stuffed with glitzy graphics, dazzling to look at, but dull, dull, dull. The history books are comprehensive, but dull, dull, dull. They are written by committee, edited by committee, choppy, superficial, and careful to offend no one. Let me say again that I don't blame the publishers. They are operating in the only marketplace that they know. Of course they prefer to make a sale to the State of Texas or California rather than selling to millions of teachers. It is easier for them, and it allows them to say that they are just complying with the States' standards by removing certain words, phrases, topics, and images. Frankly, I wish the publishers would defend the First Amendment by calling attention to any restriction on their freedom to publish. It is not good enough, I think, to defend the restrictions by saying that they are just responding to the wishes of the marketplace.

I do blame the States, however. They should abolish the textbook adoption process. They should not choose the textbooks that the State will pay for. To me, this is akin to saying that the Government will give away free tickets to certain movies, and anyone who wants to see something different must pay for it themselves.

Instead they should abolish the State textbook adoption process and allocate the State's resources for educational materials on a per-pupil basis. Schools and teachers should use that money to buy the books or software or whatever they think works best for them. The States set the standards, but they should leave the schools and teachers free to meet them as they think best.

On the subject of State standards, I respectfully commend to the committee's attention a brand new study of State U.S. history standards, off the presses today, written by Dr. Sheldon Stern, who served for many years as the historian of the John F. Kennedy Library in Boston. Dr. Stern evaluated the standards of the 48 States that have them, plus the District of Columbia, on their handling of U.S. history—the first time this has ever been done by a historian. He found that six States—Indiana, New York, Alabama, Arizona, California and Massachusetts—have established outstanding academic standards for U.S. history, but that eight have weak standards in this key subject; fully 23 States have U.S. history standards that Dr. Stern terms "ineffective". Considering the central role that statewide academic standards play in determining what our teachers teach and what our children learn, this bleak picture deserves your attention. Dr. Stern's study was prepared under the aegis of the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, of which I am a trustee.

Later this year the Fordham Institute will release a new study under my direction, which evaluates textbooks in U.S. history and world history. A dozen prominent historians cooperated in preparing this study.

I testified earlier this year on behalf of the legislation prepared by Senator Lamar Alexander to sponsor teacher training academies in history and other valuable activities. Anything that the Federal and State Governments, as well as universities and industry, can do to improve the knowledge of our teachers is a welcome improvement.

Education is a complicated, multi-faceted activity. It has many moving parts. We certainly need well-prepared teachers. We also need excellent textbooks, tests, and standards. As I tried to show in my book, "The Language Police," and as Dr. Sheldon Stern shows in his review of State history standards, we do not have them now.

Thank you for your attention.

Senator ALEXANDER. Mr. Sewall?

Mr. SEWALL. My name is Gilbert Sewall, and I am pleased to be here today.

I think that what we are looking at today is a matter of extreme importance educationally.

For 14 years, I have been the director of the American Textbook Council, an independent, New York-based educational organization that reviews history textbooks and social studies curricula. The American Textbook Council is dedicated to improve instructional materials and civic education nationwide.

Since 1989, the Council has identified many problems with history textbooks. In American Textbook Council reports and in persuasive books such as Sandra Stotsky's "Losing our Language" and Diane Ravitch's "The Language Police," textbook critics reached the same conclusions—textbook content is thinner and thinner, and what there is is increasingly deformed by identity politics and pressure groups.

The first history textbook problem is what educators, critics and journalists informally refer to as "dumbing down." Many history textbooks reflect lower sights for general education. They raise basic questions about sustaining literacy and civic understanding in a democratic polity and culture. Bright photographs, broken format, and seductive color overwhelm the text and confuse the page. Typeface is larger and looser, resulting in many fewer words and much more white space. The text disappears or gets lost. Among editors, phrases such as "text-heavy," "information-loaded," "fact-based," and "nonvisual" are negatives. A picture, they insist, tells a thousand words.

This declining textbook quality is neither a left nor right issue. Publishers are adjusting to short attention spans and nonreaders. Too many children cannot or do not want to read history, which contains concrete facts and complicated concepts, reading that requires some facility with language. So textbooks become picture and activity books instead.

The second history textbook problem—increasing content bias and distortion—involves political judgments. The critique of distorted content in history is of course a problematic one. One person's distortion is another's correction. Yet the list of textbook activists grows. It spans gender, ethnic, religious, environmental and nutrition causes that want to use textbooks to advance their agendas. The defenders of the revised history textbooks claim that textbooks used to be racist, sexist, ethnocentric, and jingo; now, they are not. This is a political half-truth, a spurious and calculated claim, but it has been an effective one politically.

A large part of the problem rests with the textbook publishers. The consolidation of educational publishing from a domain in which

many independent, competing companies created and sold textbooks has changed the field. Today, four defensive, revenue-driven, multinational corporations—Pearson, Houghton Mifflin, Harcourt and McGraw-Hill—offer fewer and fewer standard textbooks for States and teachers to choose from.

None of these publishing giants shows the least interest in innovation, change, or offering books that come closer to meeting the wishes of textbook critics and State-level curriculum reformers. Instead, publishers cater to pressure groups, for whom history textbook content is an extension of a broader political or cultural cause. They make books whose content is meant to suit the sensitivities of groups and causes more interested in self-promotion than in historical fact, scholarly appraisal, or balance. They are, more likely than not, listening to the wrong voices.

The collaboration of educational publishers with pressure groups and textbook censors is disturbing. Determining what history children will learn, who will be heroes and villains, what themes will dominate, and what messages will be sent are crucial subtexts in civic education. At worst, biased instructional materials are undermining students' appreciation for America and citizenship.

In American history, establishment of responsible government, development of a national economy, extension of democracy to blacks and women, influence in world affairs, a rising standard of living for most if not all, seems the main casualty of the multicultural idea.

Massachusetts, Virginia, and California have all produced strong history standards. Still, a gulf exists between these State standards and textbook content. California adopts textbooks through a State-level process. The most recent history adoptions in California, 1999, and Texas, 2002, indicate that these two key States are no longer really selective about the history textbooks that they adopt—nor can they be given the problem of four mega-publishers that exert iron control over the market.

Publishers claim that they are only responding to State pressure and State standards. They say the State adoption process is already an open public process. In fact, textbooks that States adopt may conform minimally and mechanically to State standards. State and local textbook adoption procedures rarely, if ever, address matters of style and textual quality. The main point of State review as far as I can discern is to comply with detailed guidelines for representation and to give pressure groups a chance to vent and bully.

Publishers should be producing cheaper books that are more text-centered, simpler in design and more honest in content. They are failing to do so.

Meanwhile, a growing number of concerned educators and parents of all political stripes are asking for history textbooks that are easy to ready and understand, that tell a story, that are compact, legible and accurate, that do not "jump around." They want history textbooks free of the political pressure groups willing to corrupt schoolbook history in order to advance their single interest. The four giants in educational publishing are ignoring these commendable efforts in order to maximize their revenues.

Thank you.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Sewall follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GILBERT SEWALL

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my experience with history textbooks and publishing goes back some 25 years. In 1978, I was the co-author of an American history textbook, *After Hiroshima: The U.S.A. since 1945*. For 14 years, I have been director of the American Textbook Council, an independent New York-based educational organization that reviews history textbooks and social studies curricula. It is dedicated to improving instructional materials and civic education nationwide.

Since 1989, the Council has identified many problems with history textbooks. In American Textbook Council reports and in persuasive books such as Sandra Stotsky's *Losing Our Language* and Diane Ravitch's *The Language Police*, textbook critics reach the same conclusions. Textbook content is thinner and thinner, and what there is, is increasingly deformed by identity politics and pressure groups.

The first history textbook problem is what educators, critics and journalists informally refer to as "dumbing down." Many history textbooks reflect lowered sights for general education. They raise basic questions about sustaining literacy and civic understanding in a democratic polity and culture. Bright photographs, broken format and seductive color overwhelm the text and confuse the page. Typeface is larger and looser, resulting in many fewer words and much more white space. The text disappears or gets lost. Among editors, phrases such as "text-heavy," "information-loaded," "fact-based," and "non-visual" are negatives. A picture, they insist, tells a thousand words.

This declining textbook quality is neither a right nor a left issue. Publishers are adjusting to short attention spans and non-readers. Too many children cannot or do not want to read history, which contains concrete facts and complicated concepts, reading that requires some facility with language. So textbooks become picture and activity books instead.

The second history textbook problem—increasing content bias and distortion—involves political judgments. The critique of distorted content in history is, of course, a problematic one. One person's distortion is another's correction. Yet the list of textbook activists grows. It spans gender, ethnic, religious, environmental and nutrition causes that want to use textbooks to advance their agendas. New heroes in leading textbooks—Mansa Masu, Anne Hutchinson, Rigoberta Menchu, Chico Mendez, and Anita Hill—are designed to advance a political agenda that highlights and ennobles people of color, peace advocates, anti-colonialists, environmentalists, and wronged women. One-time historical giants like Julius Caesar and Marcus Aurelius, Copernicus and Magellan, George Washington and Napoleon, Charles Darwin and Sigmund Freud, Albert Schweitzer and Winston Churchill play supporting roles.

The defenders of the revised history textbooks claim that textbooks used to be racist, sexist, ethnocentric, and jingoistic, and now they're not. This is a political half-truth, a spurious and calculated claim, but it has been an effective one.

A large part of the problem rests with the textbook publishers. The consolidation of educational publishing from a domain where many independent, competing companies created and sold textbooks has changed the field. Today, four defensive, revenue-driven multinational corporations—Pearson, Houghton Mifflin, Harcourt and McGraw-Hill—offer fewer and fewer standard textbooks for States and teachers to choose from.

None of these publishing giants shows the least interest in innovation, change or offering books that come closer to meeting the wishes of textbook critics and State-level curriculum reformers. Instead, publishers cater to pressure groups for whom history textbook content is an extension of a broader political or cultural cause. They make books whose content is meant to suit the sensitivities of groups and causes more interested in self-promotion than in historical fact, scholarly appraisal, or balance. They are, more likely than not, listening to the wrong voices.

Unlike in the college textbook market, where authors write their own books and market shares for each textbook are small, "el-hi" history textbook authors have such minimal control over their product that authorship is to be doubted. The big names become involved—i.e., lend their names to the enterprise—for the money. Publishers have shrunk their editorial and production staffs, moving toward a writing-for-hire production system and abandoning the royalty-based author system. Some new secondary-level history textbooks have no authors at all. Authors have been replaced by a long list of contributors, censors, and special pleaders, concerned first of all that history meets the standards of multiculturalism.

When multiculturalism promised a reformed social studies curriculum of "inclusion" in the 1980s and early 1990s, its almost universal appeal lay in its pledge to broaden the nation's understanding of minorities and ordinary people who had been unduly ignored by "presidential" and "elitist" history. Thus multiculturalism calls for a reformed history of new voices with a distinct political subtext. The American epic is transformed into a fight and triumph over white, elite, patriarchal, "European" oppression. From the age of exploration to the present day a slanted, anti-traditionalist, shaming story of oppression runs as a thematic thread.

National history standards developed in 1993 and 1994 provided outlines and thematic cues for social studies publishers involved in textbook content revision. These standards ratified historical content and themes that social studies editors had been incorporating into textbooks for longer than a decade, changes often being made under activist pressure. But content makeovers had occurred unbeknownst to most people except textbook publishers, curriculum specialists, and political activists, which is the main reason they were greeted with such public alarm and condemnation in the Senate in 1995. The historian Gordon S. Wood of Brown University said of these history disputes: "So what might seem to be a petty academic debate about the nature of historical writing in fact has momentous implications for the kind of nation that we Americans want to be."

The collaboration of educational publishers with pressure groups and textbook censors is disturbing. Determining what history children will learn, who will be heroes and villains, what themes will dominate, and what message will be sent are crucial subtexts in civic education. At worst, biased instructional materials are undermining students' appreciation for America and citizenship. In American history—establishment of responsible government, development of a national economy, extension of democracy to blacks and women, influence in world affairs, a rising standard of living for most if not all—seems the main casualty of the multicultural idea.

Massachusetts, Virginia and California have all produced strong history standards. Still, a gulf exists between State standards and textbook content. California adopts textbooks through a State-level process. The most recent history adoptions in California (1999) and Texas (2002) indicate that these two key States are no longer really selective about the history textbooks that they adopt. Nor can they be, given the problem of four mega-publishers that exert iron control over the market.

Publishers claim that they are only responding to State pressure and State standards. They say the State adoption process is already an open, public process. In fact, textbooks that States adopt may conform minimally and mechanically to State standards. State and local textbook adoption procedures rarely, if ever, address matters of style and textual quality. The main point of State review, as far as I can discern, is to comply with detailed guidelines for representation and to give pressure groups a chance to vent and bully.

Publishers should be producing cheaper books that are more text-centered, simpler in design, and more honest in content. They are failing to do so.

Meanwhile, a growing number of concerned educators and parents of all political stripes are asking for history textbooks that are easy-to-read and understand, that tell a story, that are compact, legible and accurate, that do not "jump around." They want history textbooks free of the political pressure groups willing to corrupt schoolbook history in order to advance their single interest. The four giants in education publishing are ignoring these commendable efforts in order to maximize revenues. Thank you.

Ms. STOTSKY. Thank you very much for the privilege of being here.

I am speaking today first as an administrator in the Massachusetts Department of Education, responsible for the development of all of our basic standards in the past several years, revisions of earlier documents. I am also speaking as an educational researcher for many, many years and am familiar with contents of reading programs, curricular materials in all subject areas, and materials that are used for professional development across the curriculum, about which I will have some specific remarks toward the end of my remarks here.

I am here to suggest that an understanding of our basic political principles and our civic identity as a people are at stake in the conflicts taking place today over State history standards and textbooks. Academically sound and strong history standards will not

completely solve the problem of how to strengthen the study of history in K–12 and promote civically meaningful student achievement, but they will help a great deal.

Today, for example, the traditional U.S. history course, with its in-depth study of the Founding and the Framers, has almost disappeared under the weight of "multiple perspectives." It has become, a course in social, not political, history. The result is uninformed civic participation, if any at all.

Today, many educators from my experience in Massachusetts, seek to use study of U.S. and world history to create hostility to the U.S. in particular, to Western values in general, and to eliminate a national identity for Americans. They want Americans to see themselves as global or world citizens, with a cross-national racial, ethnic, or gender identity as their primary identity. I enclose a recent resolution by the Boston City Council as evidence for this statement.

In Massachusetts, history standards were mandated in the Education Reform Act of 1993. After 3 years of battles, the first standards were approved in 1997. At that time, the main content charge by critics was that it was "eurocentric." The Boston Globe praised it for precisely that reason.

In 2001, we began to revise it, and I was now the administrator in the department responsible for that revision. The revision was mandated by law and was also needed because of various flaws in the 1997 document. The flaw was not because it was eurocentric in orientation; there were other problems with the standards.

We tried to correct all of the flaws that we saw, and we all felt that the new 2002 document, which I have a copy of here, addresses all those limitations. It was fully supported by the commissioner, the board of education, the Governor's office, and key legislators. It had broad bipartisan support in Massachusetts. We were very happy about that.

Unlike most other States' documents, it provides teachers with only one set of content standards to address at each grade level, together with related concepts and skills, and addresses the basic subjects of the history and social science curriculum—economics, geography, and civics or government.

To unify this document across the grades and across both U.S. and world history, the document suggests a few overarching themes on the origins and development of democratic principles, democratic institutions, and individual freedoms. It is not a politically correct document. Its standards provide the basis for an honest curriculum about the U.S. and the rest of the world.

During the process and before the vote on the document, there were many critics and many charges and many attempts to undo or redo certain aspects of the document. One of the major charges was a concern about the nature of the early standards having a strong emphasis on children's identity as American citizens. Some critics felt that this was going to be "offensive" to some children—that was a word that was used.

There were other little anecdotes that would give you some clues about the problems with even the geography curriculum. We had a battle over where Mexico is. I finally had to have someone call the Mexican Embassy to ask where the Mexicans think Mexico is.

It was not in Latin America. They did not want American children to see it in Middle America, Central America, or Latin America. North America is what we were told by the vice consul.

We had a problem about where Afghanistan was after 9/11. Some members of the committee wanted to take it out of the Central Asian republics and put it in the Middle East. We said no—it was going to stay where it had been for thousands of years—one of the Central Asian republics.

So these were minor little skirmishes along the way to getting these standards. Critics came out with larger kinds of concerns. They were very unhappy about the omission of anthropology, sociology, and psychology in the document, which was revising an old quarrel between social studies and history educators. They did not like our overarching themes because they did not like the current themes on the evolution of democratic principles and personal freedoms but could not quite say that directly. They charged the document as being too prescriptive, too many facts, too many standards, promoting "drill kill," rote memorization, leaving little room for creative teaching—the usual way to dismiss a document. They complained there were not enough standards on Africa, Asia, and South America before the 15th century. They found the document too Eurocentric and proposed instead and provided details for an "Islamocentric" curriculum—and I have copies of that as well. They perceived the standards we did have on Islam as biased if not racist, because they addressed problematic as well as positive aspects of Islamic civilization.

The critics did not succeed in getting basic changes and did not delay the vote. There is a question of how soon the document's standards can serve as a basis for assessment, and one of the chief critics who was at that time head of the superintendents' association keeps threatening to come up with an alternative set of standards and literally keeps trying to discourage the schools from implementing our standards.

The standards are very important to have, but I say that they will not address the whole problem because we have teachers who would like to address the new standards but do not have adequate materials to use. Many of course lack adequate knowledge of U.S. and world history themselves and are at the mercy of grossly misleading curricular materials, if not simply inadequate.

But in my judgment, the most serious problem we face with respect to the curricular materials does not stem from the textbooks produced by mainstream educational publishers but from the materials and consultants provided by professional development centers in our schools of education and by nonprofit organizations for use in the endless stream of professional development workshops that teachers are mandated to take. These centers and nonprofits tend to be ideologically driven, often have personal contacts with school personnel that are stronger than mainstream educational publishers have, and they tend to bypass public scrutiny altogether—the scrutiny that textbooks receive.

One Massachusetts organization, a nationally active one, is promoting in its workshops and curricular materials for professional development a moral equivalence between Nazi Germany and the U.S. in materials on the American eugenics movement, implying

that the U.S. is responsible not only for Hitler's racial policies but ultimately for the Holocaust. Another is promoting reparations for slavery in its materials.

These organizations and centers are regular partners in proposals with school districts for State and Federal grants.

The other problem is that our undergraduate history departments which produce the prospective history teacher do not tend to teach much political or intellectual history to prospective history teachers these days or, as I am told by many historians, they do not tend to hire professors with specialties in U.S. political history. Therefore, we end up with teachers who now need this endless stream of professional development because they have not had the adequate background in their undergraduate years and have inadequate text materials to deal with.

Academically sound materials matter because they guide academically honest and conscientious teachers and Statewide assessments. They will guide publishers of curricular materials and textbooks in States where there is accountability. They also serve, as they do in Massachusetts, as the basis for licensing regulations and tests for prospective history and government teachers. This is a very important area, because there is the basis for examining what the prospective teacher brings to the classroom. And they can serve as the basis—and this is a recommendation I am making—for judging the quality of undergraduate history and political science courses in institutions that prepare prospective teachers if Federal funding is tired to high cut scores on teacher tests in history and government or on college exit exams that reflect the academic and civic content of good history and civics standards for K–12. Thank you very much.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Ms. Stotsky.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Stotsky follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SANDRA STOTSKY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am here today to suggest that an understanding of our basic political principles and our civic identity as a people are at stake in the conflicts taking place today over State history standards and history textbooks or other curriculum materials. Academically sound and strong history standards will not completely solve the problem of how to strengthen the study of history in K–12 and promote civically meaningful student achievement. But they will help a great deal. I speak as the administrator in the Massachusetts Department of Education responsible for the development of the 2002 Massachusetts History and Social Science Curriculum Framework. I also speak as an active participant in local community life. I served as an elected trustee of my public library for 14 years and as an elected Town Meeting Member for 10 years. I also served as president of my local chapter of the League of Women Voters. I fully understand the need for informed civic participation and community service to make self-government meaningful.

Civic education has typically taken place through the history curriculum in units on local and State history in the early grades, a 1-year course on U.S. history usually in grade 11, and a middle school course in State and Federal Government. Over the past 100 years, however, there has been a steady decline in the teaching of history through the grades. During the early decades of the twentieth century, the social studies—a mix of history, political science, geography, civics, anthropology, sociology, psychology, and current events—emerged and steadily gained ascendance. As a school subject, it has always had participatory goals, but it has always been academically erratic in approach because it lacks a clear disciplinary framework. And the results speak for themselves.

Today the traditional U.S. history course, with its in-depth study of the Founding and the Framers, has almost disappeared under the weight of "multiple perspec-

tives." It has become a course in social not political history, leaving teachers little time to help students understand the historical and philosophical basis for, as well as contemporary applications of, our political principles and procedures. The result is uninformed civic participation, if any at all. Although some of the ignorance may be dispelled by a grade 12 course in U.S. Government, only 17 percent of the high schools in Massachusetts, for example, require such a course for graduation.

It is not easy today for States to develop academically sound and civically responsible history standards. Many educators (and others) seek to use study of U.S. and world history to create hostility to the U.S. in particular, and to Western values in general, and to eliminate a national identity for Americans. They want Americans to see themselves as "global" or "world" citizens, with a cross-national racial, ethnic, or gender identity as their primary identity. (e.g., see the attachment: A recent Resolution by the Boston City Council on how Columbus Day is to be celebrated in the future.) No help is available from national standards because those produced by the National Council for the Social Studies and the National Center for History in the Schools at UCLA were and remain ideologically biased, causing State-by-State battles over State standards.

In Massachusetts, statewide history standards were mandated in the Education Reform Act of 1993–1994. After a 3-year series of battles, the first set of standards was approved in 1997 by the Board of Education. At that time, critics charged it with being "Eurocentric," but the Boston Globe praised it for precisely that reason. The Department of Education began revision of the 1997 document in 2001. Revision was mandated by law and was badly needed because of major problems with the 1997 curriculum framework, but not because of its "Eurocentric" orientation.

To begin with, the 1997 document lacked specific grade by grade content standards. What it did offer as standards were four separate sets of statements for the study of history, geography, economics, and civics/government for 4-year grade spans. These statements were chiefly expressions of broad intellectual processes or academic goals. Although the document contained excellent lists of core topics and commonly taught subtopics for U.S. and world history, these topics were not written in the form of standards nor arranged developmentally. Nor did the document require a list of seminal documents taught to all students. Its fundamental flaw was that the standards it provided for the grade 10 test required for graduation were in world, not U.S., history.

The 2002 curriculum framework addresses all the limitations of the 1997 document and is fully supported by the Commissioner of Education, the Board of Education, the Governor's Office, and some key legislators—i.e., broad bipartisan support. At most grade levels, recognized historical periods in U.S. or world history serve to organize history standards reflecting the core topics of the 1997 document but integrating the relevant content of geography, civics, and economics. Thus, unlike most other States' documents, this document provides teachers with only one set of content standards to address at each grade level, together with related concepts and skills. At the high school level, the document provides standards for two continuous years of study of U.S. history. These standards are to serve as the basis for the test required for graduation. To unify study across the grades and across both U.S. and world history, the document suggests a few overarching themes on the origins and development of democratic principles, democratic institutions, and individual freedoms. This is not a politically correct document. Its standards provide the basis for an honest curriculum about the U.S. and the rest of the world.

The U.S. history standards: (1) emphasize American history, geography, and who we are as a people in the early grades; (2) present a balanced view of the Puritans and the development of our educational, political, and economic institutions in the Colonial period; (3) offer strong standards on the Framers and the Founding and on our political principles and institutions, their origins and evolution, in grades 3–5 and high school; (4) stress the Founding as politically revolutionary, not as a reflection of the thinking of slave-owning sexists; (5) require reading of a variety of seminal U.S. political documents in high school; and (6) expect students to understand the multi-ethnic, multi-racial, and multi-religious nature of the people of the U.S., with particular reference to the history of African Americans.

The world history standards: (1) clarify the roots of Western Civilization (a moral code stressing individual worth and personal responsibility, and the origins of democratic institutions and principles); (2) address the presence, nature, and history of slavery in non-Western as well as Western cultures; (3) address enough British and European history to ensure coverage of the history of democratic institutions/principles there and in the U.S.; (4) provide for systematic learning of world geography; (5) expand coverage of Islamic history because of Islam's role in shaping African and Indian/Southeast Asian history and the problems in Muslim-dominant countries today; (6) limit coverage of early Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Indian history, as

well as native cultures in the Western hemisphere and in Africa, to avoid a mile-wide, inch-deep curriculum and to address teachers' criticisms of the 1997 document; and (7) eliminate comparative study of world religions in the elementary and middle grades because of age-inappropriateness for meaningful comparisons.

Before the vote on the document, the critics—chiefly social studies or multicultural educators—set out a number of complaints. (1) They quarreled with the omission of anthropology, sociology, and psychology, and a lack of encouragement of political activism—reviving the old quarrel between social studies and history educators. (2) They claimed the document lacks "overarching" themes because they don't like the current overarching themes on the evolution of democratic principles and personal freedoms. (3) They charged that the document is too "prescriptive," has too many facts and too many standards for each grade, promotes drill and kill and rote memorization, and leaves little room for "creative" teaching. (4) They complained there aren't enough standards on Native Indians and on Africa, Asia, and South America before the 15th century. (5) They found the document too Eurocentric and proposed, instead, and provided details for, an Islamocentric curriculum. And (6) they perceived the standards on Islam as "biased" if not "racist" because they addressed problematic as well as positive aspects of Islamic civilization (such as asking students to learn about the trans-African slave trade to the Middle East and to explain why Islamic societies failed "to keep pace" with Europe after 1500).

Who were the critics? The chief critics were (1) a superintendent who at the time was head of the Massachusetts superintendents' association and was once head of "Educators for Social Responsibility" and (2) a network of educators and politicians spanning Harvard's Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Boston University's African Studies Center, an organization called Primary Source providing consultants and curriculum materials to the schools, and the Boston City Council.

These critics have used a variety of strategies, first to try to delay the vote on the standards, then, after the vote, to try to distort the State assessments to be based on them and to delay implementation of the standards by the schools. In the final stage of preparing the document for a vote, the head of the superintendents' association sent inaccurate information about the document to all the other superintendents in the State, asking for their signatures on a petition to send to the Department seeking delay and major revisions before Board approval. Both sets of critics requested non-public meetings with the chairman of the Board, the Commissioner, and/or Department staff to present the changes they wanted in the final draft. Several critics communicated regularly with some Department of Education staff (through telephone calls and requests for meetings) to get changes made—almost to the point of harassment. Almost no changes were made because the requests were outside of a public process, the suggestions were unsound or unacceptable, and most teachers/administrators did not want the vote delayed (and did not support the critics).

After Board approval of the document, allies of the critics got themselves placed on Assessment Committees responsible for developing future State tests in history. They sought but failed to get someone in their camp in charge of these assessments at the Department. They did help to get a delay to 2009 for the first statewide assessments to be based on the new standards on the grounds that teachers need all that time to put new curricula in place. In addition, the superintendent who was head of the superintendents' association keeps threatening to come up with an alternative set of standards and keeps trying to discourage the schools from implementing the standards.

We face other problems in implementing these standards. Many schools do not have enough money to buy new textbooks or other materials to address topics they have not been teaching. Teachers who want to address the new standards have few sound textbooks to use. Many lack adequate knowledge of U.S. and world history themselves—and are at the mercy of inadequate or often grossly misleading curriculum materials. In my judgment, the most serious problems we face with respect to curriculum materials in history, geography, and civics do not stem from the textbooks produced by mainstream educational publishers but from the curriculum materials and consultants provided by "professional development" centers in schools of education and by non-profit organizations for use in the endless stream of professional development workshops teachers are mandated to take. These centers and non-profits tend to be ideologically driven, often have better personal contacts with school personnel than do mainstream educational publishers, and by-pass the public scrutiny that textbooks may receive. They can easily politicize the entire curriculum in the vacuum created by neutered textbooks. One Massachusetts-based but nationally active organization is promoting a moral equivalence between Nazi Germany and the U.S. in its workshops and materials on the American eugenics movement,

implying that the U.S. is responsible for Hitler's racial policies and, ultimately, the Holocaust. The Massachusetts-based organization that is part of the network of critics is pushing reparations for slavery in its curriculum materials. Organizations and centers like these are regular partners in proposals with school districts for State and Federal grants.

The long delay before the first statewide tests in 2009 leaves many Massachusetts schools with little motivation to address the new standards quickly, especially if their K–12 coordinator or superintendent is opposed to them and hopes for political changes in the State by then. Worse yet, undergraduate history departments do not tend to teach much political or intellectual history to prospective history teachers these days or hire professors with specialties in U.S. political history to teach it. This major problem should be addressed in the Reauthorization of Higher Education Act. Unfortunately, most parents, school boards, and other citizens do not know how to use State standards in constructive ways to promote more academic curricula in their own schools.

Academically sound and explicit history standards matter a great deal. They serve as a guide to academically honest teachers and statewide assessments. They guide publishers of curriculum materials and textbooks in States where the schools must teach to the standards because there is accountability for student learning that is tied to State tests based on the standards. They also serve (as they do in Massachusetts) as the basis for licensing regulations and tests for prospective history and government teachers. And they can serve as the basis for judging the quality of undergraduate history and political science courses in institutions that prepare prospective teachers if Federal funding is tied clearly to high cut scores on teacher tests in history and government or on college exit tests that reflect their academic and civic content. Thank you.

Resolution

Boston City Council

(2003)

Whereas, throughout its history the City of Boston has been a community of immigrants from places all over the globe who have been attracted to its economic opportunities, world-class cultural and educational institutions, and its openness to new ideas and peoples; and

Whereas, the City of Boston has, in turn, benefited the global community through the contributions of its multi-ethnic citizenry to democratic ideals and progressive innovations in science, theology, medicine, governance, human rights, the arts, and numerous other fields; and

Whereas, the Boston Public Library, the oldest publicly supported municipal library in America, is inaugurating a new map exhibit entitled "Faces and Places" that celebrates the diversity of Boston's citizenry and the development of the rich texture of its neighborhood communities over the years; and

Whereas, The Mary Baker Eddy Library for the Betterment of Humanity, Boston's newest library open to the general public, is inaugurating a new exhibit in its world-famous Mapparium entitled "Words for the World" that features the voices of children sharing their grandest ideas and hopes for the world; and

Whereas, it is entirely fitting and proper at this point in our history to recognize the interconnectedness of our municipal community with the global community and to honor specifically the unique role of "Boston in the world and the world in Boston;"

Therefore, Be It

Resolved: That the Boston City Council, in meeting assembled, declares that October 11, 2003, and hereafter every Saturday of the Columbus Day weekend be "World Citizens Day" in the City of Boston and calls upon its citizens to participate in such community activities as are appropriate to the occasion.

HOW STUDY OF THE HOLOCAUST IS TURNING AMERICA INTO AMERIKA

SANDRA STOTSKY

(To be published in **Understanding Anti-Americanism: Origins, Symptoms, and Consequences**, Paul Hollander, Editor, Chicago: Ivan Dee, Spring 2004 (Not to be cited or quoted from without permission))

About a decade ago, I gave an invited talk at a session of the New England Association of Teachers of English (NEATE). In it, I criticized a growing tendency by English teachers and literature anthologies to use literature about the Holocaust for

implying similarities between Nazi concentrations camps and the internment camps for the Japanese Americans during World War II and ignoring differences. In the question and answer period following my talk, several teachers in the audience expressed great concern about my remarks. They believed their students should see "the essential similarities" between Nazi concentration camps and the internment camps for Japanese Americans and felt that any discussion of differences would be "a whitewash."

But shouldn't students see a difference, I suggested, between an experience in which people left a confinement alive and in good health and one in which they left in the form of smoke and ashes? More important, I added, shouldn't they consider why there were differences and how our political principles and institutions might account for them?

Showing some annoyance at my questions, these teachers professed that they did not see the differences as significant. In addition, they encouraged their students to see similarities between Nazi concentration camps and America's "concentration camps" for Native Americans, and between the European Holocaust and the "Holocaust" perpetrated by European explorers and settlers on these peoples through the introduction of deadly contagious diseases.

These teachers had a particular moral point of view about Americans that they wanted to inculcate in their students, and they clearly did not want their students' judgments colored by any ambiguity. We have no way of knowing exactly how successful they and teachers like them have been. But many educators, especially in the social studies, have made a mammoth effort in the past two decades to use study of the Holocaust to make students think that their country's history resembles the history of the Nazis and that there is little difference between most white Americans and the Nazis. Most of them probably believe they are helping their students understand the evils of racism and intolerance, but the "lessons" they have guided students to extract from their study of the Holocaust may be one of the major sources of anti-American attitudes in education.

This essay describes how literature about the Holocaust is being used in an increasing number of schools in this country—and more recently in Europe—to imply a moral equivalence between Nazis and white Americans, and to cultivate a negative attitude toward white Americans, American citizenship, American history, and American political institutions. Nothing could more effectively delegitimate American society than to encourage young students to believe that it can be compared with Nazi Germany. Other features of current history curricula or history textbooks contribute to this goal, such as an emphasis on the Framers of the Constitution as slaveholders or the near absence of information on racism and slavery in non-Western civilizations, but none is as poisonous (or as profoundly ironic) as the effort to use the literature about the Holocaust for this purpose. However, the efforts to do so, both in this country and abroad, are not well-known to those outside of K–12, and they are rapidly increasing in method and sponsorship. Indeed, the study of the Holocaust has recently begun to be used with a new and diabolical twist—to encourage students to view the U.S. as ultimately responsible for the Holocaust.

Moral Equivalence in the English Class

Leading school literature anthologies published during the 1990s imply moral equivalence in a variety of imaginative ways.[1] Most often, the literary context for a selection on the Holocaust is used for this purpose. For example, in its grade 8 anthology, Prentice Hall's 1994 Literature pairs the play based on Anne Frank's diary with a play based on Virginia Hamilton's The House of Dies Drear. The latter play centers on a mysterious old house in Ohio whose underground tunnels and caves were used by its wealthy abolitionist owner over 100 years ago to help runaway slaves. The two plays are implicitly linked by the central importance of the house in each play—in both cases a house that sheltered people needing protection from racists who would destroy their freedom if not their lives. They are explicitly linked by two pages entitled "Multicultural Connection." These pages describe the rise and fall of Adolph Hitler, explain the term "Holocaust," and provide figures on

[1] The publishers cited in this section were the major publishers of school anthologies during the 1990s and their anthologies are likely still in use in the schools because of the costs in replacing them. Moreover, even if State law mandates new textbook adoptions every five years, there are rarely drastic changes in content from one edition to another (every five years or so) because of the cost of changing the contents of an entire anthology and because teachers have favorite selections they want to continue teaching. However, there is no way to determine exactly what students read in these anthologies because teachers exercise their own idiosyncratic choice in what they assign students in their own classrooms. Nor is it possible to obtain exact sales figures from the publishers (or other sources), in a highly competitive and fragile market, to determine how many of their anthologies were sold to the schools in any one period of time.

the different kinds of people who died in Eastern Europe as a result of persecution. What is of particular interest is that these pages do not make or invite any explicit comparison between the Nazis and white slaveowners. The teaching apparatus for each play simply informs students that it reflects the theme of "The Just and the Unjust," making it reasonable for students to infer that the counterpart to the unjust in Anne Frank's story are the white racists who condoned or profited from slavery. The issue is not that they were unjust; the issue is that they were not Nazi-like in their behavior.

As another example, the context for Anne Frank's story in McDougal, Littell's 1994 grade 8 anthology also uses a story about black Americans to link Nazi Germany to America. In a unit thematically titled "The Will to Survive," the play is offered by itself under the title "The Invincible Spirit" but is then followed by a group of short pieces ranging widely in mood and topic under the title "Caught in Circumstances". The first work in the group is a fictional story by Paulette Childress White about the indignities suffered by a black family that is forced to go on welfare because of the father's loss of a job; the story is narrated by the 12-year old daughter as she accompanies her mother to the welfare office. It is immediately followed by Langston Hughes's poem, "The Dream Keeper," a poem that suggests how harsh the real world is for anyone with dreams. It is unlikely that students will miss the implied connections to Anne Frank's story.

It should be noted that the popularity of the play "The Diary of Anne Frank" in the secondary school curriculum long antedates the current moralism on intolerance. English teachers began to introduce the play or the diary itself (and sometimes Elie Wiesel's semi-autobiographical Night) to secondary students decades ago because these works are moving personal accounts of the Holocaust presented through the eyes of sensitive adolescents. One can find the play based on Anne Frank's diary or an excerpt from it in the six leading literature anthologies for grade 8 (including the two described above), in one literature anthology for grade 6, and in one instructional reader for grade 7 used in the 1990s. Night is also taught frequently in grades 9 through 12, to judge by the presence of excerpts from it in two grade 12 anthologies and by individual trade book sales. Both these works continue to deserve a place in school literature programs for literary and social reasons even though students may no longer be asked to read them to gain an appreciation of the strength of the human spirit in the face of evil.

Four grade 8 anthologies link the Holocaust to racism in America through an implicit comparison of Nazi concentration camps to the internment of the Japanese Americans on the West Coast during World War II. Scott Foresman's l991 anthology does so in an ingenious manner. Although it groups "The Diary of Anne Frank" with an excerpt from a play about an elderly woman in France during the occupation who pretends to be a collaborator of the Nazis in order to help their intended victims (a laudable context because it helps to bring out the character of the Dutch family who hid the Frank family), the last selection in the unit directly preceding the play about Anne Frank is Yoshiko Uchida's short story "The Bracelet." This story is about a young Japanese American girl's loss of a bracelet given by a school friend before her family is taken from their home by bayonet-armed soldiers to an internment camp with barbed wire strung around its grounds. The textual contiguity of "The Bracelet" and "The Diary of Anne Frank" clearly suggests that the editors of this anthology saw common elements and wanted to help students see them too. Further, this editorial point of view is consistent across the textbooks in this series. The grade 11 anthology in this series, which is devoted to American literature, places Elie Wiesel's Nobel Prize Acceptance Speech directly after selections by Lorraine Hansberry and Ralph Ellison, both understandably highlighting prejudice against blacks in this country.[2]

Contiguity of selections, however, is not necessary for a link to be made between the internment of the Japanese Americans and the Holocaust. All that is necessary is the presence of information about the internment camps somewhere in the anthology. Two anthologies find novel ways to bring in this information. In an earlier unit in the anthology, before "The Diary of Anne Frank" appears, McDougal, Littell's 1994 anthology offers a letter written by William Tsuchida to his brother

[2] Although Wiesel is now an American citizen, it is not clear why his Acceptance Speech—or any of his work—constitutes American literature. Selections from Night are contextualized appropriately from a thematic perspective in the two grade 12 anthologies that feature them. In one, the selection is placed under the thematic title of "The Twentieth Century: Searching for Meaning" and among a group of works by well-known European authors. In the other, the selection from Night appears with Wiesel's Nobel Prize Acceptance Speech in a section titled "Facing Death" containing thematically related works from the Romantic and Victorian Periods, 1800–1900. The only problem with this placement is that all the works in this section are supposed to be from those periods.

and sister who were confined in an internment camp while he was serving in the U.S. Army during World War II. The letter says nothing about the internment camps, but the editors make use of the letter (which they put into the anthology even though it is not a literary selection) to give students information about the internment camps. Holt, Rinehart and Winston's 1993 anthology gives students the information in a different way. It presents a short story by Yoshiko Uchida as the introduction to its grade 8 anthology, and although the story is not about the internment experience but about a young Japanese woman on her way to America to marry a Japanese man who had already immigrated to America and made his fortune here, the biographical description at the end of the story notes that Uchida "experienced firsthand the discrimination to which many Japanese Americans were subjected during World War II," adding that she spent "a year with her family in a concentration camp for Japanese Americans in Topaz, Utah." In Holt, Rinehart and Winston's 1997 anthology, the Uchida story and biographical information no longer appear. But one follow-up activity (p. T 436) to "The Diary of Anne Frank" suggests discussing Martin Luther King and civil rights, Eleanor Roosevelt and women's rights, and Mohandas Gandhi and non-violent protest, while another follow-up activity (p. T 443) suggests comparing Night or Ruth Minsky Sender's The Cage with Farewell to Manzanar, a poorly written autobiographical piece of white-guilt literature about the experiences of a very young Japanese American girl in one of the internment camps. The editors figured out how to imply similarities by noting that "all three are autobiographies by people who were imprisoned during World War II because of their religious or national background."

Prentice Hall's 1994 anthology lays the groundwork for the link in yet another way. It includes in a poetry unit directly following "The Diary of Anne Frank" a letter in the form of a poem, conveying what a young girl might have written to a friend in response to the executive order from the U.S. government requiring the Japanese on the West Coast to report to Relocation Centers for internment.[3] Thus, four of the six grade 8 anthologies facilitate links between Nazi death camps and Japanese American relocation camps, albeit in very different ways. Yet, not one directly asks students to discuss the implied parallels.

Grade 8 teachers can easily imply the analogy, if they so choose, even when they happen to be using an anthology with a Holocaust selection that contains nothing on the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II. They may simply ask their students to read, in addition to "The Diary of Anne Frank," Farewell to Manzanar. It is frequently recommended for grade 8 students. Indeed, in a sourcebook for teachers published by the California State Department of Education, a study question for Farewell to Manzanar suggests that students "compare Manzanar with the German concentration camp in I Am Rosemarie" (a story about a young Dutch Jewish girl who is deported with her whole family to a Nazi concentration camp).[4] The sourcebook does not suggest that they discuss differences as well. Students can thus be helped to make an association between Nazi extermination camps and the relocation camps for Japanese Americans regardless of what is in the literature anthology used by the class. Moreover, whether or not there is class discussion about the differences in the real-world outcomes for the Japanese Americans and the European Jews, students will likely see the internment of the Japanese Americans solely as an expression of anti-Japanese prejudice because complete information is rarely given in the text or the teaching apparatus on how the policy was formulated, by whom, and the limitations of its scope. Indeed, the lack of detailed information on this historical episode in the teaching apparatus, given that discussions based on accurate details are unlikely in an English class, reinforces the impression that the editors may not have been averse to creating an unambiguously negative image of Americans during World War II.

Grade 8 teachers can also easily imply the analogy or make it explicit, if they so choose, when they happen to be using an anthology with a selection on the internment of Japanese Americans but without a selection on the Holocaust. Many grade 8 teachers assign "The Diary of Anne Frank" as an independent literary text to supplement the literature anthology they use. That might well be the case for grade 8 teachers using Macmillan McGraw Hill's 1997 grade 8 anthology Spotlight on Literature; it contains several selections on the Japanese internment.

---

[3] A connection with discrimination against blacks and women is facilitated by the following unit, which includes a journalist's account, based on interviews with survivors, of what happened to Anne Frank, her family, and Dutch friends after they are discovered by the Gestapo. This account is directly followed by an essay by Shirley Chisholm on the prejudice that blacks and women have to overcome in this country.

[4] Page 114 in "Literature for all Students: A Sourcebook for Teachers," a product of a California Literature Institute, published by the California State Department of Education in 1985.

Is it possible that the appearance of these particular pieces by Japanese American authors in these four grade 8 anthologies is a result of happenstance? It seems unlikely for several reasons. No selections on the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II appear in anthologies for grades 7 or 9. With only one exception, no literature on the Holocaust appears at these grade levels. Nor do stories or essays on the internment of the Japanese Americans appear in anthologies for grade 11, which tend to focus almost exclusively on American literature. An anthology on American literature is not an appropriate place for Holocaust literature, but it would be for works by Japanese American authors on the internment experience if they are works of literary merit appropriate for high school students. Nor is it the case that the only publishable works by Japanese American writers are those that focus on the internment experience. To the contrary, other pieces by Japanese American authors, including many by Uchida herself, appear at other grade levels.

One may reasonably conclude that the editors of these four anthologies wanted to make it possible for students to see a connection between the Nazi extermination camps and the relocation camps for Japanese Americans. Moreover, one may also conclude that the editors are aware that these two phenomena are not parallel expressions of racism despite some surface similarities, and that it would be unethical to imply that they were or to invite students to compare them without providing further information on the limits of our wartime policy and the reasoning of our president, the courts, and others in approving the policy. I draw this conclusion precisely because the teaching apparatus in the anthologies that contain information or selections on the internment of the Japanese Americans never suggests to teachers that they have their students compare the two phenomena. And it is an accepted practice for editors to ask students to compare two or more works in an anthology.

Literature anthology editors who want Anne Frank's diary or the play based on it studied as a literary text and/or who want to reduce the possibility of false analogies use the literary context to direct the reader's attention to Anne Frank's character, to the theme of the work, and to the selection as an example of a particular literary genre or literary tradition. Macmillan offers the play in its 1991 grade 8 anthology as an illustration of the genre of tragic drama, preceding it with a comedy by Edmund Rostand. This dramatic contrast focuses the reader's attention naturally on Anne Frank's personal qualities. EMCParadigm Publishers suggests this contrast in genres in a different way; in its 1997 grade 8 anthology, the play is paired with a prose adaptation of Shakespeare's "A Midsummer Night's Dream." In McDougal, Littell's 1989 anthology and Holt, Rinehart and Winston's 1993 anthology, Anne Frank's story appears in other contexts that help students see her character as the central meaning of the work. McDougal, Littell does so by using an excerpt from the diary as an example of autobiography and then grouping it with an essay by Helen Keller, an excerpt from Of Men and Mountains by William O. Douglas, and "The Rose-Beetle Man" by Gerald Durrell. These are then followed by several biographical pieces, including one by Carl Sandburg about Lincoln and an excerpt from John Gunther's Death Be Not Proud, all of which provide a broad context highlighting individual faith, strength of will, and courage in achieving personal or social goals despite extraordinary physical or intellectual challenge if not the specter of death itself. In Holt, Rinehart and Winston, the play about Anne Frank is grouped with Carl Foreman's script for "High Noon," a dramatic work that emphasizes individual courage and integrity in the context of a community that has failed to take a moral stance.

What might anthology editors recommend as a possible moral lesson to be drawn from studying literature about the Holocaust, a lesson teachers might invite their students to discuss? Lucy Dawidowicz, a historian of the Holocaust, suggested in the last article she wrote before her death that "the primary lesson of the Holocaust" is the Sixth Commandment, "Thou shalt not murder."[5] She also believed that if the study of the Holocaust was to have application to this country, it should lead students to see the fundamental difference between a constitutional government ruled by law and authoritarian or totalitarian governments that legitimated persecution of a specific people and used terror to inculcate obedience or silence dissenters. How defenseless minorities are scapegoated in societies with problems their governments are unwilling or unable to address would be an appropriate question for a class to discuss after reading literature about the Holocaust. But I have yet to find such a question suggested for class discussion in response to reading the literature on the Holocaust. For meaningful cross-cultural comparisons of concentration camps, excerpts from A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch or Gulag Archipelago would be

[5] Lucy Dawidowicz, "How They Teach the Holocaust." Commentary, December, 1990, p. 31.

most appropriate and useful. Yet no excerpts from these works appear in the anthologies that include Holocaust literature, at least in those published in the 1990s.

Moral Equivalence in the Social Studies Class

Perhaps the strongest source of influence on the school curriculum suggesting a moral equivalence between Nazi Germany and America is Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO), an organization that provides materials and services to over 16,000 teachers ostensibly to help them address "racism, antisemitism, and violence."[6] Its web site conveys the scope of its activities, here and abroad. Although other Holocaust curricula are taught in some schools across the country, FHAO is by far the most popular source of training and materials on the Holocaust, and its prominence has increased since Steven Spielberg decided to give it income from showings of "Schindler's List." According to FHAO's web site, it now reaches over 1.5 million adolescents through its teacher network, and over 4,500 schools through regional offices in six major cities in the U.S., in addition to an office in Europe. FHAO describes itself as having an "interdisciplinary approach to citizenship education" and is supported by grants from many sources, including the Goldman Sachs Foundation and the Germenhausen Foundation, with the grant from the latter targeted to "expand outreach in Europe." The FHAO curriculum is flexible and can be taught over a long or a short period of time and at any grade level, although it most frequently takes about six to eight weeks to cover and is usually taught in grade 8 or 9. FHAO urges as much interdisciplinary cooperation between English and social studies classes as possible to help students "think deeply about issues of racism, prejudice and discrimination, and to be active participants in promoting social justice."

FHAO's goals and how it seeks to achieve them were spelled out in its first major resource book, titled Holocaust and Human Behavior, published in 1982.[7] This teacher manual was superseded in 1994 by a substantially revised resource book with the same title but now framed by the assumption of equivalence between Nazis and Americans and still in use.[8] In 2002, FHAO published an additional resource book titled Race and Membership in American History: The Eugenics Movement and has just begun to introduce this book at institutes and workshops, and to develop an online course based on the book. The contents of these three resource books reveal how this organization has evolved from laudable beginnings in the 1970s by a grade 8 social studies teacher in the Brookline Public Schools interested in moral education and in teaching about the Holocaust to become a major vehicle for smearing American history, American citizenship, and American science with the foul brush of Nazism. The contents also provide the basis for a case study in how the social activism underlying many of the K–12 curricular trends of the 1970s and early 1980s metasticized into the manipulative and malignant anti-American moralism of the 1990s and 2000s.

The 1982 resource book seeks "to promote awareness of the history of the Holocaust and the genocide of the Armenian people, an appreciation for justice, a concern for interpersonal understanding, and a memory for the victims of those events" (p. 13). It also seeks to make comparisons and parallels to past and contemporary issues, events, and choices when appropriate, with a major goal of helping today's students prevent an event such as the Holocaust from happening again. About 63 pages of the manual's 400 or so pages address the Armenian genocide.[9] The rest deal with the Holocaust, originally the sole focus intended by FHAO.[10] Because of

[6] Facing History and Ourselves Annual Report 2001–2002.

[7] Margot Stern Strom and William S. Parsons, Facing History and Ourselves: Holocaust and Human Behavior. Watertown, MA: Intentional Educations, 1982.

[8] Facing History and Ourselves: Holocaust and Human Behavior. Brookline, MA: Facing History and Ourselves National Foundation, Inc., 1944.

[9] The chapter on the Armenian genocide seems incoherently inserted into the FHAO curriculum because the manual fails to call attention to any of the extraordinary parallels in the histories of the Armenians and the Jews, both ancient peoples of the Middle East. The chapter on the Armenian genocide provides an informative chart on the origins and history of the Armenian people, a map of historic Armenia, information on how Armenians had seen autonomy if not independence during the nineteenth century as the best way for a religious and ethnic minority to be protected, and a brief note on how the Armenian response to their genocide by the Turks led to the establishment of an Armenian Republic (later taken over by the Soviet Union) and the desire of many Armenians to regain control of their lost homeland in Turkish Armenia.

[10] Although its scholarship on the details of the Holocaust is scrupulous, the historical framework FHAO offers for the study of the Holocaust in the 1982 (and 1994) teacher manual is crucially flawed. If the "final solution" was about anything, it was about anti-Semitism. Yet, only a 22 pages-long chapter provides reading selections on the history of the European Jews and on the causes of anti-Semitism. And it contains nothing on the origins of the Jewish people, their early history, and why so many were in Europe altogether, Western or Eastern. Nor are there later readings on the response to the Holocaust by what was left of world Jewry. Because

FHAO's stated belief at the time that a study of the Holocaust must have a "positive" ending[11] and that American social studies teachers would not find it useful unless it was connected to the need for active citizen participation in a democracy, the final chapter addresses political issues in contemporary American life.[12]

FHAO's goal of providing "positive" civic lessons for Americans is the source of the central problem with this curriculum. To enable teachers to use the study of the Holocaust for stressing the importance of citizen participation in America and for urging students to speak up and act in the face of perceived social wrongs, FHAO chose to rely on a psychological explanation for the behavior of the Nazis and of the Germans who supported or acquiesced in the Nazis' rise to power. In doing so, FHAO could portray the Nazis as exhibiting "human behavior" (hence the title of the resource book) in whatever they did. Such a conceptual framework seriously downplays the deep-rooted cultural and political forces that shape human behavior and differ considerably across cultures. A neglect of cultural and political forces well serves the purposes of the 1994 resource book. Although it contains little that explicitly connects anti-Semitism and the psychology of the Nazis and their supporters to America's social problems and the psychology of Americans, its conceptual framework has allowed small acorns to grow into mighty oaks.

The purpose for studying the Holocaust is now to confront "the history of racism and antisemitism at home and abroad" (p. xiii). The preface begins with a reference to an article by Marion Wright Edelman of the Children's Defense Fund about the struggle today "for the nation's conscience and future" as "the American Dream is collapsing," pitting American against American "as economic uncertainty and downturn increase our fears, our business failures, our poverty rates, our racial divisions, and the dangers of political demagoguery" (p. xiii). In the twelve years since the appearance of the first resource book, America has become in FHAO's eyes a nation consumed by hatred and violence. FHAO now sees our students as having been carefully taught to hate, and attributes "much of the violence that threatens our society" to "its roots in bigotry and hate" (p. xiii). This demonic view of American schools and American society is unrelieved throughout the book. If this curriculum had been designed for German educators, one might understand the melodramatic injunction in the preface that "we do not want yet another generation of young people influenced by propaganda to march blindly in someone else's parade" (p. xviii). Since we have not had such a generation in America, it is clear that America and Nazi Germany have merged as one country in FHAO's eyes.

The 1994 resource book leaves no stone unturned in its efforts to make sure that students see the task of confronting white racism in America as the chief reason for studying the Holocaust. Its first and last two chapters concentrate on racism and violence in American history and contemporary life. Such a framework enables FHAO to associate even Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln with the history of Nazism. The text points out that Lincoln regarded Africans as inferior in his early years, and notes Jefferson's status as a slaveholder and his words about Africans as a threat to "white racial purity" (pp. 76–77). Students are later asked to compare African Americans to European Jews (pp. 94–96). Questions in five other chapters also invite comparisons between events in American history (almost always

---

the Holocaust is so inadequately contextualized in this manual, students are unlikely to learn (in this curriculum) how much the Holocaust influenced the determination of Jews after the war to re-establish a country of their own so that they could become a nation like other nations, what their ancient homeland had been, and why they chose to return there. Nor are they apt to examine the manifestations and sources of contemporary anti-Semitism. The 1982 manual almost completely ignores contemporary anti-Semitism—its continuing virulence in some of its traditional settings and its new sources elsewhere. Only five pages in this manual offer short readings dealing in any way with contemporary anti-Semitism, and these pages appear in the same 22 pages long chapter on the history of the European Jews—before the manual discusses German history, the rise of Hitler, and the Holocaust itself.

[11] Telephone conversations with Margot Strom and her associate, Steven Cohen, April 1989.

[12] In its final chapter, the manual briefly suggests some parallels with My Lai or the experiences of the Japanese Americans and the Indians after carefully noting that while "no single historical event duplicates the Nazi deed, many share different aspects of the process that led to the death camps" (p. 219). Also played up briefly is the erroneous notion that Auschwitz is linked to "a cultural tradition of slavery" that is part of Western history only. Most of the material in the final chapter centers on three topics, which are the ones recommended for class discussion to encourage civic participation and moral decision-making: (1) the ruling by the State of Arkansas requiring equal treatment in the teaching of evolutionary theory and creationism in the schools, and the lawsuit by the American Civil Liberties Union charging that the ruling violated academic freedom, (2) the role of the Moral Majority with respect to freedom of speech, and (3) the use of nuclear weapons by the United States in World War II, the continuing development of nuclear weapons, and the potential for a nuclear holocaust without arms control. These topics were popular with social activists at that time, the last one in particular.

with reference to black Americans) and the history of racism, anti-Semitism in Europe, and the rise of Nazi Germany. FHAO's 1994 resource book moves back and forth with conceptual ease from Nazis to Americans and consistently ignores the possibility that what happened in Germany might best (or at least also) be understood as a political and cultural phenomenon. It makes explicit and frequent links not only between 20th century America and 20th century Germany but also between 19th century America and 19th century Germany.

For example, students are asked to compare the patriotism and military service of black Americans in World War I with the patriotism and military service of German Jews in Germany in World War I (p. 113). Activities of the Ku Klux Klan in America after World War I are compared to the rise of the Nazis in Europe after World War I, in addition to other parallels between Weimar Germany and post World War I America (pp. 125, 132, and 133); indeed, the Klan is elevated to a more prominent place in American history than the Democratic or Republican Party. The text also compares American schools and school texts in the 1930s and 1940s to German schools during the Nazi era (pp. 243–244) and asks students to compare Kristallnacht to an incident in Boston in which a rock was thrown through the window of a Vietnamese family (p. 267). Students are asked to discuss when the word holocaust is a useful metaphor for other events after the text points out that "African Americans have labeled their experiences with slavery and dehumanization a 'holocaust'" (p. 310). The book even closes with a query about whether the violence that it suggests is all about us in American life might lead to another Holocaust, clearly implying that the victims of this Holocaust will be African Americans (p. 564).[13]

In the March 1995 issue of The New Republic, Deborah Lipstadt expressed her unhappiness with the context into which FHAO placed the Holocaust in this resource book, pointing out that "no teacher using this material can help but draw the historically fallacious parallel between Weimar Germany and contemporary America" (p. 27). Not only did she criticize FHAO's efforts to insinuate this analogy, she also saw little to be learned from FHAO's efforts to link the Holocaust to Hiroshima, Nagasaki, the My Lai Massacres, or the mass murders in Cambodia, Laos, Tibet, and Rwanda as other examples of "mass destruction." It is worth noting that FHAO avoids references to the Soviet gulags, the inspiration they provided for the Nazi death camps, or the mass murders committed by communist regimes among its examples of mass destruction. Nevertheless, the 1994 resource book has very clear moral injunctions for Americans. Students must help make sure that white America ends what FHAO claims has been a denial of black American history; it must also apologize and make amends (pp. 505–513). And to reinforce the notion of how hurt blacks have been, the text offers in what may be its most incredible passage a sympathetic reference to Louis Farrakhan (and it is the only reference to him in this manual). He is deliberately singled out as one of those blacks who speaks "directly to the pain and pride" of all black people, with only a quick passing remark in the text that parts of Farrakhan's message "stereotype and demean other groups" (p. 507). Not even a clue that the very people he has stereotyped and demeaned are those against whom the Holocaust was directed. It is understandable why the 1994 text would find it difficult to discuss black anti-Semitism since it uses the Holocaust to portray America's blacks as Europe's Jews. But the attempt to whitewash Farrakhan can be judged only as morally perverse.[14]

FHAO's latest resource book, Race and Membership in American History: The Eugenics Movement (RMAH), is 356 pages long and consists of 76 chapters or lessons called "Readings." Its cover contains a montage of various faces, all unknown and

---

[13] FHAO has emphasized racism and violence in American life in its workshops and annual conferences on human rights over the past decade. For example, of the many workshops offered for the first annual FHAO Learn-A-Thon that took place in Brookline in May 1994, less than half dealt with the Holocaust itself. Almost all the other workshops dealt with social issues in America. These included "Science and Society: Retrieving the Forgotten History of the Eugenics Movement in the United States," "Lost Hopes, Shattered Dreams: The Streets of Boston Today," "Ordinary Heroes: Winners of the Reebok Human Rights Award," which featured a talk by a woman who is helping battered women, "Joining the Dialogue: Communities of Color and the Information Super Highway," "Teaching Children in Violent Times," "Respecting Differences: Towards a New Legal Definition of Family," and "Names Do Hurt Me: The Stereotyping of 'Non-Aryans' in Nazi Germany and of Asian Americans in the US Today." The range of social issues with which the study of the Holocaust has become associated is almost stupefying to consider.

[14] Deborah Lipstadt's expression of outrage in her New Republic article over FHAO's rationalization of Farrakhan's behavior in its 1994 resource book led to a flurry of activity by FHAO. There were about 20,000 books in FHAO's warehouse containing the page on which it had appeared, I was told Several months after the article appeared, I bought another copy of the book and found the passage no longer there. However, FHAO had neglected to remove Farrakhan's name from the index. It is still there even though the page it refers to contains nothing on him.

unidentified except for that of Adolph Hitler. These chapters contain snippets of primary source materials (excerpts from college textbooks, books written by scholars, speeches, editorials, personal anecdotes, and magazine articles), strung together by explanatory narratives authored chiefly, it appears, by an associate program director for FHAO, a former high school social studies teacher in the Brookline public schools. Each chapter is followed by "suggestions for independent research or group projects." According to the Foreword, RMAH was written to ask us "to rethink what we know about our own past. While barely remembered today, the eugenics movement represents a moral fault line in our history. It was a movement that defined differences in terms of racially superior and inferior human traits. Because these ideas were promoted in the name of science and education, they had a dramatic impact on public policies and the lives of ordinary people at the time and, in turn, created legacies that are still with us today. The eugenics movement is not a historical footnote. It is a fundamental chapter in our history that ought to be examined in our classrooms."

The Overview explains the connection to the Holocaust. RMAH "focuses on a time in the early 1900s when many people believed that some 'races,' classes, and individuals were superior to others," using a "new branch of scientific inquiry known as eugenics to justify their prejudices . . .", and while "in the United States, the consequences were less extreme," in Nazi Germany, "eugenics was used to shape and ultimately justify policies of mass murder." The brochure advertising RMAH also makes the connection clear, stating that "racism and eugenics had worldwide appeal. In Nazi Germany, they were used to justify the Holocaust. In the United States they limited opportunities for millions of Americans." To facilitate teachers' access to the readings that explain the "connections between the American eugenics movement and its counterpart in Nazi German," the Overview notes that, in a departure from previous practices (materials from its resource books have not appeared on its web site before), FHAO's web site now provides an instructional module with the readings that trace these connections.

What is the exact connection FHAO wants students to see? A causal one—that Americans and American science, however indirectly, were responsible for Nazi Germany's extermination policies and the Holocaust. There is no other conclusion American students can draw. Although RMAH makes clear that few American scientists subscribed to the eugenics movement by World War II, the chapters on "The Nazi Connection" artfully quote from various sources to indicate that Hitler drew upon the ideas of many respectable German scientists for his ideas on racial "eugenics" and that these German scientists not only supported Hitler and his use of their ideas but also acknowledged the leadership of American scientists, educators, and policy makers in the eugenics movement. Karl Brandt, the head of the Nazi program for the killing of the mentally disabled, is also quoted as telling the court, in his defense after World War II against the accusation of participating in government-sponsored massacres, that the Nazi program for the sterilization and elimination of "life not worthy of living" was based on ideas and experiences in the United States (p. 282).

FHAO also implies that the eugenics movement was the American equivalent to Soviet Lysenkoism in its effect on scientific development, although Lysenkoism is never mentioned in RMAH. On p. 274, RMAH quotes "scientist Jonathan Marks" saying in a 1995 book that if biologists "did in fact widely see the abuse to which genetic knowledge was being put, but refused to criticize [the eugenics movement] out of self-interest, they paid dearly for it. As historians of genetics have noted, the eugenics movement ultimately cast human genetics in such a disreputable light that its legitimate development was retarded for decades." Using this book as their informational resource, social studies teachers so-inclined would be able to suggest to their students that while Stalin might have retarded Soviet biology for decades by his support of Lysenko's ideas, American biology was retarded during these same decades by something even worse—racism and the goal of eliminating people, or the reproduction of people, with undesirable genetic traits. Any doubt about RMAH's ideological allegiance is dispelled by its praise of Henry Wallace as "one of the few American politicians to challenge both Nazi racism and American eugenics" (p. 283).

Despite the massive amount of citations and excerpts to prop up the book's implicit thesis and explanatory narratives, it is telling that FHAO fails to acknowledge even one biologist as a reviewer or to give a biologist's assessment of the influence of the eugenics movement on American science. Jonathan Marks is not a geneticist; he is an anthropologist by training and an associate professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of North Carolina-Charlotte. And, eminent scientists who *have* written about the history of evolutionary biology imply a very different judgment about the influence of eugenics on the history of American biology. For example, eugenics is mentioned in one short, four-sentence paragraph

in Evolution and the Diversity of Life, a 722-page collection of essays by Ernst Mayr on the history of important ideas and movements in evolutionary science.[15] Moreover, from the early 1920s to the late 1940s, American biology moved from a secondary position in world biology to the very forefront, as indicated not only by the size of the enterprise but by the number of Nobel prizes won by Americans and the number of leaders of biological and medical science here who had escaped from Nazism. FHAO itself provides no evidence that the legitimate development of American biology was "retarded for decades" by eugenics. It doesn't because it can't. All it can do is quote the judgment of an anthropologist.

A curious reader might also wonder why no biologists are quoted on their assessment of the influence of the eugenics movement on German science. Perhaps because they would support the judgment of Paul R. Gross, who writes:

Eugenics, positive and negative, has had no significant influence on the course of biological or biomedical science. Some of its sillier notions may have been used here and elsewhere, in the past, by racists as justification for their opinions; but there has been no visible effect on basic life science or the practice of medicine. The vast majority of biologists today, if asked to define 'eugenics,' would have trouble coming up with anything like a correct statement. Many would not have heard of it and most would be entirely unaware of its history. It has been forgotten, except by a few ideologues of the far left and right for whom it continues to be a *cause celebre*. There was some currency of eugenic ideas among social reformers and other intelligentsia—mostly non-biologists—in the period roughly from 1910 to 1935, and among the subset of racists and anti-Semites within that group. This made no visible difference to the character and progress of life science, in the United States or in Europe. To connect American eugenics with the Nazi Holocaust is a monstrous exercise in special pleading.[16]

The history of the eugenics movement should be better known. The American eugenics movement at the height of its influence was responsible for the forcible sterilization of thousands of Americans and did contribute ideologically and sometimes financially to the rise of Nazism in Germany.[17] Nevertheless, one must ask why an organization devoted to a study of the Holocaust should expend its energy compiling information on the history and influence of the eugenics movement in America as if it, rather than the centuries of negative cultural stereotypes and religious hatred of Jews in Christian Europe, were instrumental in the development of Hitler's Final Solution, a history FHAO has studiously ignored since its inception. In her critique of FHAO and other Holocaust curricula used in this country, Lucy Dawidowicz commented that the most serious failure she found was the omission of the history of anti-Semitism as a matter of public policy over the centuries and its roots in Christian doctrine. High school social studies teachers are likely to accept FHAO's implicit thesis and teach it to their students if FHAO's resource books are their only source of information on a topic that high school science teachers are unlikely to address in their classes (unless high school science textbooks are influenced by FHAO's ideological sympathizers).

It is not surprising that, according to FHAO's Annual Report for 2001–2002, FHAO conducted an intense institute in Stockholm this past year at the invitation of Sweden's Department of Education, with the expectation that the contents of the institute would be taught to other Swedish teachers. Although there seems to be no evidence that the Swedish government today is concerned about anti-Semitism in Sweden or in the rest of Europe, it has evinced a consistent interest in racism in America. It is also not surprising that FHAO has begun to provide teacher training seminars in Berlin for German teachers in the past several years. What better way to relieve lingering German guilt over the Holocaust than by helping young Germans see an American-dominated eugenics movement at the turn of the 20th century as ultimately responsible for Nazi racial policies and the Holocaust. Interestingly, among the scholars FHAO features at these Berlin seminars is Ian Hancock, a professor of English and linguistics and an authority on the Roma who has claimed that the lack of scholarship on Gypsy victims of the Holocaust is "due, in part, to efforts by some scholars to maintain the uniqueness of what happened to

---

[15] Ernst Mayr, Evolution and Diversity in Life (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976, paperback reprint 1997) p. 318.

[16] Personal communication from Paul R. Gross, University Professor of Life Science, emeritus, University of Virginia, former President and Director of the Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. August 14, 2003.

[17] That the American eugenics movement was responsible for Nazi racial policies and the Holocaust is the explicit thesis of Edwin Black's latest book, War Against the Weak: Eugenics and America's Campaign to Create a Master Race (Four Walls Eight Windows, 2003).

the Jews."[18] By using a scholar who seeks to justify the focus on the all-encompassing umbrella of racism by implying self-interest on the part of those scholars trying not to lose the focus on anti-Semitism (or, more accurately, to regain it), FHAO makes its own "educational" goals even clearer.

Effect of the FHAO Curriculum on Teachers

Although the 1994 FHAO resource book is framed by the assumption of moral equivalence between Nazi Germany and contemporary America, it never explicitly states that the two are equivalent. One can only speculate to what extent impressionable students who study its curriculum and read the Diary of Anne Frank will transfer their feelings about the Nazis to our own society. However, I have been able to collect some evidence on how the thrust of FHAO's evolving curriculum has affected teachers themselves, through the influence of its own workshops alone or with the help of graduate course work in a school of education. One example is a syllabus created in 1994 for a new course for students in grades 10, 11, and 12 in an upper middle class suburban high school in a Western State. Designed by two new teachers overtly seeking to address intolerance in this country, this syllabus just about takes for granted a moral equivalence between Nazi Germany and contemporary America. I received a copy of this syllabus from one of the two teachers as part of the application material for admission to a 1994 summer institute on civic education that I directed at that time at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. A recent graduate of a masters program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, this teacher must have been proud of this syllabus or she would never have sent it with the application.

According to the course description, it emerged from a school district's decision to expand its multicultural education program for the 1993–1994 school year. It was also developed to "confront the growing issues associated with diversity at the high school." It claims that the issues of "hatred, prejudice, racism, and indifference" are the social issues that students at this high school confront daily, a claim that is difficult to believe for an upper middle class high school with an extremely high achieving student body. Indeed, the school district's scholastic scores rate second in the State, according to information I received from the Chamber of Commerce. Nevertheless, the course was approved by the principal, the superintendent of schools, and the school committee and started being taught in the 1994–1995 school year.

The syllabus for "Culture, Power, and Society" explicitly connects the psychology of the Nazis and pre-World War II German culture with American cultural values and attitudes. Indeed, it suggests that the psychology of the Nazis and their supporters is an inherited cultural characteristic of most of the American population. The course outline makes its thrust crystal clear; the first unit deals with "socialization and the ethos of the American psyche (aka Why we are the way we are)" and examines the "self and the individual in American society." Unit Two, which is on racism and anti-Semitism, explains that it "will explore the roots of bias in our society" (emphasis mine). It goes on to state that after examining where and how racist attitudes are formed (for example, through stereotypes, segregation, and isolation), students will culminate the unit with the reading of Night and an extensive look at the Holocaust. In the fourth of the five units in the syllabus, students study homophobia in the United States. One does not doubt that they will link Nazi persecution of homosexuals to the "injustice suffered by homosexual individuals" in America.

In only one way is it understandable why these teachers have found the study of the Holocaust so useful for addressing prejudice and bigotry in this country. It provides them with the most horrendous image possible of a prejudiced person, an image that can be connected under the enormous umbrella of the concept of intolerance to the image of the white racist in America. With the abolition of slavery and the disappearance of lynching bees, prejudiced behavior in this country is generally invisible. Violence may be visible, but bigotry is not. What could better symbolize prejudice or intolerance and make a more powerful impression on young minds than images of the Nazis, the death camps, and the gas chambers? The course is not just a waste of academic time; it has the potential for much harm. It explicitly assumes that the "prejudiced personality" discussed in the required textbook The Social Animal by Elliot Aronson can be generalized to all Americans and then harnesses to this false generalization the power of a normal adolescent's emotional response to the Holocaust. Sustained by such a negative force, this generalization, however spe-

[18] In an essay in Alan Rosenbaum ed., Is the Holocaust unique? Perspectives on Comparative Genocide (Boulder,CO: Westview Press, 1996), as described by Christopher Shea in an article "Debating the Uniqueness of the Holocaust," The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 31, 1996: A7–8.

cious, has the potential for cultivating in young students a negative attitude towards their society, its political institutions and principles.

Other examples of the effects of FHAO's workshops on teachers appeared in other application material to me. One grade 8 teacher proudly explained how, after taking a number of Facing History workshops, she had restructured her teaching of To Kill A Mockingbird to "help prepare students for the Facing History unit in social studies." Her students "are now being asked to look for parallels between Nazi Germany and the U.S., looking at U.S. slavery and subsequent racism as our holocaust. . . . I will read them excerpts from Jonathan Kozol's Amazing Grace to help them begin to see the ghettos that exist today. That's what I might like to focus on at the institute: the connection between contemporary ghettos of poor blacks in American cities with the ghettos and extermination of Jews and others in the Holocaust."

It should be noted that it is not easy for outsiders to find out what takes place in Facing History workshops. Only teachers from the schools that have arranged (and paid) for the workshop can attend, and the web site that enables these teachers to exchange ideas about classroom practices and resources is password-protected.

Moral Equivalence in the Anne Frank Journal

The moral equivalence of America and Nazi Germany has been promoted in the teaching materials accompanying yet another effort to stimulate the reading of Anne Frank's diary in the schools and to educate students about the Holocaust. According to a 1991 brochure, the Anne Frank Journal was used as part of an educational program around the exhibition "Anne Frank in the World 1929–1945," produced by the Anne Frank Centre in Amsterdam and distributed in America through the Anne Frank Center in New York City.[19] Adapted from educational material for secondary schools in Holland, the Journal served as preparatory material for a visit to the exhibition or for follow-up. It was also used to accompany the reading of the play based on Anne Frank's diary, the diary itself, or other reading materials on the Holocaust. Bearing a strong resemblance in vocabulary and ideological thrust to the 1994 FHAO manual, the 1993 edition of the Journal was based on the assumption that "the study of history is most meaningful when it has significance for present day society." It stressed "the need for every individual to make a choice . . . when racial violence . . . is common." It aimed to "encourage young people to examine their own experience with racism and discrimination and to make them consider their own responsibility in racist events they encounter." As does FHAO, it subsumed anti-Semitism under racism so that it could deal with racism against blacks in this country. Its brochure contained a few photographs showing acts of anti-Semitic vandalism in Great Britain and Holland, but its chief concern was with the racism of "fascists" and neo-Nazis towards "people of color" in America and Western Europe. Despite the fact that the neo-Nazi movement in America was by the Journal's own admission not a large one, students were nevertheless asked to "collect newspaper clippings about neo-nazi activities and anti-fascist actions" and to discuss the "similarities and differences between Berlin 1934, Paris 1986, and Neo-nazism in the USA."

The Journal's ideological agenda was clearest in a section called "A Message of Hate." It asked students: "How is the 'White Supremacy' movement in the U.S. different from the Nazis and neo-Nazis? How is it the same? . . .Discuss why this movement is particularly American. Discuss the effects of a history of slavery in the United States on today's version of white supremacy?" And, similar to the anti-white hate-mongering apparent in the 1994 FHAO resource book, the Journal concluded its list of suggested questions for students with: "Could today's racism lead to something like the Holocaust?" The question clearly does not have the Jews in mind as the victims of this Holocaust.

The Journal was published for a number of years, although it is no longer listed on the web site for the Anne Frank Center.

The Call for More Literature on Intolerance in the English Class

Pre-college students also read a great deal about the Holocaust in both their English and social studies classes because of national professional encouragement.

---

[19] According to The Anne Frank Center, its goals are to: Effectively introduce young people to Anne Frank, the Frank family's personal story, and the history of the Holocaust; Help young people and communities explore the difficult issues of discrimination, intolerance, and bias-related violence in a positive and constructive way; Engage young people to examine and challenge discrimination, intolerance, and bias-related violence; Carry the Center's anti-bias message to isolated areas and under-served communities across the nation, where people seldom have opportunities to discuss the problems of racism and discrimination, and to effect community-initiated action; Illustrate the importance of personal responsibility and tolerance by honoring those individuals who actively confront prejudice and bias-related violence.

In the spring of 1994 the Executive Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) approved a resolution urging teachers to let their students read and discuss literature on "genocide and intolerance within an historically accurate framework with special emphasis on primary source material." Again, genocide has been conflated with the far broader concept of intolerance. Part of the rationale offered for the resolution was the need to counter the attempt to deny that the "European Holocaust of the 1930s and 1940s" ever happened, although it is not clear why NCTE thought this effort was needed in English classes in as much as Anne Frank's story is offered in all of the leading literature anthologies and is regularly one of the most popular titles in trade book sales. The NCTE also created a task force titled Committee on Teaching about Genocide and Intolerance to compile a list of resources to assist teachers in "planning and producing instructional materials on the rhetoric and literature of genocide and intolerance." The rationale given in the announcement of the resolution stated that "continuing acts of racial, ethnic, class, and religious hostility are occurring in increasing numbers in the United States and around the world" . . . and that these "destructive forces of intolerance and bigotry must be countered in every setting." Those who see themselves fighting the forces of Satan in this country could not have articulated their goals with more spirit. Indeed, the militancy in this statement evokes the image of the religious zealots orchestrating the Inquisition or the Salem witch hunts. It also suggests that an implementation of the resolution may well result in an even greater association than now exists between the Holocaust and any past or contemporary incident in this country that is construed as an act of prejudice.

In 1999, NCTE published the work of this Committee titled Teaching for a Tolerant World: Essays and Resources, for grades 9–12. As one might expect, essays and resources addressing the Holocaust appear together with those addressing African Americans, Asian Americans, "Chicanos/Chicanas," Native Americans, and Gays and Lesbians. Only two essays in the entire collection suggest that intolerance or genocide might be attributable to other than Americans or Nazis. One deals with the effects of twentieth century genocide against women, describing the experiences of Armenian and Cambodian women among others. The other essay—on the Ukraine Famine—manages to indict Americans and other Westerners for not reporting the famine when it took place—a splendid example of how the Left manages to cover up its own culpability by casting blame on the West in situations where it is chiefly responsible for withholding facts or misleading the public.

Use of the Study of the Holocaust Proposed by the National Center for History in the Schools

The guidelines in the National Standards for United States History proposed in 1994 by the National Center for History in the Schools at the University of California, Los Angeles seem to reinforce the idea that the main purpose for studying the Holocaust in American schools is to indict the United States. The guidelines dealing with the Holocaust (pp. 201–202) in this document are as follows:

"Demonstrate understanding of World War II and the reasons for the Allied victory by: . . .

Analyzing the dimensions of Hitler's "Final Solution" and the Allies' response to the Holocaust . . .

Grades 7–8: Explain what was meant by the "Final Solution" and draw from primary sources such as eyewitness accounts, oral history, testimony of Nazi officials, and documentary photographs and films to examine the human costs of Nazi genocide. Using letters, laws, and newspaper articles, identify FDR's immigration policy toward Jewish refugees from Hitler's Germany. How did Americans respond to news of the Holocaust?

Grades 9–12: Construct a historical argument or debate to examine Allied response to the Holocaust. When did the Allies discover the scope of Nazi persecution of European Jewry, as well as the persecution of Jehovah's Witnesses, Gypsies, homosexuals, and other groups? What actions did European nations and the United States take to support Jewish immigration? Why did the Allies fail to organize rescue attempts and resist appeals to bomb rail lines leading to Auschwitz and other camps?"

There is no question in this document about why the American press (especially The New York Times) consistently underreported the Holocaust as it was taking place. Nor is there a question about the effect of the Holocaust on support by the U.S. for the establishment of the State of Israel. Indeed, the Holocaust is completely severed in this document from questions about the establishment of the State of Israel, a topic covered about 15 pages later. Interestingly, the two questions the document poses in this later section seem to be getting at something else. The document asks: "Why did the U.S. State Department oppose recognition of the new State

of Israel in 1948 and why was the U.S. the first country to extend recognition?" (p. 217)

The Costs of Turning America into Amerika

The school curriculum is being increasingly used today not to help students understand the cultural history of an "other" but to call attention to a prejudice against nonwhite people that some educators and editors see as the dominant characteristic of all Americans of European descent (including, ironically enough, the survivors of the Holocaust in America). One certain cost in the effort to make America look morally equivalent to Nazi Germany is the transformation of the literature class into a pseudo-social science class. Can Anne Frank's reflections about life and people, or Elie Wiesel's spiritual and philosophical responses to the Holocaust, be at the center of student attention or be contemplated at all in classrooms where teachers are eager to have students address racism, sexism, violence, alternative family structures, or homophobia in this country?

One cannot help but ask this question when the organizing topic for a group of instructional selections is clearly racial prejudice and all its victims, aside from Anne Frank, are Americans. A particularly egregious example of the way Anne Frank's story is used as the linchpin for grouping an array of victims of American prejudice appears in Macmillan's (1994) instructional reader for grade 7. The editors have grouped together excerpts from Anne Frank's diary and a biography of Anne Frank by Miep Gies (a member of the Dutch family that hid the Franks) with poems by an American Indian and an African American, a story about an American Indian child, an anecdote about a Puerto Rican child, a chapter from Thurgood Marshall's biography, an excerpt from Martin Luther King's Nobel Prize speech, and an excerpt from Beyond the Divide, a novel by Kathryn Lasky about a brave Amish girl who survives the wilderness in the Old West of 1849 with the help of a small group of American Indians. According to the afterword in the novel, this group of Indians was in fact gradually massacred by white settlers over the next two decades and eventually obliterated as a tribe.

The thematic motifs suggested by the editors for this unit, entitled "Reach Out," are courage, faith, determination, and the need for the help of others to survive or succeed in attaining one's goals. But even if the teacher emphasizes these motifs and does not use this convenient grouping of victims of prejudice to make explicit connections between Nazi racism and the prejudice directed at blacks, Hispanics, and Indians in this country (or between Nazi racism and slavery or the killing of American Indians in the nineteenth century), what young student reading this unit could fail to sense and internalize the intended associations. This unit is one of the cleverest examples of moral manipulation I have come across. The editors must have spent a great deal of time sifting through journals and various data bases in order to locate a group of selections about victims of prejudice in this country at the right reading level that could be put together with a Holocaust selection to facilitate transfer to white Americans of the moral revulsion that is the normal response to Nazi behavior.

A second cost may lie in the way in which students come to view the Holocaust itself when examples of "intolerance" can range from the Final Solution to, say, the views of the parents who opposed the Rainbow curriculum in New York City, as they were regularly characterized by editorials and news reports in The New York Times. The Holocaust cannot help but be trivialized when the language used to classify it as a topic of study in English classes is no different from the language used to describe Rush Limbaugh's views on feminists and others.

The greatest costs are clearly civic and intellectual in nature—an even deeper discrediting of our political principles, procedures, and institutions, the stimulation of greater interracial hatred, and a decline in the capacity to grasp and make important intellectual and moral distinctions especially in reference to this country's principles. The latter can be illustrated in an op-ed essay by Ellen Goodman in the Thursday, August 28, 2003 edition of the Boston Globe on the removal of a granite block containing the Ten Commandments from the grounds of an Alabama courthouse. She opens her essay with an anecdote about a Muslim who had murdered his adulterous mother on the grounds that she had dishonored the family but who expected an Islamic court to exonerate him on the grounds that this would be the "ruling of God." Goodman says she doesn't know how jurists using the Koran as their law book ruled in this matricide (nor did she indicate if she had sought to find out whether civil authorities had sought to prosecute the murderer in a civil court, or if one existed), but she sees this anecdote as an example of a struggle between democracy and theology in Iraq that is similar to "our own struggles with theocracy and democracy." In other words, in Goodman's thinking, Chief Justice Roy Moore's placement of the monument on courthouse grounds in an attempt to convey the his-

torical fact that the American legal system is rooted in a particular moral code (the Sixth Commandment of which is "Thou shalt not murder") is analogous to an expected use of the Koran by Islamic judges to justify murder. Whether or not an American judge is a Christian or an atheist and such a monument can be on courthouse grounds, an American judge's rulings remain rooted in a particular moral code. The issues are whether an American judge has the authority to place any monument of his choice on public grounds and whether the placing of this particular monument amounts to the establishment of a particular religion rather than serving as a reflection of a historical fact.

Most English or social studies teachers who use literary or non-literary materials that imply similarities between Nazis and Americans do so, I believe, because they have been taught through the media but more directly through course work in schools of education (and probably in humanities courses in the arts and sciences) to see intolerance (or social injustice) as this country's enduring original sin. Moreover, it is not irrelevant that well over 80 percent of K–12 teachers today are white middle class females. Sexism has been so consistently associated with racism, religious bigotry, and homophobia as types of discrimination practiced by white heterosexual males that it is not difficult for female teachers today to identify themselves with other victims of bias and to accept the implied or explicit extension of the psychological dynamics of white male Nazis to white Americans as reasonable and as independent of the specifics of the discriminatory act itself. In addition, the desire to epater le bourgeois is as much a part of American literary and non-literary history (e.g., Mark Twain's satires) as is the feminist zeal to correct our moral failings—the latter being particularly characteristic of white Protestant females in the 19th and 20th centuries. It is also not irrelevant that the inspiration for FHAO came from courses in moral education taught by Carol Gilligan at the Harvard Graduate School of Education in the mid-1970s, and that work on FHAO's resource book on the American eugenics movement during the 1990s was funded through the Harvard/Facing History and Ourselves Project (p. ix), with Gilligan serving as a major advisor.

The earlier effort by some educators (and others) to suggest a moral equivalence between America and the Soviet Union has had of necessity to be altered. The equation now appears to be evolving into one between America and Nazi Germany, with a new twist implying that American science in the 19th and early 20th century was responsible for Nazi racial policies—and the Holocaust. Attempts by the pedagogical moralists in our schools or publishing houses to address intolerance in America by reducing America's moral status to that of Nazi Germany in the eyes of the young must be addressed openly as a public policy issue regarding the school curriculum, not sheltered from open criticism and discussion as a matter of teachers' academic freedom or pedagogical judgment.

Senator ALEXANDER. Mr. Hagopian?

Mr. HAGOPIAN. Senator Alexander, I am honored to be here and grateful for this opportunity. I find that it is an opportunity to describe the classroom context within which these books are used as I share my textbook selection experiences out in California.

Let me start. In the world of the ideal classroom, the course offering is history, not social studies. Even E.B. White's adventuresome mouse, Stuart Little, knew this. When, along his wayward journey, Stuart was pressed into service as a substitute teacher, he stood on a stack of books on top of the desk and offered comments to the students as they ran through their subjects. Some of you in the room may remember this. When the students brought up social studies, Stuart Little said: "Never heard of them." By implication, he and his author had studied history, the well-told story that aims to be comprehensive as it imparts, as has been said here today, civic literacy and public memory. Engaged in this real-world endeavor, students advanced their reading, writing, public speaking, and reasoned judgment capabilities. Studying history, after all, is self-rewarding—the more you know, the more you want to know.

This ideal classroom that I want to describe here is staffed by a history teacher. he or she has read and written history, hopefully more American history—Ms. Stotsky's point is a key one—broadly

and deeply. History occupies a place of importance in his or her life, and because of this, the teacher transmits a contagious enthusiasm about events, personalities, words, acts, deeds. I call it the broad sweep—it is interwoven in nature—and the controversial aspect of this discipline comes through in the lessons.

Activity varies—reenactment, essay writing, speeches, debates, document annotation, biographies, mapping, time-lining, researching, polling, interviewing, and comprehensive exams that help establish what I believe is a platform of understanding, a basis for going on.

Exchange between students and teachers is as lively as the links between past and present are profound. In this saturated environment I am describing, students produce history as well as study it. They recognize history's uses and grow to realize that the subject offers invaluable background for any life endeavor. Careful reading and notation of understanding forms a basis for all the activity and outcomes I mention. These habits are conspicuous in the ideal history classroom.

We know that across the United States, high praise is in order for classrooms that do match this description or whose scope and ambition exceed it—and many do. We also know that in too many classrooms, something called "social studies" is offered, of which history is one little, self-contained part, like one of many dishes on a buffet table.

Sadly, we know that too many history classrooms are staffed by teachers with too little background in or enthusiasm for the subject. We also know that in too many classrooms, too much and sometimes all instruction is from the textbooks, a condition captured in an old favorite cartoon of mine in which the teacher is saying to the class: "Today is February 5, so we must be on page 403."

Alarming, too, is something else of which we are all aware. Careful reading and notation, as textbook expert Gilbert Sewall, seated to my left, has observed, is a fast-disappearing habit. Not surprisingly, the National Assessment of Educational Progress continues to show low student achievement in history and civics.

However dismal and discouraging these plain realities may be, I am heartened—and I must say energized—by great efforts that I have seen over the past decade and a half to revitalize history study in the United States. I am intrigued by the example you gave this morning from U.S. News and World Report; I cannot wait to see that list of 100 documents and see which ones on the banned list I am using. I had better be careful.

The tremendous interest that I have found in pre-collegiate history instruction of numerous academic historians, great teachers in their own right, is so encouraging, whether in those wonderful Gilder-Lehrman or National Endowment for the Humanities summer seminars, those insightful events sponsored by the National Council for History Education, those ambitious teaching grants in American history colloquia, or the ongoing enrichment provided by History Channel and PBS broadcasts, and I should mention Ken Burns films, and here in this region, I should mention the tremendous efforts at the National Archives, the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian, and Colonial Williamsburg, the growing partnerships of interested teachers, academic and Park Service historians and

others is casting a widening ray of light over history study in our Nation.

I have been supported as well by my home State of California's History Framework. I went to Dr. Ravitch, to my left, who I believe was given honorary citizenship in the State of California for her efforts in producing that. First published in 1988 and largely renewed with updates in 1997, this great guide offers a well-articulated and planned K–12 curriculum specifying content at all levels through its accompanying grade-level standards.

For me, my States's history framework has served as a bulwark against efforts, sometimes considerable efforts, and educational fads—many, many of those—that otherwise might have succeeded at deemphasizing the history content that I believe I have been able to practice.

Please make one more addition to that ideal history classroom I have been describing. Place there for each student a truly distinguished textbook. Its lively, sustained narrative conveys to the learner through lean, vigorous prose and peppery detail so telling that readers are transported to the times and sites of great events, crucial decisions, and legacies of all kinds. The author often lets history's eyewitnesses and documents of an era tell the story. The textbook's illustrative material tends toward original art, portraits, documentary photographs, related maps and artifacts. And only modest space is given over to those chapter reviews.

The ideal book offers a clear historical chronology, but it presents our story in a seamless fashion. As outstanding as the book may be, students' reading and notation is not the end-all of their history study but merely a prelude to historical engagement.

In reality, American students are increasingly issued textbooks as we have been saying that fall embarrassingly short of this ideal. The narration resembles, as David McCullough has noted, an old piano teacher's favorite lament: "I hear you play all the notes, but I hear no music."

Often, in the textbooks under my review, the narrative is shrunken, thin in detail, inaccurate in places and, most bothersome of all, interrupted page after page by panels of poofs, puffs, color bursts, and by TV-screen-shaped, short, quick, get-your-history-on-the-go windows, with little narrative in between. The overall format seems attuned to that of the tabloids, television episode sequencing, and as I have said in other forums, the backs of cereal boxes.

Today's history textbooks are increasingly unitized, and that is too bad. After all, the Civil War is a defining, transformative, national experience—only in its most artificial sense is it a "unit of study." Books that break something so compelling as the story of American freedom into a series of units that place more emphasis on pedagogy, pre-tests, posttests, scrambles, and other puzzles do dampen among learners the natural ardor that I believe they have for history.

My own experience with California State adoption and local selection of history textbooks for my eighth-grade students extends back through three cycles. I should say right here that I am fortunate to work in a school district that has supported the text selections that I have made for my grade level. In 1983—I will do a

quick history of this—I selected from among perhaps half a dozen State-adopted texts A Proud Nation. That was the title. In format and approach, this was a comparatively simple, straightforward book. As I set its presentation of nine or ten historical episodes side-by-side with those of others on the market, I detected a good measure of its author, Ernest R. May's, vivid prose that had impressed me when I read several of his works in graduate school. I found more attention paid to detail, less to puzzles and games, and where there was some special feature, he developed full, flavorful, telling anecdote rather than the kind of fragmentary account often found in the competitors' books.

If A Proud Nation was historically meaty, The Story of America, which I named for selection in 1990, is even more so. the volume is heavy, perhaps weighing 6½ pounds. Now, there is another police—the backpack weight police. We are getting a lot of that pull-by-the-handle luggage to take care of that. So when I assign the book to my students, I ask them to keep it at home in a clean, well-lighted place, ready for use—and use the book we do. The students return from nightly readings with careful reading notes or identifications that we work toward improving throughout the year.

While daunting at first for some students, most do grow accustomed to the demands of the reading. No textbook is full-blown ideal. However, John A. Garraty's The Story of America, with its comprehensive narrative, document basis, rich art and portraiture comes closer to the ideal, at least, than any other entry in the last three adoption cycles.

In fact, in the subsequent adoption year, 1999, when Story of America was replaced, and I collected California's new adoptions for consideration, not one of them came even close to my history book gold standard. All, in my opinion, had embraced the thing, fragmented, distracting pitfalls I have already described.

It seemed to me that several of the new books exhibited another minus—they avoided controversy—and they were far from simple books in format and came with superfluous "kits." These text supplements more often than not amounted to extra puzzles and jumbles rather than documents or photo aids. And these books are absurdly expensive, I should say. I recall assembling a group of eighth-graders and letting them compare the new books in the textbooks sweepstakes according to an ideal textbook criteria, and I asked them to include Mr. Garraty's book in the comparison—and hands down, they chose Story of America. I was secretly glad.

So in 1997, I sought out Gilbert Sewall's advice as the time approached to make my textbook selection. Mr. Sewall recognized that with my own history background and the materials and documents that I used, my students and I would fare just fine through another adoption cycle by purchasing from the publisher's warehouse enough extra copies of Story of America to have on hand through 2004.

I will conclude here. Back home, another promising school year has begun. Along with teaching duties, I will be involved in another foray into history textbook selection as we have reached the end of yet another cycle. I am not aware of any reversal in the book publishers' retreat from quality. Trying to "think big" the other

night, I tried to envision how to precipitate movement along a path toward history textbook excellence.

I determined that all it would take is some economic robustness and a Governor in just one State who would take one bold step. Buoyed by the diverse efforts to revitalize history instruction that I have already mentioned, this Governor would ask history professors at his or her various State university campuses to assemble the brightest, best, most articulate and most enthusiastic history undergraduates, with hopefully more than a little, let us say, United States history study and plenty of world history study. Then, in an act of great foresight, this Governor would personally recruit these promising collegians to the State's history classrooms and to careers as history teachers. The Governor would then call upon the leading school system educators and beckon them to in every way make the profession more attractive—attractive enough to divert away some of the customary traffic from the law, business, and banking schools. History classrooms thus staffed would, I believe, lead to a demand for better books, and I believe this would create some attention across the Nation.

If we say we want to strive for the best, I believe we must think big.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hagopian follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT HAGOPIAN

Mr. Chairman, Committee Members, and Staff, I am indeed honored and grateful to have this opportunity to testify on the quality of history textbooks in our schools. Because I have been so involved in their selection and use over my 32-year teaching career and because I recognize their utility in history instruction, I applaud your interest. Today I find it necessary to describe the classroom context within which these books are used as I share my textbook selection experience.

In the world of the ideal classroom, the course offering is history, not social studies. Even E. B. White's adventuresome mouse, Stuart Little knew this. When along his wayward journey Stuart was pressed into service as a substitute teacher, he offered comments to the students as they ran through their subjects. When the students brought up social studies, Stuart Little said, "Never heard of them." By implication, he—and his author—had studied history, the well-told story that aims to be comprehensive as it imparts civic literacy and public memory. Engaged in this real-world endeavor, students advance their reading, writing, public speaking, and reasoned judgment capabilities. Studying history, after all, is self-rewarding: the more you know, the more you want to know.

This ideal classroom is staffed by a HISTORY teacher. He or she has read and written history, broadly and deeply. History occupies a place of importance in his or her life, and, because of this, the teacher transmits a contagious enthusiasm about events, personalities, words, acts, deeds, the broad sweep—interwoven in nature—and the controversial aspect of this discipline. Activity varies: reenactment, essay writing, speeches, debates, document annotation, biographies, mapping, timelining, researching, polling, interviewing, and comprehensive exams that help establish a platform of understanding. Exchange between students and teacher is as lively as the links between past and present are profound. In this saturated environment, students produce history as well as study it. They recognize history's uses and grow to realize that the subject offers invaluable background for any life endeavor. Careful reading and notation of understanding forms a basis for all the activity and outcomes I mention. These habits are conspicuous in the ideal history classroom.

We know that across the United States, high praise is in order for classrooms that match this description or whose scope and ambition exceed it. We also know that in too many classrooms something called social studies is offered, of which history is one little self-contained part, like one of many dishes on a buffet table. Sadly we know that too many history classrooms are staffed by teachers with too little background in or enthusiasm for the subject. We also know that in too many classrooms too much—and sometimes all—instruction is from the textbook, a condition captured

in an old cartoon in which the teacher is saying to the class, "Today is February 5, so we must be on page 403." Alarming, too, is something else of which we are aware: Careful reading and notation, as textbook expert Gilbert Sewell has observed, is a fast disappearing habit. Not surprisingly the National Assessment of Educational Progress continues to show low student achievement in history and civics.

However dismal and discouraging these plain realities may be, I am heartened—and, I must say, energized—by great efforts I have seen over the past decade and a half to revitalize history study in the United States. The tremendous interest in pre-collegiate history instruction of numerous academic historians, great teachers in their own right, is so encouraging. Whether in those wonderful Gilder-Lehrman or National Endowment for the Humanities summer seminars, those insightful events sponsored by the National Council for History Education, those ambitious Teaching Grants in American History colloquia, or the ongoing enrichment provided by History Channel and PBS broadcasts and Ken Burns films, the growing partnerships of interested teachers, academic and park-service historians and others is casting a widening ray of light over history study in our nation. I have been so supported, as well, by my home State of California's History Framework. First published in 1988 and largely renewed with updates in 1997, this great guide offers a well articulated and planned K–12 curriculum, specifying content at all levels through its accompanying grade-level standards. For me my State's history framework has served as a bulwark against efforts and educational fads that otherwise might have succeeded at de-emphasizing history content.

Please make one more addition to that ideal history classroom I have been describing. Place there for each student a truly distinguished textbook. Its lively, sustained narrative, conveys to the learner through lean, vigorous prose, and peppery detail so telling that readers are transported to the times and sites of great events, crucial decisions, and legacies of all kinds. The author often lets history's eyewitnesses and documents of an era tell the story. The textbook's illustrative material tends toward original art, portraits, documentary photographs, related maps, and artifacts. And only modest space is given over to chapter reviews. The ideal book offers a clear historical chronology, but it presents our story in a seamless fashion. As outstanding as the book may be, students' reading and notation is not the end-all of their study but merely a prelude to historical engagement.

In reality, American students are increasingly issued textbooks that fall embarrassingly short of this ideal. The narration resembles, as David McCullough has noted, an old piano teacher's lament: "I hear you play all the notes, but I hear no music." Often, in the textbooks under my review, the narrative is shrunken, thin in detail, inaccurate in places, and, most bothersome of all, interrupted page after page by panels of poofs, puffs, color bursts, and by TV-screen-shaped, short, quick, get-your-history-on-the-go windows with little narrative in between. The overall format seems attuned to that of the tabloids, television episode sequencing, and, as I have said in other forums, the backs of cereal boxes. Today's history textbooks are increasingly unitized, and that is too bad. After all, the Civil War is a defining, transformative national experience; only in its most artificial sense is it a "unit of study." Books that break something so compelling as the story of American freedom into a series of units that place more emphasis on pedagogy, pre-tests, post-tests, scrambles, and other puzzles do dampen among learners what I believe is a natural ardor for history.

My own experience with California State-adoption and local selection of United States History textbooks for my eighth-grade students extends back though three cycles. I should say right here that I am fortunate to work in a school district that has supported the text selections that I have made for my grade level. In 1983, I selected from among perhaps a half dozen State-approved texts, A Proud Nation. In format and approach, this was a comparatively simple, straightforward textbook. As I set its presentation of nine or ten important historical episodes side by side with the others on the market, I detected a good measure of its author Ernest R. May's vivid prose that had impressed me when I read several of his works in graduate school. I found more attention paid to detail, less to puzzles and games. And when there was some special feature, he developed a full, flavorful, and telling anecdote rather than the kind of fragmentary account often found in the competitors' books.

If A Proud Nation was historically meaty, The Story of America, which I named for selection in 1990, is even more so. The volume is heavy, perhaps weighing six pounds. So when I assign the book to my students, I ask them to keep them at home in a clean well-lighted place ready for use. And use the book we do. The students return from nightly readings with careful reading notes, or identifications, that we work toward improving throughout the year. While daunting at first for some of the students, most grow accustomed to the demands of the reading. No textbook is full-

blown ideal. However, John A. Garraty's The Story of America, with its comprehensive narrative, document basis, rich art and portraiture comes closer to the ideal than any other entry in the last three adoption cycles. In fact, in the subsequent adoption year, 1997, when Story of America was replaced and I collected California's new adoptions for consideration, not one of them came even close to my history book gold standard. All in my opinion had embraced the thin, fragmented, distracting pitfalls I have already described.

It seemed to me that several of the new books exhibited another minus: they avoided controversy. And they were far from simple books in format and came with superfluous "kits." These text supplements more often than not amounted to extra puzzles and jumbles rather than documents or photo aids. And these books are absurdly expensive. I recall assembling a group of eighth graders and letting them compare the new books in the textbook sweepstakes according to an ideal-textbook criteria, and I asked them to include Mr. Garraty's book in the comparison. Hands down, they chose Story of America.

So, in 1997, I sought out Gilbert Sewell's advice as the time approached to make my textbook selection. Mr. Sewell recognized that with my own history and materials and documents, my students and I would fare just fine through another adoption cycle by purchasing from the publisher's warehouse enough extra copies of Story of America to have on hand for students through to 2004.

Back home, another promising school year has begun. Along with teaching duties, I will be involved in another foray into history textbook selection, as we have reached the end of another adoption cycle. I am not aware of any reversal in the book publishers' retreat from quality. Trying to think big the other night, I tried to envision how to precipitate movement along a path toward history textbook excellence. I determined that all it would take is some economic robustness and a governor in just one State who would take one bold step. Buoyed by the diverse efforts to revitalize history instruction I have previously mentioned, this governor would ask history professors at his or her various State university campuses to assemble the brightest, best, most articulate, and most enthusiastic history undergraduates. Then in an act of great foresight, this governor would personally recruit these promising collegians to the State's history classrooms and to careers as history teachers. The governor would then call the leading school-system educators together and beckon them to in every way make the profession more attractive—attractive enough to divert away the customary traffic flowing to the law, business, and banking schools. History classrooms thus staffed would lead to a demand for better books. If we say we want to strive for the best, I believe we must think big! Thank you.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you to all four of you for your written and your oral testimony.

Senator Ensign has joined us, and what I would like to do is take about 5 minutes and ask questions, and then I will turn it over to him for 5 minutes, and we will just go back and forth unless someone else comes. Then, we will end the hearing at about 11:30.

Listening to your comments, I began to make a list of all the obstacles to the ideal kind of textbook that you described, although it was interesting to me that you were actually able to choose one, and you somehow made your way through, Mr. Hagopian, all of the obstacles and were able to select a textbook.

On my list are: weak textbooks, weak standards, social studies instead of history, adoption committees, bias and sensitivity committees, no competition in the publishing industry, or not much, low teacher qualifications, colleges of education that do not emphasize history, Federal legislation that emphasizes things other than history, and then, one which to me increasingly seems to be at the root of it all—a real difference of opinion in the United States and especially among many professional educators about whether it is really important to teach American history, whether it is really important to have a common culture or whether we are a United States of America or just a lucky sort of United Nations, with people having arrived in this great, big place with lots of money and opportunity, and we just should be happy of wherever we came

from, without much regard to wherever we have come. Now, those are a lot of obstacles, and Senator Ensign, before you came, I wanted to encourage the panelists to give ideas back and forth, so let me try to focus in on this.

You have described in the development of standards, Dr. Stotsky, and also, Dr. Ravitch especially in the writing of textbooks, this army of ideologues from the right and the left and from the right wing, the left wing, and every wing, as you said, Dr. Ravitch, who descend upon the standard-writers or the textbook writers and publishers or the test-writers, and insist that everything be just thus and so. And I guess they descend upon teachers as well perhaps who are even more vulnerable, because they are there by themselves, and if you teach about the underground railway or you teach about religion or you teach about something in a way that someone does not like, you are going to hear from some of these people often in an organized way.

So with tests, with standards, and with classroom teaching, I guess an obvious question is how do we provide a counter to those special interest groups. One example of what usually happens in American society is that you have counter-groups. You have some broad-based group or groups or some institutions that take the other side of it and say, Whoa, wait a minute.

I will give you example. In the legislation that the Senate passed 90-to-nothing, we talk about two things in the First Amendment—the free exercise of religion as well as not establishing a religion. By the time it got over to the House of Representatives, someone wanted to change that because they did not want to talk about the establishment of religion.

That is the kind of thing that goes on. I am going down on Friday to Tennessee to a celebration of those who were in the battle of King's Mountain, which was a Revolutionary War battle. This was a bunch of pioneers who won that battle, and their reason—they went down on their knees to pray with a fire-and-brimstone teacher named Samuel Doake before they went over the mountain to fight, a big prayer about the Lord and Gideon which has been recorded in all of our textbooks in Tennessee—but the reason they were fighting was because they were tired to paying taxes to support the bishop of a church that they did not belong to.

So it is a wonderful story that emphasizes the importance of religion even to those pioneers and how it pervaded every aspect of their lives. They would not go out and fight a battle without it, yet it also provides a story of what we meant when someone wrote into our Constitution that we did not want an established religion in this country. Yet many teachers, even Congressmen, many textbooks, many tests, I guess, shy away from a discussion about what we mean by the free exercise of religion and what we mean by the establishment of a church.

So how do we provide a counter-balance to all of these people from every wing who have a perfect right in our country to say what they believe? One possibility might be that the Albert Shanker Institute has put out a recent study which has a lot of signatories from every direction. I notice that just at Harvard, they have Henry Lewis Gates and Harvey Mansfield agreeing, which is pretty good, and if we have that kind of background of a broad base of

diversity, maybe the Albert Shanker Institute or other institutes in America might provide a counterweight.

So how do we go up against the zealots and give some light to the textbooks, the tests and the classroom teaching?

Dr. Ravitch?

Ms. RAVITCH. Senator Alexander, I want you to add to your list of the problems the very act of the State adoption process, because that is where these very small groups—it can be just a letterhead group—can get people frightened and intimidated. And if you have a true marketplace where there are 3 million teachers buying textbooks like Mr. Hagopian—he selected a textbook that is actually going out of print. The two best textbooks that I am familiar with—one is the Boorstein-Kelly Book—the lead author is Daniel Boorstein, the emeritus librarian of Congress, which is a wonderful book; and the Garraty book—but the States today say these books are too hard. Kids cannot read all this text. They need more graphics and more dazzle and more web pages. So they are going out of print. But they should not go out of print. If there were a real marketplace, he could continue to find a publisher delighted to sell 30,000 copies instead of a million copies and able to make a reasonable profit going to his market.

I wanted to make a couple of other observations, and they bear on this point. I was on a talk show one night, talking about this subject, and man called in and said, "I am in Denton, TX, and I went to the State history adoptions, and I did not like the way the textbook presented the story of what happened at Omaha Beach. They called it' a tragic day at Omaha Beach.'"

So I sat down with the State board, and we rewrote the story, and it is now "a heroic day at Omaha Beach." Well, that is fine, but you know, that is a political rewriting of history, and if everybody gets to rewrite everything that they do not like in the textbook, what in the world will kids get other than this kind of homogenized pap?

Another point on the same subject is that as a member of the National Assessment Governing Board, I saw a letter come in a few months ago from a woman who said, "I see that one of your questions relates to the Armenian genocide. I am of Turkish descent, and there was no Armenian genocide. Please take that question out."

Well, a lot of test publishers would drop the question because they do not want to have a problem, but the staff actually went to the trouble of going to the Library of Congress, going to a number of eminent historians, and after a review that consumed months, responding to that parent and saying, "We are sorry—we disagree with you—there was an Armenian genocide, and the question is not going."

But not many publishers would be willing to show that degree of courage.

Just one other point about the question that Sandy Stotsky mentioned on multiple perspectives. This is now a mantra in the social studies field. We do not have a point of view; we teach multiple perspectives. This is in fact a dishonest statement. We do not teach the point of view of the slave owners. We do not teach the point of view of Hitler and the Nazis. We do not teach the point of view

of the Holocaust deniers. We do believe that there is a perspective that American citizens learn, and it is the perspective of democratic institutions, the rule of law, and the principles that are embodied in our Constitution and Bill of Rights. And as long as the social studies field continues to cling to this idea of multiple perspectives, we cannot teach American citizenship or civic values or democratic values because that represents a point of view, and that is not acceptable.

But the question that I would like to turn to ask my fellow panelists, since you encouraged us to discuss, is one that I——

Senator ALEXANDER. Before you do that, what about my question—how are we going to provide a counterweight to the people you described as left wing, right wing, and every wing? How do you embolden textbook publishers, teachers——

Ms. RAVITCH. It was in my first statement, which is——

Senator ALEXANDER. To get rid of the adoption.

Ms. Ravitch [continuing]. If the States stopped adopting textbooks, that would open up the marketplace for small publishers.

Senator ALEXANDER. How did that get started?

Ms. RAVITCH. It got started after the Civil War because the Southern States did not want anyone to use textbooks that taught the story of the Civil War from a Northern perspective, so they wanted to control the textbooks that came into their States and make sure that the story that was told in Georgia and Mississippi and Alabama and Louisiana and other States that took this decision to adopt textbooks, their children would learn of the war of Northern aggression.

Senator ALEXANDER. Did that then spread to the rest of the country?

Ms. RAVITCH. It spread to some States because they thought they saw some advantage to it. California did not have that reason, and I have—Gil will know better; Gil is a Californian, and maybe Mr. Hagopian can comment on this—but I read a dissertation on California's decision to begin State textbook adoption, and it seemed to be for reasons of efficiency, but it has certainly not made the materials cheaper; if anything, they are more expensive than they have ever been.

Senator ALEXANDER. But basically, we have a situation now where every State or most States have it?

Ms. RAVITCH. Twenty-two.

Mr. SEWALL. About half the States, mainly in the West and South. The original rationale behind State adoption was quality control. This is no longer the case, and in fact the three largest State adopting States—California, Texas, and Florida—are really adopting almost everything that comes to the table.

Senator ALEXANDER. Say that again, please.

Mr. SEWALL. What the publishers submit, they are putting on their lists.

Senator ALEXANDER. So in those three States——

Mr. SEWALL. So quality control is a joke.

Senator Alexander [continuing]. Which represent about 30 percent of all the people in the country would be those three States, or more; they put on an approved list of textbooks for, say, U.S. history or social studies——

Mr. SEWALL. Correct.

Senator Alexander [continuing]. About any book that the publisher sends them, but there is now only a limited number of publishers; is that correct?

Mr. SEWALL. At one time, States were selective, but this is no longer the case because of consolidation.

Senator ALEXANDER. I will go to Senator Ensign, but just to get to the bottom—then, how is Mr. Hagopian in California—California has a State adoption process like that and a limited number of publishers, but you were still able to get a textbook that you thought was a pretty good one, The Story of America; right?

Mr. HAGOPIAN. I thought the choices decreased through the three cycles—six books, and I think they were—I do not know the size of these publishing houses——

Senator ALEXANDER. What choices did you have, say, for U.S. history?

Mr. HAGOPIAN. Two in 1990. There was Houghton Mifflin, and there was Holt.

Senator ALEXANDER. Those were the only ones approved by the California State review committee that decides what textbooks you can use.

Mr. HAGOPIAN. Yes.

Senator ALEXANDER. What do you do—just ignore those textbooks when you teach your course?

Mr. HAGOPIAN. Well, fortunately, the Garraty book was one of the two.

Senator ALEXANDER. But what do good teachers do when presented with dull textbooks?

Mr. HAGOPIAN. In 1999, that was exactly my question, and the gentleman to my left helped me with an answer. He said: Stick with what you have. Go to the warehouse.

Mr. SEWALL. Ask for a State exemption, which localities and districts can do, and use the old textbook rather than the new and so-called improved books that the publishers have brought to the market in 1999.

Ms. STOTSKY. I was going to respond to your question, too, if I may, but I do not want to interrupt what you were going to say.

Senator ALEXANDER. Go ahead.

Ms. STOTSKY. I just wanted to take a stab at your question about where might the sources of counter-pressure come from.

Senator ALEXANDER. Senator Ensign, the Massachusetts standards, which Dr. Stotsky is the chief administrator for, are among the best in the country and withstood a series of attacks from these various wings on the way up. I would be interested to hear how you did that.

Ms. STOTSKY. One needs first of all a lot of transparency in the process, and this may vary from State to State. You need to start with some good people on an advisory committee, and who is appointed to that advisory committee should be on the front page of the major newspaper in the State, why they were chosen. This at least starts to get the process out in the open so it is not certain groups controlling who gets to be appointed to be on the working committee to develop standards. That is one place to start. And

they have to be publicized and the rationale for why they are on the committee and who they represent needs to be clear.

Then, there need to be drafts that are made available, clearly, and the major newspapers have to help out here. Again, we need a lot of good public relations.

There also needs to be good representation from our different branches of Government, because as you well know, if anyone has a vested interest in the maintenance of our democratic institutions and procedures, it is the people who are elected politicians in our State Senate, State legislature, Governor's office, and so on.

I was very fortunate to have one of our State Senators who agreed to help chair the revision of our U.S. history standards. He was an old history major, and he helped with a select group of history teachers work out the final revisions of our history standards. He was a Democrat. We had a Republican Governor. So everybody was happy because we had total bipartisan input, and no one could say that the standards were either Republican standards or Democrat standards, because he was thrilled to work with a good group of U.S. history teachers at the high school level and revise these standards. He cared deeply about American citizenship, and he spread the word to his colleagues in the State Senate that this was what he was doing. So this was in a sense depoliticizing the standards by throwing it right into politics in a sense.

But that kind of transparency is part of what you need to activate.

A third group, I discovered by accident, and we are very fortunate in Massachusetts because our history in our State museums and historical societies is national history to a large extent. We were able to discover a huge number of State and local historical societies and museums that had been ignored for 20 to 30 years, and suddenly, they saw first drafts of standards that looked like they were tapping traditional American history again. This was revising them because their holdings are all about American history. They are not about the citizens of other countries. They are about the citizens of this country. So that suddenly, we got hundreds of letters asking to be a part in some way of the standards to help implement the standards, so we have another group of people who represent communities, chambers of commerce, very eminent citizens in all the towns that are active with historical societies and local museums.

So there is another group that can be tapped to some extent, but you need a big transparency in your process to do this.

Senator ALEXANDER. Senator Ensign?

Senator ENSIGN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate you having this hearing. I think it is a very important hearing, because this is a serious problem that we have in our schools.

Obviously, in the time since a lot of us have gone to school, there are hugh differences compared to what the schools are teaching today. Dr. Ravitch, you were talking about perspective and the multiple perspectives that we try to teach from. The argument that I have heard used, is that, for instance, when somebody sees an accident or a crime being committed, and you take three different witnesses, they may see different things. So, depending on who is reporting the history it will depend on the perspective that they

write it, and therefore, they think that writing it from multiple perspectives is the way that we need to go.

Having said that, I agree with you. Part of teaching history, in my opinion, is teaching those principles to our children, the next generation. It is not only teaching historical facts; it is also teaching historical principles. And if you want to teach rule of law, if you want to teach the importance of democratic principles, of free market principles, versus a socialistic or a communist type of perspective, you have to teach from the perspective that our Founders had. From that perspective it can be taught how some of the things that happened throughout our history and throughout world history—why they have or have not worked. And if you try to be "politically correct" and give equal weight to all historical perspectives, and this is why they believed, and those kinds of things, I think you just end up teaching mush to the children. You want them to be able to critically think, but you also need to give them the perspective on history of what really worked and what did not, not just here are these different perspectives, but also what historically has worked.

Also, I fundamentally believe that a lot of this comes down from the rejection of truth. If there is no truth in the world, then how can there be moral absolutes? I love to go to the high schools and ask kids are there moral absolutes? Most of the kids will say no. So I will get one of the kids and say, "So there are no moral absolutes. Are you absolutely sure that there are no moral absolutes?" That always gets them to think a little bit.

But the rejection that there are certain rights and wrongs has led us to where we are today. Now, having said that, who determines the individuals who serve on these bias committees? Do the publishing companies rely on their own qualifications, or do they rely on the guidelines provided by groups like the American Psychological Association?

Ms. RAVITCH. What I found, Senator, is that there has been an accretion. In other words, the bias guidelines began to develop in the late sixties and early seventies. A lot of the assumptions in these guidelines have just become completely obsolete, but they stay there forever. So that, for example, the Educational Testing Service bans the use of the word "yacht" because "yacht" is an elitist term, and no American child is supposed to know it, or only the rich know the word "yacht" because they are the only ones who actually have ever been on a yacht. Well, I have never been on a yacht, but I know what it is.

The other assumption that the bias guidelines make, particularly in the testing industry, is that girls cannot answer questions about supports because girls do not participate in sports; girls cannot answer questions about the military because girls are not in the military. This is all totally obsolete, but it just keeps growing and growing, and the list of topics or words that are banned remain there.

I have come to the conclusion over months of talking to people about these issues that the overwhelming majority of people thinks this is ridiculous. I have had very little contact with people calling and saying, "I demand that the word' actress' stay out of our vocabulary." I mean, heaven's stake, the Emmy Awards, the Academy

Awards, and the Tony Awards give awards to actresses, the best actress and the second leading actress, etc., and no one seems to think this is a bad thing.

I read every day in The New York Times words that are supposed to not ever appear in a textbook. When David Brinkley died, they ran an op-ed piece titled, "David Brinkley, Anchorman," and I thought, oh, good grief, don't they know you are not supposed to say that word?

I think all of this comes about because there really is no public scrutiny, and I think that if the States would just agree to publish their bias guidelines, make public the deliberations—what are you removing, what are you deleting, what are you censoring—then we could as citizens decide for ourselves whether this is reasonable or whether it is ridiculous.

Senator Alexander had said we should talk to each other, and I had a question because it is posed to me time and again. Whenever I talk about the subject of this kind of bias and sensitivity review and taking out words that offend anybody, anywhere, sooner or later somebody says, "I am a concerned citizen. What can I do?" I get emails all the time saying, "I want to join your organization," and I do not have an organization; I am just a writer.

So what can we do to bring this out into the open, to develop greater transparency so that those restrictions that are reasonable are viewed by the public and remain there, and the ones that are ridiculous get laughed out of existence.

Ms. STOTSKY. Could I suggest there is another aspect to it that does need to be addressed as well. From my understanding having been in the Department of Education, we were told over and over again by our legal counsel whenever I raised questions about what was being considered bias that it was very important to have bias committees in order to protect the Department of Education, or that schools needed them to protect themselves against lawsuits, and that without bias review, there would be lawsuits that would be consuming our time, and who would be having these lawsuits against the Department or others would typically be the aggrieved parents of students who are failing, who would then claim that students fail because there was either a hostile environment created by insensitive questions or some—there is a particular legal language that is used that indicates that this is preventing a student from performing at their best in answering a question because of some damage created by the question. So that is the issue.

Senator ENSIGN. Could I just make a comment on that? I think that that is so prevalent today. I grew up in the West, and in the West, you have a certain perspective—you really do. It is different from the East. First of all, Western history is taught more in the West, and there is much more of the Civil War and the Revolutionary War taught here in the East. Because of proximity students can learn it better back here. There is no question about that.

So because we in the West are at a disadvantage that we do not live and breathe the history of the Revoluntionary or Civil War as much in the West, should it not be taught? If you take this concept to the nth degree, you could make the argument that because people in Alaska are isolated to a great degree, or people in Hawaii have a different culture, that they should not learn what other con-

tinental U.S. students learn because they are not exposed nearly as much. This could lead people to say that sutdents in Alaska and Hawaii would be disadvantaged on a test, because they are lot farther away because it is not part of the daily culture like it is for someone who lives around Colonial Williamsburg. Certainly, their perspective on history is going to be much more in their daily lives.

So I think that that is such an important concept to get out of our teaching. Simply because it may disadvantage certain people does not mean that we should dumb down our entire educational system.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know my time is up so I want to thank the panel. This is a discussion that needs to be had a lot more across the United States. One of the greatest powers that we have as Senators or Members of Congress is the power to convene people together, so I want to compliment you, Mr. Chairman, on bringing this issue up and starting something that hopefully will continue. We need to continue to push this issue much more dramatically. I will close with this. Back in the early 1800's, there was a man named William Wilberforce, and there were two things that he did in his life. One was to abolish slavery in the United Kingdom. He was the one who was really, truly responsible for abolishing the slave trade. The other was the restoration of manners. And when I say "manners," I do not mean being polite. He wanted to restore manners so that it again became politically correct to act properly. In England it had become politically incorrect to treat people with respect and to have good morals. What we have to do as part of our responsibility as leaders is to lead the country in the right direction instead of leading it in the wrong direction, and ensuring that students are taught the facts and not just historical perspectives is all part of that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you, Senator Ensign, and we will pass on the compliment to Senator Gregg, who dreamed up this particular hearing, but it is a subject that Senator Ensign and many of our Senators are very interested in.

Tomorrow, for example, David McCullough is going to join a small group of Senators and congressmen to talk about how we can identify all the various activities we have in the United States Government, of which there are a lot—there are more than we know, really—various efforts to try to encourage the teaching of American history and civics in particular, and then we probably will do the same with groups outside of American Government.

I promised the panelists that we would bring this to a close at about 11:30, so I will do that with this comment, maybe in a way in answer to my own question. Dr. Ravitch suggested we get rid of the State adoption process. That sounds like something well worth pursuing, and maybe this panel could take its argument to the meeting of the National Governors' Association, which meets twice a year, once in February and once in the summer. Many Governors might get most of their way through a term without knowing or understanding exactly how textbooks get adopted. I know that I did, and I was pretty active in education. It is just not one of the first things you do when you come in as Governor, to figure

out what to do about that, other than appoint a few people to these commissions.

But Dr. Stotsky, your suggestion about how you succeeded in Massachusetts in establishing high standards and resisting narrow interests was not to take your process to the back room but to take it out in the open. In other words, in a way, you put your confidence in the broadest number of Americans, which is also a very good lesson of American history going back to the beginning of our country.

So maybe we need to look for ways to create and involve institutions and organizations that represent the broader number of Americans rather than narrow interests and make them a part of the process.

I happen to agree with that. I think, just as Dr. Ravitch found out with her book, that once she lays this out there, most people would think it was a Dave Barry column. They would not believe it. They would think she made up the whole back section of her book, it is so absurd, and you could not watch any movie or hold any conversation without running afoul of some ridiculous prescription from a bias and sensitivity council, and you wonder why anybody is wasting money and time on such things, and hopefully, everyone is ignoring what they suggest, but they are not.

One other example of the idea of spreading out the broader number of people, if you will permit a little bit of a commercial, is that the Senate passed by 90-to-nothing this year legislation which I and many other Senators introduced to create summer residential academies for outstanding teachers and outstanding students of American history and civics. They are modeled on the idea of the Governors' Schools, which more than two dozen States have had for a number of years. And I believe that if you were to bring together 200 of the best history and civics teachers in California, for example—the Mr. Hagopians of the world—and give them 2 weeks to focus on that subject, we as Americans would be comfortable with just about whatever they would come up with, because I think if they are broadly selected and given their knowledge and background, they would excite one another, and they would develop lesson plans and ways to deal with subjects, ways to teach difficult subjects or interesting subjects, go back to their schools and infect those schools with new enthusiasm for the teaching of American history and civics. And in the same way, if students of American history and civics were able to spend a month at a summer residential academy sponsored, say, by the Library of Congress and the University of North Dakota or the University of Massachusetts and the John Adams House, or one of your historical associations, or one of the National Park Service's historical centers, that those students would go back to their classes and their schools with a great understanding of American history.

So that legislation has 230 sponsors in the House, and it is just one of a number of things that the Federal Government is trying to do.

Senator Gregg intends that this just be the beginning of a discussion of this subject. You have provided in your testimony and in your work and in your lives a good record for us to publish and to circulate to others.

I would encourage you in the next 2 weeks, if you have something you would like to add to your testimony or something you would like to add to the record, we would welcome it, and we look forward to working with you and continuing to discuss American history, civics, textbooks and standards.

Thank you very much for your time. The hearing is adjourned.

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STEPHEN D. DRIESLER

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, the Association of American Publishers' (AAP) School Division represents the principal trade association of the educational publishing industry for kindergarten through twelfth grade. AAP members publish over 85 percent of all the textbooks and other instructional materials including tests and assessments used in our nation's primary and secondary schools.

Thus, AAP has a great interest in the subject matter of this hearing and wishes to submit for the record the views of the educational publishing industry.

Let me start out with a riddle: I am loved, I am loathed, I am immeasurably influential and controversial. I offer a road to success, yet not all respect me. I make a mistake, I make the headlines. I am a product of years of thoughtful planning and politicizing, but I occasionally find myself floating in a toilet bowel.

What am I?

A textbook.

It is important for members of this Committee to understand that textbooks in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States are paid for by tax dollars and given to students free of charge. Because textbooks are purchased with public funds, the selection of which textbooks get purchased and used in our schools involves a lot of public scrutiny. Textbook selection often becomes a political battle, much like a legislative fight in which competing interests try to persuade public officials to their point of view.

It also must be remembered that in America, citizens have a First Amendment right to complain about textbooks. As Dr. Diane Ravitch points out in her book, The Language Police, "Battles over the political orientation of textbooks is nothing new in American educational history" (p. 68).

Dr. Ravitch goes on to point out several times in her book that "the buying and selling of textbooks is more akin to a government procurement process than it is a real marketplace with consumer choices" (p. 97).

Let me elaborate on this; textbooks are usually developed and produced to meet the requirements and specifications (often very specific and explicit) established by the customer. Said another way, textbooks are published to meet the demands of the school system that purchases them.

Dr. Ravitch addresses this situation in her book where she writes on page 97, "they (publishers) want to sell textbooks, and . . . they must respond to the demands of the marketplace. To succeed in this highly regulated and politicized environment, it is essential for educational publishers not to become embroiled in controversy."

She goes on to point out on page 98, "Publishers whose textbooks do not get adopted in one of these States sustain an economic blow . . ." Dr. Ravitch further explains the publisher's dilemma on page 104, "Publishers spend millions of dollars merely to prepare for a textbook adoption process. A rejection in the big States may be the death knell not only for a series but for the publisher as well . . ."

Literally, publishers often find themselves damned if they do or damned if they don't follow the guidelines set forth, not only by State or local Boards of Education, but guidelines established by national organizations like the National Council of Teachers of English and the International Reading Association (NCTE–IRA), or the American Psychological Association.

Dr. Ravitch acknowledges the publisher's dilemma on page 71, "Textbook publishers were in an impossible situation. On the one hand, they were pressed on all sides to be studiously neutral by removing every point of view and every potential controversy from their books; on the other, fundamentalist parents complained that the textbooks' neutrality was a failure to take a stand on behalf of correct morality. The harder the textbook editors tried to make their product inclusive of all points of view without endorsing any, the more impossible it was to satisfy the Christian New Right and those who did not share its fundamentalist theology."

To give members of this Committee a better understanding of how detailed and specific bias and sensitivity guide lines imposed on the publishers by a State can be, I have attached the California "Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content." In her book The Language Police, Dr. Ravitch points out "California's standards send a clear signal to publishers about what is and is not acceptable in textbooks (and other instructional materials) adopted by the State" (pg. 107).

California is our Nation's largest State and as such, it is also the single largest purchaser of textbooks. The economic reality for an educational publisher is, if they want to sell textbooks in California, they have to follow these guidelines.

California is not the only State with such guidelines, according to Dr. Ravitch, Over 40 States "adhere to the NCTE–IRA standards" (pg. 124).

The economic reality on publishers to conform to these standards was recognized by Dr. Ravitch on page 85 when she writes, "no publisher could afford to enter a statewide adoption process with a textbook whose contents had been branded as racist or ageist or handicapist or biased against any other group."

In conclusion, publishers are accountable for aligning the textbooks they publish to a multitude of content standards established by State and local education agencies. Only instructional materials that conform to these standards will be purchased by these educational agencies. Most State and local school systems invite their citizens to review and comment on textbooks up for adoption.

AAP members are committed to producing the highest possible quality textbooks, tests and other instructional materials, within the parameters established by our customers.

AAP members would welcome any changes in the textbook selection process, which would increase the focus on the pedagogical quality of the materials themselves. But, we also believe these changes must originate in the local communities with parents, teachers and school officials determined to resist the politicizing of public education and textbook selection.

Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content

2000 Edition

Developed by the
Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division
California Department of Education

Adopted by the
California State Board of Education

Published by the
California Department of Education

Publishing Information

When *Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content* was approved by the California State Board of Education on January 13, 2000, the members of the State Board were the following: Robert L. Trigg, President; Kathryn Dronenburg, Vice President; Marian Bergeson; Susan Hammer; Carlton Jenkins; Marion Joseph; Yvonne Larsen; Monica Lozano; Janet Nicholas; Vicki Reynolds; and Nickolas Rodriguez

The document was developed by the Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, California Department of Education.

The 2000 edition was edited by Faye Ong, working in cooperation with Greg Geeting, Interim Executive Director, California State Board of Education. It was prepared for printing by the staff of CDE Press. The cover and interior design were prepared by Juan Sanchez. Typesetting was done by Carey Johnson. The document was published by the California Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California (mailing address: P.O. Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244-2720). It was distributed under the provisions of the Library Distribution Act and *Government Code* Section 11096.

© 2001 by the California Department of Education
All rights reserved

ISBN 0-8011-1532-9

Ordering Information

Copies of this publication are available for $8 each, plus shipping and handling charges. California residents are charged sales tax. Orders may be sent to the California Department of Education, CDE Press, Sales Office, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95812-0271; FAX (916) 323-0823. See page 16 for complete information on payment, including credit card purchases. Prices on all publications are subject to change.

A partial list of other educational resources available from the Department appears on page 16. In addition, an illustrated *Educational Resources Catalog* describing publications, videos, and other instructional media available from the Department can be obtained without charge by writing to the address given above or by calling the Sales Office at (916) 445-1260

Notice

The guidance in *Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content* is not binding on local educational agencies or other entities. Except for the statutes, regulations, and court decisions that are referenced herein, the document is exemplary, and compliance with it is not mandatory. (See *Education Code* Section 33308.5.)

Prepared for public by CSEA members.

Foreword iv
Purpose of Standards 1
Special Circumstances 2
Male and Female Roles 3
Ethnic and Cultural Groups 4
Older Persons and the Aging Process 5
People with Disabilities 6
Entrepreneur and Labor 7
Religion 7
Ecology and the Environment 8
Dangerous Substances 8
Thrift, Fire Prevention, and Humane Treatment of Animals and People 9
Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States 9
Brand Names and Corporate Logos 10
Diet and Exercise 12
Appendix: Requirements of the *Education Code* Regarding Social Content 13

Foreword

Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content reflects California's continuing effort to ensure that the instructional materials we use in our public schools contribute to a positive educational experience for all students. These standards are based on California law as well as policies established by the State Board of Education regarding matters of social importance.

Instructional materials play an important role in forming a child's attitudes; therefore, these materials need to reflect a multicultural society and to avoid stereotyping. The following standards ensure that instructional materials contain appropriate depictions of matters such as male and female roles, older people and the aging process, people with disabilities, and religion.

The standards also address other sensitive issues, including brand names and corporate logos. In addition, the standards provide for exceptional situations where less than full compliance is allowed, including classical or contemporary literature; music, art, stories, or articles; and the presentation of historical perspectives.

These social content standards are used by evaluators at the state level to determine instructional materials' compliance with legal requirements and State Board policy. In addition, we encourage local educational agencies to review these standards carefully in their own selection of instructional materials. This document will help ensure that locally selected materials comply with the requirements for social content.

DELAINE EASTIN
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

MONICA LOZANO
President
California State Board of Education

Standards for Evaluating Instructional Materials for Social Content

Research has documented that the interests, prejudices, and ideas children develop as they mature are influenced directly by everything they see and hear. Much of a child's early development takes place in school; therefore, instructional materials contribute to a positive or negative school experience. The California Legislature recognized the vital role of instructional materials in the formation of a child's attitudes and beliefs when it adopted *Education Code* sections 60040 through 60044, 60048, and 60200 (see the Appendix).

In addition to providing positive school experiences and encouraging students' aspirations, instructional materials should reflect a pluralistic, multicultural society composed of unique individuals. The *Education Code* sections referenced in this document are intended to help end stereotyping in instructional materials by showing diverse people in positive roles contributing to society. Instructional materials used by students in California public schools should never portray in an adverse or inappropriate way the groups referenced in the laws.

Purpose of Standards

The laws require that instructional materials portray accurately and equitably the cultural and racial diversity of American society; the male and female roles; and the contributions of minority groups and males and females to the development of California and the United States. These requirements imply that instructional materials must also help students to understand both the historical roles and the contributions of women and minorities in other societies; the forces that shaped those roles and contributions; and how and why the roles and contributions of contemporary American women and minorities differ from those of women and minorities at other times and in other cultures.

Many evaluators are needed to review the large number of instructional materials that are submitted to the California Department of Education. Those materials must be examined for legal compliance with the various social content requirements specified in the *Education Code*. Evaluators must use individual judgment to determine whether materials do in fact comply. This document provides reasonable, systematic standards on which evaluators may base their judgments so that the evaluation will be as consistent and equitable as possible.

There are standards pertaining to age, disability, and nutrition that are not referenced in statute. These standards are based on policies adopted by the State Board of Education. As such, the standards regarding those areas must be considered by those who review for compliance. Policy areas are identified by the date of Board approval, not by statutory code sections.

In applying the standards to instructional materials, evaluators should consider special circumstances under which compliance is not required. Those special circumstances are described below.

Special Circumstances

Less than full compliance may be allowed under the following special circumstances:

1. *Literary, historical, and cultural perspectives.* When examining instructional materials for adverse reflection or roles, an evaluator must make a qualitative judgment of classical or contemporary literature (including folktales), music, art, stories, or articles having a particular historical or cultural perspective. Complete compliance with the guidelines may be inappropriate in some cases. What might be considered an adverse reflection or a failure to portray appropriate roles should be judged in the context of high-quality literary works. Discussion material should be included in the teacher's edition of instructional materials indicating that, although a particular attitude toward women or a minority group was prevalent during a period in history, that attitude has changed or is changing.

2. *Reference to humans.* Not all instructional materials need to include references to human beings. For instance, math problems described solely in abstract terms or stories about animals without human attributes are perfectly acceptable in instructional materials but are outside the scope of the standards. In addition, materials that contain references to children need not include references to adults even though this omission may limit the scope of the roles and contributions that can be presented.

3. *Special purpose—limited portrayals.* Several kinds of circumstances make it necessary to modify requirements regarding proportion and balance of portrayals. These circumstances do not eliminate the need to carefully review for adverse reflection or derogatory references, but they do make it difficult to achieve the usual kind of required balance.

   a. *Narrow focus—limited scope and content.* An evaluator must consider the number of characters presented and the relationships among them; if the material includes only three or four main characters or if all of the main characters are members of the same family, obviously it will be unrealistic to expect portrayal of a wide diversity of ethnic groups or roles and contributions. If the setting is restricted to a limited locale, such as an inner-city ghetto or a sparsely settled desert region, the possibilities for showing a wide range of socioeconomic groups in a wide range of activities are necessarily limited. Materials with a narrow focus and/or limited portrayals should be clearly identified as such so that no false impressions are conveyed.

   b. *Infrequent use.* The materials are designed to be used infrequently (example: a test to be administered only two or three times a year).

c. *Small group.* The materials are part of a small group of materials that are designed for a special purpose (example: an enrichment series of pamphlets with fewer than eight pamphlets per grade level).

d. *Audience.* The intended audience is other than students (example: parents).

e. *Ancillary materials.* These materials are part of the core program and support the basic program (example: workbooks, test booklets, transparencies, tapes, and slides).

4. *Series.* When conducting a compliance review of a series of instructional materials designed to be used as a basic program, an evaluator must judge each grade level individually without regard to the content of any other component. However, it is important to consider certain exceptions referred to previously under "Special purpose."

5. *Teachers' materials.* Evaluators must use the standards for reviewing students' and teachers' materials. Two considerations are especially important in connection with teachers' materials: (1) In no case may instructions in a teacher's edition designed to counteract noncompliant pictures or text in a student's edition be given any weight in the evaluation of the student's edition. (2) Instructions to the teacher about students' activities that could reasonably be expected to cause adverse reflection or represent roles inaccurately must be considered noncompliant even though those instructions are not seen by the student.

Male and Female Roles

Education Code Sections 60040(a) and 60044(a)

Purpose. The standards promote the individual development and self-esteem of each student, regardless of gender.

Method. The standards will be achieved by portraying people of both sexes in the full range of their human potential in all societal roles.

Applicability of Standards. The standards regarding adverse reflection and equal portrayal must be applied in every instance. The other standards require compliance when appropriate.

1. *Adverse reflection.* Descriptions, depictions, labels, or rejoinders that tend to demean, stereotype, or patronize males or females because of their sex must not appear.

2. *Equal portrayal.* Instructional materials containing references to, or illustrations of, people must refer to or illustrate both sexes approximately evenly, in both number and degree of importance, except as limited by accuracy or special purpose.

3. *Occupations.* If professional or executive occupations, parenting, trades, or other gainful employment is portrayed, men and women should be represented equally.

4. *Achievements.* Whenever instructional material presents developments in history or current events or achievements in art, science, or any other field, the contributions of women and men should be represented in approximately equal numbers.

5. *Mental and physical activities.* An approximately equal number of male and female characters should be depicted in roles in which they are being mentally and physically active, being creative, solving problems, and experiencing success and failure in those roles.
6. *Traditional and nontraditional activities.* The number of traditional and nontraditional activities engaged in by characters of both sexes should be approximately even.
7. *Emotions.* A range of emotions (e.g., fear, anger, tenderness) should be depicted as being experienced by male and female characters.
8. *Gender-neutral language.* Such general terms as *people, men and women, pioneers,* and *they* should be used to avoid the apparent exclusion of females or males.
9. *Parenting activities.* Both sexes should be portrayed in nurturing roles with their families. The responsibility of parenting should be emphasized.

Ethnic and Cultural Groups

Education Code Sections 60040(b) and 60044(a)

Purpose. The standards project the cultural diversity of society; instill in each child a sense of pride in his or her heritage; develop a feeling of self-worth related to equality of opportunity; eradicate the roots of prejudice; and thereby encourage the optimal individual development of each student.

Method. The standards will be achieved by including a fair representation of majority and minority group characters portrayed in a wide variety of occupations and roles, including cultural and artistic roles.

Applicability of Standards. The word *group* as used in these standards refers generally to one of those named in *Education Code* Section 60040: "American Indians, American Negroes, Mexican Americans, Asian Americans, European Americans, and members of other ethnic and cultural groups." Current federal and state reporting guidelines for affirmative action and other similar programs use a different type of classification. However, because any racial, ethnic, or cultural groups can be fitted into those listed in the *Education Code*, that code section will remain the basis for implementation of the guidelines.

All the following standards apply to all instructional materials that depict contemporary U.S. or California society or any unidentifiable society. In addition, standards 1, 2, and 3 apply to all materials that depict any contemporary society outside the United States subject to standard 1 under "Special Circumstances" concerning certain perspectives regarding literature, music, art, history, or other cultures; and standard 3 applies concerning certain kinds of limited portrayals.

The standards regarding adverse reflection and proportion of portrayals must be applied in every instance. The other standards require compliance when appropriate.

1. *Adverse reflection.* Descriptions, depictions, labels, or rejoinders that tend to demean, stereotype, or patronize minority groups are prohibited.

2. *Proportion of portrayals.* Instructional materials containing references to, or illustrations of, people must portray accurately, to the extent possible, the roles and contributions of a fair proportion of diverse ethnic groups, especially those groups referenced in the statute (Section 60040[b]).
3. *Customs and lifestyles.* When ethnic or cultural groups are portrayed, portrayals must not depict differences in customs or lifestyles as undesirable and must not reflect adversely on such differences.
4. *Occupations.* If professional or executive roles, trade jobs, or other gainful occupations are portrayed, majority and minority groups should be presented therein in fair proportion.
5. *Socioeconomic settings.* Minority persons should be depicted in the same range of socioeconomic settings as are persons of the majority group.
6. *Achievements.* Whenever developments in history or current events, or achievements in art, science, or other fields, are presented, the contributions of minority persons, particularly prominent minority persons, should be included and discussed when it is historically accurate to do so.
7. *Mental and physical activities.* Majority and minority group characters should be depicted in fair proportion in roles in which they are being mentally and physically active, being creative, solving problems, and experiencing success and failure in those roles.
8. *Traditional and nontraditional activities.* The portrayal of minority characters engaged in activities that have traditionally been viewed as typical of their culture should be balanced by portrayal of such characters engaged in other less traditionally recognized activities.
9. *Root culture.* Depiction of diverse ethnic and cultural groups should not be limited to the groups' root cultures (traditional activities associated with ancestral culture) but, rather, must include such groups in the mainstream of U.S. life and must identify them as Americans.

Older Persons and the Aging Process

Approved by the State Board of Education
On July 12, 1979

Purpose. The standards promote the development of a healthy perception of older people and a concept of the aging process as a natural phenomenon.

Method. The standards will be achieved by depicting older persons and their activities and contributions as a vital part of society.

Applicability of Standards. The standards regarding adverse reflection and proportion of portrayals must be applied in every instance. The other two standards require compliance when appropriate.

1. *Adverse reflection.* Descriptions, depictions, labels, or rejoinders that tend to demean, stereotype, or patronize older persons are prohibited.
2. *Proportion of portrayals.* Instructional materials containing references to, or illustrations of, usual human activities must include older persons except as limited by accuracy or special purpose.
3. *Roles.* The presentation of older persons in instructional materials should not be significantly different from the portrayal of people of other age groups except as is necessary to identify them as older persons.
4. *Aging process.* When appropriate, the aging process should be pictured as a continuous process spanning an entire lifetime.

People with Disabilities

Approved by the State Board of Education
On July 12, 1979

Purpose. The standards promote the development of a perception of people with disabilities that is clear and undistorted, without fear, distrust, loathing, amusement, ridicule, contempt, or pity.

Method. The standards will be achieved by depicting the involvement, activities, and contributions of people with disabilities as an integral part of society.

Applicability of Standards. The standards regarding adverse reflection and proportion of portrayals must be applied in every instance. The other standards require compliance when appropriate.

Whether a disability is temporary or permanent is of no particular significance to evaluators. In programs for persons with disabilities, a disability is a disability regardless of duration.

1. *Adverse reflection.* Descriptions, depictions, labels, or rejoinders that tend to demean, stereotype, or patronize disabled persons are prohibited.
2. *Proportion of portrayals.* Instructional materials that depict a broad range of human activities must include some representations of people with disabilities except as limited by special purpose or the need for accuracy.
3. *Roles.* The presentation of people with disabilities in instructional materials should not be significantly different from the portrayal of nondisabled persons except as is necessary to identify them as people with disabilities.
4. *Emotions.* Materials should not convey the impression that people with disabilities are any different from other people in their emotions or their ability to love and be loved.
5. *Achievements.* When developments in history or current events or achievements in art, science, or any other field are presented, the contributions of people with disabilities must be included when it is appropriate and historically accurate to do so.

Entrepreneur and Labor

Education Code Sections 60040(c) and 60044(a)

Purpose. The standards develop in students an unbiased view of the functions of the entrepreneur and of labor in American society.

Method. The standards will be achieved by presenting, when it is appropriate to do so, a balanced picture of the roles of entrepreneurs, managers, and labor (as represented by workers and their organizations) in the American free enterprise system.

Applicability of Standards. The standard of adverse reflection must be applied in every instance. The other standard requires compliance only when appropriate.

1. *Adverse reflection.* References or labels that tend to demean, stereotype, or patronize any persons engaged in any particular occupation or vocation, whether essentially entrepreneur, management, or labor, are prohibited.
2. *Roles.* Accurate reference should be made to the role and contribution of the entrepreneur and labor in the total development of California and the United States.

Religion

Education Code Section 60044(a) and Subsection (b)

Purpose. The standards enable all students to become aware and accepting of religious diversity while being allowed to remain secure in any religious beliefs they may already have.

Method. The standards will be achieved by depicting, when appropriate, the diversity of religious beliefs held in the United States and California, as well as in other societies, without displaying bias toward or prejudice against any of those beliefs or religious beliefs in general.

Applicability of Standards. The standards are derived to a degree from the United States and the California constitutions and relate closely to the requirements concerning the portrayal of cultural diversity. Compliance is required.

These standards should not be construed to mean that the mere depiction of religious practices constitutes indoctrination. Religious music and art, for example, may be included in instructional materials when appropriate.

1. *Adverse reflection.* No religious belief or practice may be held up to ridicule and no religious group may be portrayed as inferior.
2. *Indoctrination.* Any explanation or description of a religious belief or practice should be presented in a manner that does not encourage or discourage belief or indoctrinate the student in any particular religious belief.
3. *Diversity.* When religion is discussed or depicted, portrayals of contemporary American society should reflect religious diversity.

Ecology and the Environment

Education Code Section 60041(a)

Purpose. The standards develop in all students a sense of responsibility for the protection and improvement of the natural environment as much as possible.

Method. The standards will be achieved by emphasizing to students, when appropriate, issues related to ecology and the environment and what ordinary citizens can do to contribute to the resolution of those issues.

Applicability of Standards. This standard is applicable only when appropriate. Instructional materials may omit discussion or portrayal of the kind required by these standards and still comply with the *Education Code* under this section. The material may be silent on those issues *provided* such silence does not imply that no problems exist in the environment.

1. *Ecology.* The interdependence of people and their environment should be represented.
2. *Environmental protection.* People's responsibilities for creating and protecting a healthy environment should be emphasized.
3. *Resource use.* Wise use of natural resources should be encouraged. Instructional materials should never depict, encourage, or condone waste of resources except as necessary to illustrate a point.

Dangerous Substances

Education Code Section 60041(b)

Purpose. The standards provide all students knowledge of the various uses and misuses of dangerous substances.

Method. The standards will be achieved by presenting factual information regarding the effects of dangerous substances.

Applicability of Standards. The following standards require compliance when appropriate:

1. *Discouragement of use.* The use of tobacco, alcohol, narcotics, or restricted dangerous drugs, except as prescribed by a physician, must not be glamorized or encouraged by illustrations or text.
2. *Hazards of use.* When references to, or illustrations of, the use of substances are included in other than an incidental manner, such as a passing reference to a character taking cough medicine or a classic short story referring to "father's pipe," the hazards of such use should be depicted or pointed out.

Thrift, Fire Prevention, and Humane Treatment of Animals and People

Education Code Section 60042

Purpose. The standards instill in all students some basic values: thrift, fire prevention, and humane treatment of animals and people.

Method. The standards will be achieved by demonstrating the connection between these values and both everyday and extraordinary occurrences in human living and history.

Applicability of Standards. The prohibitions listed below require compliance in all cases; all other mandates apply when appropriate. When making judgments based on these standards, evaluators must consider the vast differences that have existed among different cultures and in acceptable standards of humane behavior during different historical periods.

1. *Waste*. Waste must not be encouraged or glamorized.
2. *Fire hazards*. Unsafe practices and situations that constitute fire hazards must not be depicted (except for clarifying a point), condoned, or encouraged.
3. *Inhumane treatment*. Physical abuse of adults or children or violence against, or other inhumane or depraved treatment of, animals or people must not be depicted (except for clarifying a point), condoned, or encouraged.
4. *Thrift*. The practice of thrift should be encouraged through illustrations or text or both.
5. *Fire prevention*. Methods of fire prevention and fire safety rules in general should be explained and the use of such methods and rules encouraged through illustrations or text or both.
6. *Humane treatment*. Humane treatment of people and animals should be encouraged through illustrations and text. However, inhumane treatment that occurred in history (such as historical references to slavery or the Holocaust) should not be omitted or glossed over but should be depicted when it is appropriate to do so.

Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States

Education Code Section 60043

These standards need to be met only when students are at a level appropriate to the comprehension of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. In addition, the standards apply only to instructional materials for social science, history, or civics classes.

1. The Declaration of Independence should be presented.
2. The United States Constitution should be included.

Brand Names and Corporate Logos

Education Code Sections 60048 and 60200
"Guidelines" approved by the State Board of Education
On January 13, 2000

Purpose. The standards prevent unfair exposure of any privately produced product and students' exposure to unnecessary advertising.

Method. The standards will be achieved by omitting, whenever possible, illustrations of or references to private producers or their products.

Applicability of Standards. The two standards require compliance when appropriate. They also require judgment concerning the educational purpose of the material or the segment of the materials involved; the educational purpose determines how the standards are to be applied.

These standards apply to all instructional materials that depict contemporary American society. In representations of foreign societies, the standards apply to brand names, products, and logos familiar to the average American who has *not* traveled abroad.

1. *Use of any such depictions.* Instructional materials shall not contain illustrations of any identifiable commercial brand names, products, or corporate or company logos unless such illustrations are necessary to the educational purpose of the instructional material and that purpose cannot be achieved without using such illustrations, or unless such illustrations are incidental to a scene of a general nature (example: Times Square, New York City).
2. *Prominent use of any one depiction.* These exceptions aside, if a brand name, representation, or company logo is illustrated, prominence shall not be given to any one brand or company unless, in turn, such illustration is necessary to the educational purpose of the instructional material and that purpose cannot be achieved without using such illustration (example: a Coca Cola sign in a foreign country, demonstrating the social influence of American corporations abroad).

Guidelines for Exemptions. Exemptions to the standards regarding brand names and corporate logos are allowable for the following purposes:

Historical purposes. Use of a corporate name or product may provide a historical reference.

> Examples: Photograph of "Dewey Defeats Truman" headline with the newspaper's name in full view; Henry Ford and history of automobiles, manufacturing

Consumer and career-related education. A real-world example may contain valuable information that cannot be duplicated with a fictitious scenario.

> Examples: Analysis of commercials to determine why some advertising campaigns are successful and others are not; analysis of job trends in various fields and corporations

Research applications. Students need to know how to conduct valid research to find reliable information.

> Examples: The use of the *World Book Encyclopedia* or *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations* as sources; use of information gathering through Internet search engines or other online resources, such as the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

Foreign language instruction. Prominent commercial products are shown in foreign language materials to provide a better picture of day-to-day lives of people within that culture.

> Example: Names of newspapers or products unfamiliar in the U.S. may be mentioned in descriptions of people's daily lives.

Necessary sources of information. The use of information from the best or only source is acceptable and necessary to avoid plagiarism or to maintain the accuracy of a primary-source document.

> Example: A 1942 newspaper used for researching articles about World War II contains incidental advertising.

Copyright protection. Sources should be listed unobtrusively, such as in small font underneath a photograph or numbered in the back of the book except where copyright protections are necessary. Corporate logos or names should not be repeated elsewhere in the instructional material unless there is a clear educational purpose for doing so.

> Examples: A publisher may have the corporate name or logo on the front of the book and on a page that provides copyright information; a publisher may use a corporate name to refer the reader to another document for further information.

Literature and references to literature. Literature is generally exempt from a review for social content and includes previously published novels, short stories, poetry, essays, speeches, nonfiction, musical scores, and folktales.

Web-based resources and television shows. Those items are not reviewed because the content changes constantly. School districts are responsible for reviewing them to evaluate appropriateness of use.

Events, locations, sports teams, and people. International or national events that make a profit but are part of the general culture and do not target advertising solely to students (e.g., the Tour de France, Olympics, Indianapolis 500) may be referenced. Names of sports teams and organizations are allowed. Theme parks and commercial products associated with them may be depicted in instructional materials only if they fit into one of the categories noted above. Individuals and names of fictitious characters that are in the public domain may also be referenced.

Examples: Some photographs of historical people or various cartoon characters are part of the public domain and may be used without violating copyright laws. Use of popular cultural icons that are current would most likely violate copyright laws.

Each of the exceptions noted previously must serve an educational purpose in the instructional materials.

Diet and Exercise

Approved by the State Board of Education
On January 10, 1986

Purpose. The standards accustom students to seeing and dealing with representations of nutritious foods and foster a positive attitude toward exercise; diet and exercise are essential to children's health and well-being.

Method. The standards will be achieved by emphasizing foods of high nutritional value and regular exercise when it is appropriate to do so.

Applicability of Standards. The standards require compliance when appropriate. Depictions of foods of low nutritional value and of sedentary people are not absolutely prohibited; materials are to emphasize the importance of proper diet and regular exercise.

The relationship of diet and exercise to the overall health and well-being of children is well documented. A variety of opportunities to learn about good nutrition and exercise should be available so that children can attain optimal physical and mental development. Instructional materials should provide appropriate reinforcement in *illustration and content*. Illustrations should emphasize the selection of a variety of nutritious foods that are low in fat, salt, and sugar and high in fiber content. Foods that contribute little other than calories should be minimized.

1. *Variety of opportunities.* A variety of opportunities should be available for students to learn about good nutrition and exercise so that they attain optimal physical and mental development.

2. *Reinforcement through illustrations and content.* Instructional materials should appropriately reinforce through illustrations and content the benefits of consuming nutritious foods and exercising regularly. Illustrations of foods should emphasize the selection of a variety of nutritious foods that are low in fat, salt, and sugar and high in fiber. Depictions of foods that are of low nutritional value should be minimized.

Appendix

Requirements of the Education Code *Regarding Social Content*

Portrayal of cultural and racial diversity

60040. When adopting instructional materials for use in the schools, governing boards shall include only instructional materials which, in their determination, accurately portray the cultural and racial diversity of our society, including:

(a) The contributions of both men and women in all types of roles, including professional, vocational, and executive roles.

(b) The role and contributions of American Indians, American Negroes, Mexican Americans, Asian Americans, European Americans, and members of other ethnic and cultural groups to the total development of California and the United States.

(c) The role and contributions of the entrepreneur and labor in the total development of California and the United States.

Ecological system; use of tobacco, alcohol, drugs, and other dangerous substances

60041. When adopting instructional materials for use in schools, governing boards shall include only instructional materials which accurately portray, whenever appropriate:

(a) Man's place in ecological systems and the necessity for the protection of our environment.

(b) The effects on the human system of the use of tobacco, alcohol, narcotics, and restricted dangerous drugs as defined in Section 11032 of the *Health and Safety Code*, and other dangerous substances.

Thrift, fire prevention, and humane treatment of animals and people

60042. When adopting instructional materials for use in the schools, the governing board shall require such materials as they deem necessary and proper to encourage thrift, fire prevention, and the humane treatment of animals and people.

Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States

60043. When adopting instructional materials for use in the schools, the governing board shall require, when appropriate to the comprehension of pupils, that textbooks for social science, history, or civics classes contain the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Prohibited instructional materials

60044. No instructional materials shall be adopted by any governing board for use in the schools, which in its determination, contains:

(a) Any matter reflecting adversely upon persons because of their race, color, creed, national origin, ancestry, sex, handicap, or occupation.

(b) Any sectarian or denominational doctrine or propaganda contrary to law.

Commercial brand names, products, or logos

60048.

(a) Basic instructional materials, and other instructional materials required to be legally and socially compliant pursuant to sections 60040 to 60047, inclusive, including illustrations, that provide any exposure to a commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo in a manner that is inconsistent with guidelines or frameworks adopted by the State Board of Education may not be adopted by a school district governing board.

(b) The governing board of a school district may not adopt basic instructional materials and other instructional materials required to be legally and socially compliant pursuant to sections 60040 to 60047, inclusive, including illustrations, that contain a commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo unless the governing board makes a specific finding pursuant to the criteria set forth in paragraph (5) of subdivision (c) of Section 60200 that the use of the commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo in the instructional materials is appropriate.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the publisher of instructional materials to include whatever corporate name or logo on the instructional materials that is necessary to provide basic information about the publisher, to protect its copyright, or to identify third-party sources of content.

(d) The state board may adopt regulations that provide for other allowable exceptions to this section, as determined by the state board.

(e) The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall develop and the State Board of Education shall adopt guidelines to implement this section.

Adoption of List of Basic Instructional Materials; Submission Procedures; Criteria

60200. The state board shall adopt basic instructional materials for use in kindergarten and grades 1 to 8, inclusive, for governing boards, subject to the following provisions: . . .

(c) In reviewing and adopting or recommending for adoption submitted basic instructional materials, the state board shall use the following criteria, and ensure that, in its judgment, the submitted basic instructional materials meet all of the following criteria: . . .

(5) Do not contain materials, including illustrations, that provide unnecessary exposure to a commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo. Materials, including illustrations, that contain a commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo may not be used unless the board determines that the use of the commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo is appropriate based on one of the following specific findings:

(A) If text, the use of the commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo in the instructional materials is necessary for an educational purpose, as defined in the guidelines or frameworks adopted by the State Board of Education.

(B) If an illustration, the appearance of a commercial brand name, product, or corporate or company logo in an illustration in instructional materials is incidental to the general nature of the illustration.

Publications Available from the Department of Education

This publication is one of over 600 that are available from the California Department of Education. Some of the more recent publications or those most widely used are the following:

Item no.	Title (Date of publication)	Price
1356	Best Practices for Designing and Delivering Effective Programs for Individuals with Autistic Spectrum Disorders (1997)	$10.00
1436	California Department of Education Early Start Program Guide (1998)	10.00
1373	Challenge Standards for Student Success: Health Education (1998)	10.00
1409	Challenge Standards for Student Success: Language Arts Student Work Addendum (1998)	12.75
1435	Challenge Standards for Student Success: Physical Education (1998)	8.50
1429	Challenge Standards for Student Success: Visual and Performing Arts (1998)	12.50
1290	Challenge Toolkit: Family-School Compacts (1997)	9.75*
1439	Check It Out! Assessing School Library Media Programs: A Guide for School District Education Policy and Implementation Teams (1998)	9.25
1476	Educating English Learners for the Twenty-First Century: The Report of the Proposition 227 Task Force (1999)	10.50
1509	Elementary Makes the Grade! (2000)	10.25
1389	English–Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1998)	9.25
1475	First Class: A Guide for Early Primary Education (1999)	12.50
0804	Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1989)	7.25
1064	Health Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1994)	10.00
1488	History–Social Science Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (2000)	9.00
1284	History–Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, 1997 Updated Edition (1997)	12.50
1457	Mathematics Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999)	8.50
1508	Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (2000 Revised Edition)	17.50
1065	Physical Education Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1994)	7.75
1514	Prekindergarten Learning and Development Guidelines (2000)	13.50
1462	Reading/Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1999)	17.50
1399	Ready to Learn—Quality Preschools for California in the 21st Century: The Report of the Superintendent's Universal Preschool Task Force (1998)	8.00
1511	SB 65 School-Based Pupil Motivation and Maintenance Program Guidelines (2000)	10.00
1496	Science Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (2000)	9.00
0870	Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1990)	9.50
1452	Service-Learning: Linking Classrooms and Communities: The Report of the Superintendent's Service Learning Task Force (1999)	7.00
1472	Strategic Teaching and Learning: Standards-Based Instruction to Promote Content Literacy in Grades Four Through Twelve (2000)	12.50
1255	Taking Charge: A Disaster Preparedness Guide for Child Care and Development Centers (1996)	10.25
1261	Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1996)	15.00

* Other titles in the *Challenge Toolkit* series are *Outline for Assessment and Accountability Plans* (item no. 1300), *Safe and Healthy Schools* (item no. 1299), *School Facilities* (item no. 1294), *Site-Based Decision Making* (item no. 1295), *Service-Learning* (item no. 1291), *Student Activities* (item no. 1292), and *Student Learning Plans* (item no. 1296). Call 1-800-995-4099 for prices and shipping charges.

Orders should be directed to:

California Department of Education
CDE Press, Sales Office
P.O. Box 271
Sacramento, CA 95812-0271

Please include the item number and desired quantity for each title ordered. Shipping and handling charges are additional, and purchasers in California also add county sales tax.

Mail orders must be accompanied by a check, a purchase order, or a credit card number, including expiration date (VISA or MasterCard only). Purchase orders without checks are accepted from educational institutions, businesses, and governmental agencies. Telephone orders will be accepted toll-free (1-800-995-4099) for credit card purchases. *All sales are final.*

The *Educational Resources Catalog* contains illustrated, annotated listings of departmental publications, videos, and other instructional materials. Free copies of the *Catalog* may be obtained by writing to the address given above or by calling (916) 445-1260.

Prices and availability are subject to change without notice. Please call 1-800-995-4099 for current prices and shipping charges.

00-020 02-2005-600 1 01 98

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○