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## ABSTRACT
PREFACE

A historical study often lends itself to many interpretations. In this study, the writer recorded several interpretations of the events which led to the banning of all social studies textbooks authored or edited by Edwin Fenton, professor of history at Carnegie-Mellon University, from the Georgia state-approved textbook list since 1972. As an educator and historian, the writer has attempted to gather all the facts available to serve as a basis for these interpretations, generalizations, and conclusions.

The moods of society during periods of internal strife often reflect the reasons why censorship continues to survive in a democratic nation where freedom of the press is supposed to be a guaranteed privilege. During the early fifties, fear of the spread of communism in this country led to the banning of several books considered to be inconsistent with the ideals of a free democratic society or supportive of communist views. During the sixties, a decade of social change and reform, several books again were banned as they were considered by some to be threatening to the traditions and social institutions of this nation.

The respect for authority, moral standards and unquestioned loyalties of the older generations were challenged by the young in the late sixties and early seventies. Politically, the government was charged with providing legislation which would solve the problems created by demands for social change. Educationally, educators were challenged to
provide curricula which were more viable with the times and textbooks which included newer and broader concepts of the modern era. Unfortunately, the newer concepts were not readily accepted by everyone. While the political demands for social change met strong opposition from those who supported the traditions of the past, new concepts in education were also strongly opposed by some groups who viewed them to be threatening to traditional concepts in education.

In this study, the writer describes how a series of social studies textbooks, which included some new concepts and strategies, were banned from a state-approved textbook list in the early seventies. A group of laymen and educators felt that these textbooks were not suitable for the classroom because they encouraged the young to think critically of a democratic society instead of just becoming loyal patriots and supporters of a democratic society. With the social unrest of the late sixties and early seventies attracting the attention of the responsible citizenry, the books became victims, in Georgia, of the times they were written to enhance. The writer also describes how those who opposed the new textbooks were successfully able, during the early seventies, to use the upheaval created by the demand for social change on a broader scale to influence the Georgia State Board of Education to act against all works by Edwin Fenton.

This study is significant because it demonstrates censorship directed against an individual rather than a specific work. This study is also significant to the history of education in Georgia as it explores the relationship among the Georgia State Board of Education, its professional textbook committee, and outside pressure groups.
The purposes of this study are to (1) describe the course of events which led to the Georgia State Board of Education's removal of all textbooks edited, authored, or contributed to by Edwin Fenton from the state-approved textbook list, and (2) to report the current availability of the textbook selection process in Georgia. This study will also include a review of the policies for textbook selection and how the professional textbook selection committees are formed.

The scope of this study covers the period from 1960 to 1977. It is limited to those events of the era which contributed directly or indirectly to the deletion of all social studies textbooks, edited, authored, or contributed to by Edwin Fenton from the Georgia state-approved textbook list.

The significant phrase in this study, which may require some explanation, is the "banning of the Fenton books in Georgia." Literally, this phrase suggests banning or prohibiting the sale of books written by Edwin Fenton in Georgia; but, in this study it means the deletion of Edwin Fenton's books from the state-approved textbook list. This action, in effect, bans the books from nearly all of the public schools in Georgia since over eighty per cent of all Georgia textbooks are purchased with state funds and books not on the state-approved list cannot be purchased with state funds.

A significant portion of the material researched for this study comes from the personal files of Dr. Fenton. The material includes personal letters, newspaper articles, and articles from professional journals. Other sources include the minutes from the State Board of Education's meetings during the era of controversy, the policies for textbook
selection from the Georgia State Department of Education and interviews with state department officials, state board members, and members of the Georgia Council for the Social Sciences. Other references include subsequent Georgia textbook lists, the Citizen's Education Review, the Atlanta Journal, newsletters and periodicals of professional organizations.

This investigation begins by analyzing those events of the sixties which had an indirect influence on the state board's action. In this same section, the writer describes the development of the "new" social studies which is the source of Fenton's social studies series. Also, considered in this part of the study are the implications of censorship and some past occurrences in Georgia and in the nation.

The second part of this study focuses on Georgia's conservatism, its social and political reaction to the changing trends of the sixties. Further, the writer discusses the political structure of the State Board of Education and its policies governing the selection of textbooks in Georgia. This section will also include the changes in the policies since 1972.

Finally, this study describes those events which led to the removal of the Fenton social studies textbooks from the state-approved textbook list and the resulting consequences.
CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND EMERGING TRENDS

This chapter is designed to establish a foundation for the trend of thought which influenced the kind of action the State Board of Education of Georgia took against works of Edwin Fenton. During the decade prior to the action taken against Professor Fenton's textbooks, social unrest, change, and reform dominated the era. The Vietnam War, the civil-rights movement, the assassinations of three national leaders, and the youth movement had a tremendous impact on social thought in America. As the demands for social change and educational reform accelerated, the Federal government financed projects in which Professor Edwin Fenton and other professional educators were busy developing new social studies curricula to enhance the academic growth of the period.

The enthusiasm for social change and educational reform, however, was not shared by everyone. There was diverse opposition to change and reform among the different groups due to the varied degrees of moderation among them. The die-hard guardians of the southern tradition were among those who provided the strongest opposition. Their reaction to social change and educational reform on a smaller scale filtered into Georgia's textbook controversy. The opposition to Professor Fenton's works were raised over national issues which served as background to the Fenton textbook controversy in Georgia.
The Vietnam War

The war in Vietnam dominated American foreign policy and had strong influence on the domestic programs of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society. The costs of the war reached an estimated level of thirty billion dollars a year and forced the Johnson administration to cut back on its "Great Society" plans. The drain of human and economic resources into the Vietnam War underscored the inability of the Johnson administration to provide adequate funds to fulfill the promises to eliminate poverty and racial injustice. At the same time of the Vietnam crises, the "Great Society" was facing other crises, such as urban riots and water and air pollution, requiring huge appropriations from the national income. ¹

The Vietnam War was the most important single cause of protest among white citizens during the sixties. ² The anti-war movement increased as the war escalated. Liberals, radicals, and university students participated vigorously in demonstrations, "teach-ins and sit-ins." Some young men burned their draft cards. By 1967, opposition to the war included many of the most influential members of Congress from both political parties. ³


The role of America in the Vietnam War caused division and concern within the American society. There were both pro-war and anti-war factions in the American society. As the anti-war faction launched protest against United States involvement in Vietnam, there was concern among the pro-war factions about the loyalty of those protesters who became draft evaders and refused to serve in the armed services of the United States. Although the nation at-large treated the Vietnam War as a prolonged headache rather than a national cause,\(^4\) there were those Americans who believed it to be the duty of all Americans to serve in the armed forces when called upon, irrespective of the circumstances of war. Their dogmatic views on loyalty and duty to this country made it difficult for those who sought to be more rationalistic about the war.

This difficulty was encountered by Edwin Fenton when the Georgia State Board of Education banned his social studies textbooks from the state-approved textbook list. The inquiry based textbooks were designed to develop rational thinking among students. The treatment of such issues as the Vietnam War and other national issues caused some to say the books were elements of revolution, rather than scholarship.\(^5\) This type of attitude was encouraged in the late sixties and early seventies when some students resorted to violence, smashing windows and fire-bombing buildings as they protested the government's war policy. Young protesters on


\(^5\)Douglassville Sentinel (April 12, 1972), p. 4.
campuses across the nation demanded that universities close down in strikes against the United States' involvement in the Vietnam War. Occasionally, violent demonstrations required the national guardsmen to be called in to disperse the protesting students. At Kent State University in Ohio, four protesting students were shot and killed. As the anti-war protest spread during the early 1970s, it created an untimely atmosphere for the Fenton series to appear in Georgia. Al Leake, chairman of the Georgia Basic Education Council (GBED), wrote,

One of the revolutionary tactics advocated is the inquiry method of teaching. ...The revolutionary aspect is in its realignment of lines of authority in the teaching process. Students assume powers and abilities their maturity cannot reasonably support. ...Fenton has edited two books on the New Social Studies which incorporate the inquiry approach. Books from the Fenton series are in use in Georgia schools.

Amidst an era of student revolt against the system, the Fenton series attracted more scrutiny by the Georgia State Board of Education. Some board members felt that the Fenton series encouraged protests among students because they did not condemn the anti-war protesters. Further, the conservative board members also disapproved of the liberal treatment of the civil rights movement. Some board members felt that some civil rights leaders received too much recognition and denied that they deserved a place in the American history book.

7The Georgia Basic Education Council is an organization of laymen designed to keep the public informed on educational matters in Georgia.
8Douglassville Sentinel (April 12, 1972), p. 4.
The Civil Rights Movement

The 1960's was an explosive decade of social reform. Ignited by the courage and leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., it was a decade that ached with mass beatings and jailing of thousands of student activists in the South as they staged their non-violent protests for equality, justice, and freedom.  

After eleven years of civil-rights struggles, radical and divisive changes began to appear in the movement. The civil rights legislation enacted in 1964 and 1965 had done little to relieve the masses of poor blacks who were victimized by low incomes, unemployment, poor housing and inferior education. As the war in Vietnam escalated, the prospects for further funding of the war on poverty faded. Frustrated by this dim background of hopelessness, many black communities in major cities across the nation exploded in patterns of violence that came to be known as the "long hot summers". The civil rights movement became more militant and some of its leaders began to preach "black power." President Johnson, calling for law and order, reasoned that the only genuine long range solution to the problems must be an attack upon the conditions which were causing despair and violence. Meanwhile, the black power movement alienated many young whites who were early participants in the cause for social justice. During the mid-sixties, some whites,

---


10 Current, p. 774.

11 Wolf, p. 33.
who opposed the new civil rights legislation and the movement, staged reactions which became known as a white backlash.

The White Backlash

The move to resist the civil rights movement was extremely popular, especially among the conservatives of the once "solid South." One of the most popular leaders of the white backlash was Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia from 1966 to 1970. Before becoming governor, Maddox, then a restaurant owner in Atlanta, led the first major challenge to the hotly disputed public-accommodation section of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Just two hours and ten minutes after President Johnson signed the bill, Maddox ordered three blacks away from his place, the Pickrick, at gunpoint. A three-judge panel in Atlanta ordered him to desegregate the Pickrick, but instead he and Moreton Bolleston, Jr., operator of the Heart of Atlanta Motel, asked Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black to state the effectiveness of the lower court's ruling. Black refused to do so explaining that to delay the enforcement of the law would be an unjustifiable restraint on the will of Congress. That was not good enough for Maddox. "It's involuntary servitude!" Maddox lamented. Defiant to the end, Maddox strapped a snub-nosed pistol to his side and whenever blacks appeared he rushed to the door to discourage them. When a United States district court ordered him to show cause why he should not be cited for contempt, Maddox closed the Pickrick. Maddox's stand earned him the

title "Mr. White Backlash," as he symbolized the movement."

The fact that Lester Maddox was later elected governor of Georgia is indicative of the popular attitude among Georgians toward civil rights during the 1960's. The presence of this attitude seemed evident among some State Board of Education members, as they lashed out against lessons in the Fenton series about the experiences of some civil rights activists, such as Dick Gregory and Martin Luther King, Jr.14

The Youth Movement

The youth movement which emerged during the sixties with its manifestations of difference in behavior and life styles among the younger generation led some observers to conclude that a cultural revolution was developing in America. The Vietnam War and the struggle for justice by the black population affected the whole country, but had a particular impact on the young. Many were extremely embittered by these two events that, in their eyes, betrayed the ideals in which their parents taught them to believe.15 Students insisted that some of their parents' values were misguided and out-of-date. Their refusal to yield to a culture they did not accept became the prevailing attitude of participants in the youth movements across the United States.16

14 Minutes, State Board of Education meeting (Atlanta, Georgia: January 20, 1972). See Appendix A.
15 Wolf, p. 6.
16 Rozwence, p. 580.
The hippie movement and the virulent student unrest of the late sixties represented the first dramatic signs of this vital change in the life of America's young people. A new morality emerged as the young began to "experiment with drugs, scorn the middle class values of neatness in personal appearance, and challenge all taboos concerning sex and obscene terms of sexual reference. Above all, the young -- whether radical, moderate or conservative -- shared a passionate liking for rock music."17

The students, while rejecting the value system of prior generations, were actively concerned with trying to bring more constructive changes. They demanded that their classes and textbooks be more relevant to the current society. They were aware of the internal problems of the United States and were seeking means of redress.18

Those entrusted with the teaching of values seemed totally unprepared to move from dogmatic to rational presentation of value systems. As their authority was threatened, some resorted to preaching rather than reflection. The youth responded with despair and violence.19 By the end of the decade, student demonstrations and protests had rocked colleges and universities throughout the United States.

Closely related to the unrest of the youth, and transcending it, was the task of all responsible citizens to improve the schools of the

17 Ibid., pp. 580-581.
18 Ibid., p. 821.
nation and to provide for rapidly increasing enrollments. Federal aid to education was significant, but it made no more than a start at coping with the problem. The social studies series by Fenton and his associates was the result of one of several projects funded by the Federal government to improve education.

The protest and violence which occurred in the youth movement strongly influenced the Georgia State Board of Education to react negatively towards the Fenton series. The high occurrence of student protest led some board members to think that Fenton's treatment of the controversial issues surrounding the Vietnam War and the civil rights movement would influence more protest.

Summary

In summary, there were three major events during the sixties which influenced the trend of thought causing the Fenton social studies textbooks to be banned from Georgia's state-approved textbook lists. The Vietnam War influenced the Georgia State Board of Education's decision to remove the Fenton social studies series from the state-approved textbook list because many of the protests in this country during this period were related in one respect or another to the war. These protests against the war raised serious questions which challenged the dogmatic standards of older generations -- a change not readily accepted among the conservative state board of education members in Georgia. The civil rights movement challenged the traditions of racism and social injustice

20 Ibid., p. 33.
which were common in Georgia. It also influenced the youth's challenge to the older generation. The mere mention of civil rights activists in a school textbook was an insult to the ultra-conservative views held by many Georgians during this period. And finally, the youth movement filled the nation's cup with protests. The controversial issues which led to student protest were the same issues covered in Fenton's social studies textbooks. Although these three events were of national emphasis, they had an indirect but definite impact on the Georgia State Board of Education's decision to remove the Fenton series from the state-approved textbook list.

The following chapter will discuss the background and development of the new social studies from which the Fenton series was derived.
CHAPTER II

TRENDS IN SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION DURING THE SIXTIES

INTRODUCTION

During an era of social reform and change, educators found themselves actively engaged in efforts to meet the demands for curriculum reform, especially in mathematics, science, and the social studies. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the movement which led to the development of the new social studies. The textbooks by Edwin Fenton and others, which were the center of controversy in Georgia, resulted from the new social studies projects. This chapter identifies the goals of the new social studies and tells how early projects were financed. It also identifies those educators who took the lead in the development of the new social studies projects.

This chapter recognizes some of the early criticisms of the new social studies including its strengths and weaknesses. It also recognizes the role of some professional organizations in the development of the new social studies. The development of the new social studies was an effort by professional educators to satisfy the demands of society for a more viable curriculum.

New Science and New Math

During the late fifties and the early sixties the new mathematics and new science curriculums began to disturb the calm American school
classrooms. Spurred by the launching of the Soviet satellite, Sputnik, and financed generously by private foundations and the United States government, the new curricular reforms were spread throughout American schools. The scientists and mathematicians inaugurated a different system of developing curricular materials based on a new set of premises. With the strong financial support from the government, they were able to experiment freely. Sputnik generated a national emergency in education. As a result, the best scholars could be recruited for curriculum development. The main charge against the traditional curriculum was its content. Its vast materials were to be limited to eliminate the frills and emphasis placed on the process of science inquiry. The new principles, materials, and teaching strategies to be employed were different and each textbook had to be accompanied by elaborate instructional guides which replaced the teacher-written course of study. Because the projects stressed a new emphasis upon scientific method, extensive laboratory manuals, sets of laboratory equipment, and audio-visual aids integrated with the text were developed to teach the essential elements of a discipline accompanied by the course of study. Fenton claimed that the results inspired the educational world.21

The New Social Studies

The first call for a revolution in the social studies came in 1961, when an article by Charles R. Keller, Director of the John Hays

Fellows Program, appeared in Saturday Review. This article was considered significant in at least two respects. First, the author was a former college professor of history and Director of the Advanced Placement Program, and second, the article first appeared in a popular periodical rather than a professional journal. These two aspects also characterized the critiques in science and mathematics, which led to the curriculum revision movements of the new science and new math. 

In his article, Keller wrote,

...things are relatively quiet on the social studies front, where perhaps, the need for revision is greatest.... The time has come to take a searching look at the social studies in American schools, to ask why nothing significant is happening in this area, and to make suggestions for change.

In part, the present unhappy situation results from the fact that social studies is not a subject. It is a group of federation of subjects: history, geography, political science, economics, sociology, anthropology and psychology, often merged in inexact and confusing ways. Furthermore, too many social studies teachers have emphasized the creation of good citizens rather than the content and discipline of their subjects.

As Keller continued, he cited the current situation in the social studies:

Although no national pattern exists, it is possible to make some general statements about school offerings.... In the fifth grade, for the first but far from the last time, comes American history, and in the sixth grade world geography and history. With the seventh grade, and continuing through grade twelve, begins a series of courses which, many schools must be questioning not only as courses but also because of the cyclical pattern in which they are arranged....

This cyclical pattern for grades seven through twelve was recommended in the 1961 Report of the Committee on

---


Social Studies, and since that time there has been little change in the curriculum although the United States and the world have moved considerably since 1916.24

As a result of the cyclical arrangement of courses, boring, demotivating, expensive repetition of subject and material is all too common. Articulation... is particularly inadequate in the social studies. American history, for instance, is taught in survey courses in grades five, eight, and eleven, - and again in college - with practically no consultation or coordination of work among teachers.25

As Keller closed, he pleaded,

The hope is that students will not just learn facts but will become acquainted with concepts and skilled in ways of thinking which will help them to analyze and come to grips with the new, complex, and difficult situations which they will constantly be facing.

Needed, too, are closer ties between school and college teachers that will benefit both groups.... The sheepskin curtain which has been rung down between schools and colleges must be pierced.26

The circular reform movement reached the social studies when three developments converged. First, the educational community saw that the social studies had failed to keep pace with curricular reform in science and mathematics. Yet the world's most pressing problems - war, the population explosion, racial relations - all fell within the social studies area. Second, new knowledge about the way in which children learn demanded new materials of instruction and new teaching techniques. Finally, money from private foundations and the government became available to support research.

24 Ibid.
25 Ibid., p. 60.
26 Ibid., p. 62.
University scholars, elementary and high school teachers, and school administrators quickly joined forces to push reform.

Early Pioneers

There were at least two pioneers in social studies whose labors in the 1950's anticipated the major thrust of the new social studies movement. They were Lawrence Senesh and Edwin Fenton. Both were scholars in the academic disciplines, economics and history, respectively. Senesh, a professor of economics at Purdue University, created a program at Elkhart Indiana where he taught economics to children in the first, second, and third grades. The initial support for his Elkhart endeavors came from the school district central office. The program included fourteen elementary schools. He taught teachers and took over classes to learn and then to demonstrate what could be done with effective teaching ideas. The program was later financed by an Elkhart businessman and prior to publication of the first edition of Our Working World, an elementary school social studies textbook series, development money was provided by the publisher, Science Research Associates.

Fenton, a professor of history at Carnegie-Mellon Institute (now Carnegie-Mellon University) had been given responsibility for the preservice teacher education of secondary school history teachers. To serve as a model to his students, Fenton secured permission from the Pittsburgh Public Schools and the administration of Taylor-Alderdice High school to teach one section of a history course each school year to academically

27Fenton, p. 3.

talented youth. This laboratory not only served as an observation post for Carnegie Tech's prospective high school history teachers, but also provided a testing ground for Fenton's own ideas on the content and pedagogy of history education.29

Fenton was bothered by the pat narrative assertions common to the secondary historical source writing found in history textbooks. Also, in his own teaching he had experienced the students' boredom with history and social studies courses. To bring life to history, to make it more problematical to students, and hence to rekindle student curiosity, he introduced primary source documents to students as the raw data from which history is created. Since raw data lie unanalyzed, uncombined, and mute before the historian, he must bring conceptual frames, evidential rules, and, most importantly bothersome questions to bear on the assembled data, in order to create meaning from randomness and disorder. Out of Fenton's experiences with using primary source documents in his high school history class came the publication, 32 Problems in World History.30

As early exemplars of the new social studies movement, Senesh and Fenton provided some clear directions and precedents:

1) The initiative in bridging the chasm between school and university is taken by professors in the disciplines of history and the social sciences.

2) The curriculum reformer gains credibility with potential clients by actually implementing his ideas in classrooms where he is a demonstration teacher.

3) Although funds are needed for full-scale curriculum materials

29 Ibid., p. 21.
30 Ibid., p. 21.
development, little or no money is needed to get started.

4) In seeking where to begin, the prospective reformer can find no better location than his own back yard.

5) The initial, visible, obvious focus for curriculum revision is the course textbook.

6) The intellectual acumen, enthusiasm, and charisma of the change agent enhances the diffusion and adoption of innovations.

7) The test of the usefulness, effectiveness, and appeal of new curriculum materials is in the place where they are to be used - the classroom.

8) The nature of knowledge (the structure of economics or history) provides the initial, primary impetus for revision of the materials of instruction. 31

By the end of 1963, a number of other reformers had joined Senesh and Fenton in the new social studies movement. Numerous curriculum projects across the nation began to develop materials that were based either on the structure of a single discipline or an interdisciplinary framework forged from the major concepts of the social sciences. 32 Among the more viable of these current efforts to revise the social studies program, the following seemed most promising: 33

31 Ibid., p. 21.
1) Project Social Studies of the United States Office of Educa-
tion

2) The support of social science under the course content im-
provement program of the National Science Foundation

3) The Social Studies and the Social Sciences publication spon-
sored by the American Council of Learned Societies and the National Coun-
cil for the Social Studies.

4) The several task forces at work on separate strands of the
social studies program; for example, American Economics Association;
American Association of Geographers and National Council of Geographic
Education; American Anthropological Association; American Sociological
Association; other associations and groups.

In 1958, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS)
recognized that at least two trends were emerging: 1) infiltration of
the social studies curriculum by previously neglected social sciences,
including anthropology, economics, social psychology, and sociology; and
2) new ways of viewing knowledge in the disciplines of geography, his-
tory, and political science, as well as in the other social sciences.
During the same year, the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS)
established a Committee on the Secondary Schools in order to alert schol-
ars to the needs of the schools. To achieve this purpose, ACLS sponsor-
ed a series of panel discussion conferences on the problems and needs of
secondary school curricula.34

34Haas, pp. 22-23.
In 1960, NCSS and ACLS joined forces to sponsor a series of papers on the content objectives of each of seven social sciences and two other papers on regional studies. Each statement was prepared by an eminent scholar in the discipline; the statement on history, for example, was prepared by Joseph R. Strayer of Princeton University. Prior to publication, most of the essays were presented and discussed at two separate meetings; one at Indiana University in the spring, 1961 and the other at an annual national convention of NCSS in November, 1961.\textsuperscript{35}

In 1961, the National Science Foundation funded three social studies projects. The High School Geography Project of the Association of American Geographers, in cooperation with the National Council of Geographic Education, was begun under the directorship of Nicholas Helburn at Montana State University in Bozeman. At Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, the Sociological Resources for the Social Studies Project of the American Sociological Association opened its offices with Robert Feldmesser as director. And, the Anthropology Association was begun at the University of Chicago under the directorship of Malcolm Collier.\textsuperscript{36}

**Project Social Studies**

In November, 1962, the United States Office of Education announced the initiation of Project Social Studies:

Experts in education and the academic disciplines that comprise the social studies have acknowledged the need for revising the social studies curriculum at all levels. With the initiation of Project Social Studies, the Office of Education has provided an opportunity for representatives of both these groups to discuss ways of improving research,

\textsuperscript{35}Ibid., p. 23.  \textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 39.
instruction, teacher education, and dissemination of information in this field.... The Office invites interested individuals and groups to share their ideas of other activities that are needed....

Congress had already allocated funds for the project under Public Law 83-531 through the Cooperative Research Program to support three kinds of field activities: 1) basic and applied research projects; 2) curriculum study centers; and research development activities. 38 A little more than six months later, the Office of Education announced that awards had been approved for seven curriculum centers, eleven research projects, and two developmental activities. Of six types of programs available under the Cooperative Research Program, Project Social Studies was already using three. 39

Contracts with seven institutions of higher learning were signed to establish curriculum centers to fulfill one or more of these purposes:

1) To redefine the aims of social studies curriculums at one or more grade levels;

2) To develop sequences of presenting subject matter that are based on what is known about human development and the teaching-learning processes;

3) To work out methods and prepare materials to meet specific needs;


38 Ibid.

4) To try out new methods and materials and evaluate them; and
5) To disseminate information about the most promising methods
and materials. 40

The following list identifies each center and briefly summarizes
the task of each:

1) Carnegie Institute of Technology (Carnegie-Mellon
University). Under the Direction of Edwin Fenton, this
center will prepare materials and make suggestions on read-
ing materials for students of history and social sciences
in grades 9 to 12. Term of contract: April 1963 to
October 1967.

2) University of Minnesota. Under the direction of
Edith West and others, this center will use an inter-
disciplinary team of experts to identify the structure of
each of the social science disciplines. It will prepare
and evaluate guides and materials to be used from kinder-
garten through grade 14. Term of contract: April 1963
to June 1967.

3) Harvard University. Under the direction of Donald
W. Oliver, this center will plan a social science curricu-
lum based on an analysis of public issues. From a curricu-
lum including approximately thirty teaching units organized
around five persistent social problems, it will select, de-
velop, and evaluate instructional materials and teaching
procedures for grades 8, 9, and 10. Term of contract: July 1963 to June 1968.

4) Syracuse University. Under the direction of Roy
A. Price, a center will identify the basic concepts which
should be communicated to students in the social studies
program and prepare illustrative materials for three grade
levels. Term of contract: May 1963 to June 1968.

5) Ohio State University. Under the direction of
Edward J. Furst, a center will concentrate on economics
at the 9th grade level. It will analyze the structure of
economics as a discipline, prepare materials, and dissemi-
nate information about those materials that prove most ef-
fective at this level. Term of contract: October 1963 to
September 1966.

40 Ibid., p. 357.
6) Northwestern University. Under the direction of Jonathon McLendon, a center will work at improving instruction about U. S. society in grades 5, 8, and 11. It will attempt to eliminate the unnecessary duplication that occurs in the teaching of American history at these grades and will develop and evaluate instructional materials to replace those that are eliminated. Term of contract: September 1963 to June 1968.

7) University of Illinois. Under the direction of Ella C. Leppert, a center will work out three sequential courses for a social studies program for the secondary school. These courses are to be part of a 5 year sequence designed to help students understand the basic structure of the social order, the dynamic nature of societies, and the effects of social change. Term of contract: August 1963 to December 1968.41

Of the eleven approved research projects, only seven were contracted and funded at the time Smith was writing his report. Of these seven, only two appeared to be related even peripherally to the general scope of the new social studies movement.42

Two developmental activities funded were the conference at Stanford University under the direction of G. Wesley Sowards and the conference at Syracuse University, chaired by Stephen K. Bailey. The former conference was to consider such matters as the extent of agreement on the place of the social studies in the curriculum, the improvements most needed, and the research most needed to bring those improvements about. The latter conference met to pull together the findings of research already completed, to identify problems on which research is needed, and to stimulate research on those problems.43

41Ibid., pp. 357-358.
42Haas, p. 41.
43Smith, p. 359.
Developing the New Social Studies

In 1963, Lawrence E. Metcalf, a professor of education at the University of Illinois in Urbana, cited six deficiencies in the current curriculum. The deficiencies were: (1) the wholly ritualistic quality of the instructional purposes offered to teachers by curriculum planners, (2) a poor and wrong solution to the problem of student motivation, (3) a failure to accord recognition to the newer social sciences and the continued domination of history, (4) the requirement that teachers take methods courses which do no more than elaborate upon the obvious, and (5) a tendency to treat the normative aspects of social studies instruction with the totalitarian methods of prescription and indoctrination.44

With Jerome Bruner's Process of Education in one hand and money from the U. S. Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and private foundations in the other, social scientists and educators marched forth and created what came to be called "the new social studies."45 These new programs, however, were not without their criticisms. In the very early stages of their development, it was pointed out that the efforts so far were characterized by lack of overall agreement on both ends and means. Each group attacking the school curriculum problem either had too easily given up the difficult task of overall structure for the social studies or had undertaken immediately and deliberately the specific task of outlining course content within one of the

45 Radz and Risinger, p. 2.
disciplines (e.g., economics) or for one of the school divisions (e.g., the ninth grade course in geography). The accomplishments in scope and sequence of a coordinated social studies program from kindergarten through grade twelve were meager. 46

It was further cited that the many efforts at revising the social studies were ...proceeding without benefit of "systems approach," "set theory," or old-fashioned concern for curriculum balance, coordination, and articulation. Lacking any such planning made it seem almost impossible to bring order out of the many scattered starts. 47

Criticisms of the social studies were widespread and frequently found in educational circles. Suggestions for the improvement of the social studies were as diverse as the personalities discussing them. While math and science received the bouquets for curriculum breakthroughs, the social studies was still treated as a retarded child in a fast changing school scene. 48

Many critics counted the excess of "presentism" in teaching, while others made charges against the quality of the social studies textbooks, insufficient attention to patriotism, neglect of fact-learning, and a dozen other faults. It seemed that everyone had a different notion of what the social studies should have attempted. 49

46 Paul R. Hanna, pp. 190-191.
47 Ibid., p. 191.
49 Ibid., p. 360.
Several questions remained to be considered. Should there be a standard curriculum for the whole country or should there be growing diversity? Should more elective courses be offered? Should more insistence be devoted to fact-learning? Should more attention be given to non-Western cultures? Should there be large scale projects to investigate revolutionary new approaches to teaching about human behavior? If there was a lack of uniformity in the social studies offerings, there was a comparable lack of agreement among the critics as to what the offerings should be. Although the critics did not agree on a formula for a uniform curriculum, many insisted that one should exist. 50

With the single exception of Donald Oliver's project at Harvard, each of the U. S. Office of Education curriculum projects in the social studies sought to identify the structure of social science discipline or to build a curriculum around social science concepts. The directors took their cues from Jerome Bruner's influential volume The Process of Education (1960). However, by 1965, no consensus about structure had emerged. Some groups seemed to identify the term with generalizations drawn from the social sciences; others employed the terms structure and concept interchangeably; and there were some implications that structure is synonymous with the social scientist's mode of inquiry. 51

The new social studies, like new math and the new science, abandoned the traditional expository method of teaching. This method

---

50 Ibid., p. 360.
was replaced by another set of teaching strategies diversely called the discovery or inquiry method, hypothetical teaching, or an inductive approach. This method was described as follows:

Students are presented with data and encouraged to discover generalizations for themselves, to build one generalization upon another, and eventually to develop an understanding of the entire structure of the subject matter which they are studying.52

All of the project directors except one indicated that they would not write new textbooks. They were producing or collecting an enormous variety of materials such as narrative accounts, case studies, analytical articles, sets of statistics, and so forth, which could be used as take-off points for thinking. It was hoped that abandoning conventional texts and the use of facts and generalizations would bring about a revolution in the thinking of students.53

Almost all of the projects intended to teach generalizations and concepts were drawn from the disciplines of history and the social sciences.54 In the courses which were being designed, students were to organize knowledge as historians, geographers, political scientists, economists, anthropologists, sociologists and psychologists organize it. Two projects were primarily devoted to identifying generalizations from the disciplines and arranging them in sequential order for teaching. All of the projects had scholars on their staffs, one of whose major functions was to identify the most significant parts of their disciplines. These scholars or other members of the staff then incorporated the

52 Ibid., p. 207. 53 Ibid., p. 207. 54 Ibid., p. 207.
ideas which had been identified into materials suitable for inductive
teaching at various grade levels. 55

Several of the projects emphasized another aspect of the dis-
ciplines, the mode of inquiry of history and the social sciences. Tra-
ditional courses had often failed to investigate unequivocally the man-
ner in which practicing social scientist develop and validate hypothe-
ses. The emphasis upon the disciplines combined with the search for
structure and the employment of inductive teaching techniques gave a
new emphasis to the types of critical thinking characteristic of the
best scholarly work. 56

By the first months of 1966, the new social studies project
staffs were well on the way to producing their first units and courses,
or were already engaged in the process of field testing the new mater-
ials. 57 Also about this time, some attention was being devoted to the
tasks of preparing teachers for the introduction of the new materials
and courses. Hilda Taba, then Professor of Education at San Francisco
State College, noted that the charges were "profound enough to cause a
serious gap between what teachers are now doing or can now do and what
is expected of them" Furthermore, as Taba continued, "if one considers
the continuing explosion of knowledge in all content fields and in the
use of media of educational technology, it seems that the need for
retraining of teachers will be a continuous rather than a temporary
phenomenon." 58 Taba cited the gaps considered to be primary targets

55Ibid., p. 207. 56Ibid., p. 208. 57Ibid., p. 208.
58Hilda Taba, "Techniques of In-Service Training," Social Educa-
for in-service education if it was to serve as an agent of change. The chief areas of concern were:

1) A new approach to the content of social studies. Perhaps the most difficult task of in-service training lies in helping teachers to shed their deep seated reverence for covering detailed facts, to develop a capacity to identify large ideas, to use facts selectively and economically to develop or elucidate these ideas.

2) The development of thinking. Teachers need to learn how to organize instruction in two dimensions... according to two cognitive maps: one representing the significant dimensions of content, and another the requisite intellectual skills for processing the materials of this content.

3) Organize knowledge for optional learning. Teachers need to become knowledgeable about the processes of thinking: how it develops, what the basic processes are, and what it takes to encourage and to nurture it.

4) Enlarging the conception of teaching. Teachers need to overcome the oversimplified concepts of teaching and recognize it as one of the most complex activities, requiring a multitude of considerations... and,

5) Inductive teaching. Inductive learning requires inductive teaching. Teachers must "shift from an expository style of teaching to an heuristic one."59

All twelve of the new social studies project directors agreed on the necessity for some in-service education in order to assure effective use of the new materials.60

One ardent proponent of combining in-service education with the ongoing efforts of curriculum materials development was Edwin Fenton.61

In 1966, Fenton admonished his fellow historians not only to help develop a wide range of materials devised for a variety of objectives and student audiences at all grade levels, but "to suggest criteria by which

---
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teachers can decide which of the new materials, if any, to select for their students," to make teachers disciplined, knowledgeable and imaginative through their college history classrooms, "to develop ways to get experimental editions of new material into the hands of college subject professors, of methods teachers, of NDEA institute directors, and classroom teachers everywhere," to "establish centers where the materials can be collected and where teachers can visit to observe a range of teaching strategies," and to make sure that the projects contribute to them and that the history profession helps to staff and to utilize them.62

The United States Office of Education under Title XI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, funded a new and potentially vital sort of in-service preparation. Each summer four or five thousand social studies teachers could attend summer institutes, for about six weeks on college campuses. The institutes were in history, geography, civics and economics. Other social studies disciplines were later included. The teachers attended the institutes full-time and received a basic stipend of seventy-five dollars per week plus fifteen dollars for each dependent. In 1966, the USOE began the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program. This program sent teachers with at least three years of experience to a university for a full year's study. Fellows received a four-thousand-dollar stipend plus an additional five hundred dollars for each dependent, and the university to which they want received twenty-five hundred dollars per fellow to cover tuition and

other expenses. In 1966, ten universities received from ten to twenty-five fellowships in the social studies area, a total of 185. Each university selected its own participants from among a large number of applicants. Some of the fellows attended Carnegie-Mellon University under the tutelage of Fenton and members of his staff.

Also, in 1966, a number of books appeared which were designed as new social studies methods textbooks for use with preservice and in-service social studies teachers. Among these were the Fenton "inductive approach," the Oliver and Shaver rationale for the Harvard Social Studies Project, the analysis of inquiry teaching and learning by Massialas and Cox, the first conference report of the Social Studies Education Consortium on "concepts and structure" edited by Irving Morrissetts, and a volume by Clements, Fielder, and Tabachnick on inquiry in elementary social studies.

The Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Materials

Although the other new social studies projects played a major role in the development of the new social studies, it was the Carnegie-Mellon group which produced the materials which later fed the fires of controversy in Georgia. The Fenton and Good project at Carnegie-Mellon University had contracted with Holt, Rinehart, and Winston to publish their entire grades 9-12 social studies curriculum. In 1967, several projects from this project were published by Holt: (1) a series of

---

63 Fenton (1967), pp. 117 and 119.
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brief experimental units; (2) a set of six teacher-training films showing Fenton teaching a class of bright ninth-graders; and (3) an introduction to the many aspects of the new social studies reform movement.  

The Holt curriculum, as it was later called, was based on seven major principles. First, the readings for the courses were chosen partly to help students learn the mode of inquiry of history and the social sciences. Second, the materials developed were designed for inductive teaching. Third, the material within each course and from one course to the next were organized sequentially. Fourth, the materials relied heavily on audio-visual aids designed specifically for particular tasks within particular courses. Fifth, supplementary materials were provided with each course. Sixth, two types of evaluation were used to measure student mastery of the objectives and to assess the program; and seventh, a teacher's manual was provided for each course to give maximum aid to the teacher.  

The Holt Curriculum represented an endeavor to move forward a viable partnership between the social sciences and the humanities. A look at the course titles gives one a feeling for the counterpoint between the historical and scientific approaches. In the ninth grade, "Comparative Political Systems" and "Cooperative Economic Systems" are offered; in the tenth grade, "The Shaping of Western Society" and

66 Ibid., pp. 57-68.  
67 See a charted sequence of the Holt Curriculum in Appendix B.  
"Tradition and Change in Four Societies" are the courses offered; in the eleventh grade, "American History" is taught for the full year; and in the twelfth grade, "Introduction to the Behavioral Sciences" and "The Humanities in Three Cities" are taught to round out the curriculum. Sometimes the insights of the social sciences are an overt concern as in "Comparative Economics Systems." However, in history offerings they are incorporated more subtly, as in a study of changing American social structure.\textsuperscript{69}

Fenton, like many other innovators in the new social studies, acknowledged his debt to some ideas advanced by Jerome Bruner in \textit{The Process of Education} (1960). He did not concur completely with Bruner's claim that we would move away from the study of history, but he was impressed by the inductive aspects of Bruner's teaching, his notion about a spiral curriculum, and his inquiries about the structure of disciplines.\textsuperscript{70}

Fenton recognized that the new social studies projects had overlooked the slow learners. While originally the authors designed courses for above average children, a new version was prepared to take care of low ability groups.\textsuperscript{71} The Carnegie-Mellon project group indicated that teachers should emphasize four sets of objectives in addition to knowledge and inquiry skills with slow learning students.
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First, they should help these students to develop good self concepts in order to convince them that they are not hopelessly dumb, that they can graduate from high school, that they can get a job, and that they do belong - to a community, to a nation, to mankind. Second, they should help students to develop better attitudes to learning by encouraging student participation in class discussions. Third, ... help students to clarify their opinions about the nature of a good man, a good life, and a good society. Finally, teachers of slow learners must emphasize learning skills.72

The textbook and materials designed by the Carnegie-Mellon project for slow learners was entitled "The Americans: A History of the United States." This book became a focal point of the book banning attack against Edwin Fenton in Georgia.

New Social Studies in Georgia

Professionally, social science educators at the University of Georgia found themselves trying to keep pace with the nation in developing new approaches to teaching the social studies. The eighth project of Project Social Studies to be funded by the Cooperative Research Branch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was the Anthropology Curriculum Project at the University of Georgia. The purpose of this project was to develop instructional material in anthropology for pupil and teacher use in grades 1-7. Under the directorship of Marion J. Rice and Wilfred C. Bailey, this project used fourteen experimental schools, all in Georgia, representing children from rural, town, and metropolitan areas.73


Summary

The new social studies projects were a movement to revise and reform the social studies curriculum. Lawrence Senesh and Edwin Fenton were early pioneers in the new social studies reform movement. They were later joined in the effort by other professional educators, such as Donald Oliver, Hilda Taba, A. Wesley Sowards and many others. Influenced by the writing of Jerome Bruner and the generous financial backing of the United States Office of Education, educators and researchers moved forward with the new social studies projects. The projects were also supported by several professional organizations.

Although the other new social studies projects played a major role in the development of the new social studies, it was the Carnegie-Mellon project by Fenton, Good and others which produced the materials which later led to controversy in Georgia. Their work, which was later called the Holt Curriculum, was based on seven major principles. First, readings were chosen to help the students learn the mode of inquiry of history and the social sciences; second, the materials developed were designed for inductive teaching; third, the material within each course and from course to course was organized sequentially; fourth, the materials relied on audio-visual aids for particular tasks within the courses; fifth, supplementary materials were provided; sixth, two types of evaluation were used to measure student mastery of the objectives and to assess the program; and seventh, a teacher's manual was provided maximum aid for the teachers.

The Holt Curriculum developed by Fenton, Good and others at Carnegie-Mellon University represented a move toward a viable partnership between history, the social sciences, and the humanities.
Fenton acknowledged his debt to Jerome Bruner for his inductive aspects of teaching, his notion about a spiral curriculum, and his inquiries about the structure of disciplines. While originally the authors had designed courses for above average children, Fenton also recognized that the new social studies projects had overlooked the slow learners. For the slow learners they emphasized four objectives which included helping the students to develop good self-concepts, developing better attitudes toward learning by encouraging participation in classes, clarifying their opinions about what is good, and emphasizing learning skills. The textbooks developed by this group became the subject of controversy in Georgia.
CHAPTER III
CENSORSHIP AND TEXTBOOK SELECTION

INTRODUCTION

The nature of this study is based on the problems of censorship and the procedures for textbook selection. Censorship refers to the process of suppressing material or information or parts of it which is deemed objectionable on moral, political, military, or other grounds and prohibiting such information from being transmitted to its destination without revision. In this study, censorship refers to the prohibition of social studies textbooks edited, authored, or contributed to by Edwin Fenton from the approved textbook list in Georgia. This list includes at least eighty percent of all textbook purchases made in that state. A major concern of educators during the controversy over the Fenton social studies series was determining who should censor or screen the textbooks before they are used in the classrooms. In this chapter the writer discusses some views on the problem of censorship in education and cites some cases of censorship in education which drew national attention. Furthering the investigation of the Fenton controversy, the writer reviews Georgia's recent history of censoring textbooks for public schools.

Another major concern for professional educators during the Fenton controversy was the procedure for selecting textbooks for the
public schools. Who had the power to do what? This question was at the core of the issue when concerned professional educators challenged the authority of the Georgia State Board of Education to select and censor textbooks. In the latter part of this chapter, the writer discusses some views on textbook selection and describes the method of textbook selection used in Georgia before and after the controversy.

The Problem of Censorship in Education

The process of censoring is a continuing problem, as old as the effort to communicate one's thoughts in any enduring form and as old as the desire to impose one's opinion on that of a neighbor. It is a problem, particularly in a democratic society which is founded on the premise of the right of free speech and free press.74

The question of censorship has many aspects. It is likely to arouse heated debate, but such debate is not necessarily a cause for alarm. A more serious consequence would be a situation in which airing of the controversy was prohibited. However, there is a real danger that the furor over an isolated case may obscure the basic issue, the right to act on one's own judgment. American citizens have the right, even the obligation to concern themselves with matters of public morality and security, in fact with any issues as they relate to communications. A viable democracy rests on the assumption that citizens will consider this obligation and will weigh the evidences on all sides of an issue before they act. The danger in the exercise of this right is

---

the tendency to confuse free discussion and dissent with the right to censor.\textsuperscript{75}

Censors are dangerous when they decide to monitor one's freedom to know. The less qualified they are, the more dangerous their efforts. Unfortunately, their lack of qualification is often matched only by their zeal and loudness. A vociferous individual or group of citizens without any particular qualifications for the role of judge and without any authority invested by the public attempts, occasionally with success, to exercise what could be called a "tyranny of ignorance."\textsuperscript{76}

Pro-censorship groups have many targets. Anna S. Ochoa, president of the National Council for the Social Studies (1978), in her president's address to the council at their national meeting in Houston, Texas in November, 1978 cited a dozen targets which pro-censorship groups have attacked. They are as follows:

1. Adolescent Novels - ones that deal with the problems adolescents face - whether they focus on drugs, juvenile delinquency, or sex.

2. Realistic Dialogue - here the target is sub-standard English. The Gablers fear that reading such dialect is a way of teaching students to use it.

3. Works by Questionable Writers - e.g., Langston Hughes, Malcolm X, Joan Baez, Ogden Nash.

4. Books by those considered to be homosexual authors - Emily Dickinson, Tennessee Williams, Walt Whitman, Gore Vidal, John Milton,

\textsuperscript{75}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 9.
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and Hans Christian Anderson.

5. Another category is books they describe as trash. Included here are such titles as Native Son, Catcher in the Rye, and Soul on Ice.

6. Teaching methods that represent secular humanism, which the protesters see as a set of ideas that denigrate family, church, and country.

7. Materials about ethnic studies and drug education.

8. Role playing.


10. Materials that make negative statements about parents.

11. Phase elective English programs.

12. Sex education.

Even though the examples given have applied to the middle and secondary school levels, elementary titles are becoming increasingly vulnerable. Whether in the form of textbooks or library books, elementary materials are becoming increasingly realistic.\textsuperscript{77}

For many decades public schools have been caught in the stifling stranglehold of pressure groups.\textsuperscript{78} Nowhere can the extremes of censorship be better illustrated than in the sensitive areas of textbook censorship and freedom in the classroom, largely because the censoring groups argue that it's necessary to protect the youth and their morals from ideas which would corrupt them and destroy their patriotism.\textsuperscript{79}


\textsuperscript{78}Williams, p. 9.
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Generally in the name of morality and patriotism, the censors usurp the professional privileges which teachers and administrators have gained through years of specialized training.\textsuperscript{80}

Ironically, the real censors are not the pressure groups, but rather, the person or group that has authority. A censor can be a state board of education, a superintendent of schools, a principal, a school board, a teacher, or a librarian. When these authorities give in to the demands of pressure groups and remove books or parts of them, they become censors.\textsuperscript{81}

One aim of public supported education in a free society is to produce free people capable of living productively in such a society. Such people must develop analytical ability, an intelligent understanding and toleration of divergent points of view, and a degree of responsibility which will permit them to act fairly and with good conscience.\textsuperscript{82}

Their education, then, must acquaint them with accurate information, encourage their intellectual curiosity, and help them learn to make valid judgments on the basis of facts. These goals are challenged by pressure groups attempting to gain control of the schools.

At levels of education and within most subject areas, theories exist which are repugnant to some elements of society. Educators must be left to function as professionals to determine the appropriateness of what will be taught within their discrete disciplines. Further, the public must educate itself about the changing society and ask whether
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\end{flushright}
its public school textbooks will be "shaped by pressure groups or by scholars seeking to supply the most accurate information available, presented objectively?" 83

Teachers are better prepared than ever before and are increasingly demanding that they, not the public, determine what constitutes appropriate education. 84 The public, on the other hand, must support its educators during attacks, by thoroughly investigating the identity and the charges of pressure groups. 85

Incidence of Censorship in Education

Censorship is increasing, and the focal point is the public school - both curriculum and libraries. According to the records of the American Library Association's Office for Intellectual Freedom, censorship attempts between 1969 and 1972 increased at a rate of 200 percent a year. 86

Anna S. Ochoa also cited in her presidential address at the 58th Annual Meeting of the NCSS, that an organization called Education Research Analysts had served as consultants to many pro-censorship groups. They have visited such places as Kanawha County, West Virginia, New Orleans, Louisiana, and St. Paul/Minneapolis, Minnesota where issues

---

83 Ibid., p. 9.
of censorship have occurred. Ms. Ochoa stated, that,

...in general, they find many instructional materials to be anti-American and anti-Christian. Specifically, they offer the following statement as a description of their commitment: "Until textbooks are changed, there is absolutely no chance that crime, violence, VD and abortion rates will do anything but climb."

Because of its scope, the writer will not attempt to list all incidence of censorship. However, there are some cases which drew national attention and are due special notice.

Historically, the official process of censoring has depended largely upon the interests of those in power at the time. The focus of suppression during the Middle Ages reflected the strength of the church and concentrated on heresy and blasphemy. As the strength of governments grew, the focus of suppression concentrated on treason and sedition. During the American Revolution there were efforts to suppress the works of Thomas Paine by British authorities. Plantation owners attempted to suppress anti-slavery literature in the antebellum South. After World War I and World War II the fear of the rise of communism in the United States caused several books to be censored. By 1970, with approximately one-half of the United States population under age twenty-five, the tensions had turned to a fear for the breakdown of morals

88Ibid., p. 305.
among our youth.

Biologists have been subjected to spirited attempts to restrain them when they taught the Darwinian theory of evolution. In 1925 the question of evolution was taken to court in the famous "monkey trial" of teacher John T. Scopes. Darwin's theory of evolution was banned in states all over the South and Midwest. This issue was revived in California in 1974 as it pitted eminent scientists against articulate religious fundamentalists. The controversy was over the new science textbooks for the state's elementary school children. Some groups wanted the biblical creation to accompany evolution in texts. Although the effort failed, the books were forced to be modified to eliminate scientific dogmatism.

Social scientists have long been subjected to the taunts of superpatriots and the hypersensitive for merely pointing out the obvious. One writer's books were banned because he made such a statement in his book as, "America, land of great opportunity for man, is today not a land of equal opportunity for all." During the early 1950's, a former leader of the Daughters of the American Revolution took the lead on the Georgia State School Board to ban Frank A. Magruder's *American Government* because she felt the book gave too much emphasis on internationalism. Another major controversy over social studies textbooks occurred at Kanawha County, West Virginia in 1974. The Kanawha County

---


protesters' principal objections to the books were based on the fact that they contained profanity, which the fundamentalists considered blasphemous; the writing of such individuals as Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver, and Charles Manson; and a number of activities in which younger children were asked to imagine that they were God or to decide solutions to open-ended activities.

The protesters were further offended by the inclusion of stories that used dialects common to various groups in the United States. Underlying the expressed objections to the materials and to the unrepresentative nature of the decision making process, there were two other themes. First, there was sincere religious fundamentalism of many protesters and second, there was a feeling that it is the responsibility of schools and educators to uphold and inculcate traditional values of home and community.93

There are several pro-censorship organizations, both national and state, which have played significant roles in the censorship of many books. Among these organizations are The Heritage Foundation, America's Future, Citizens for Decent Literature, The Hard Core Parents of Louisiana, the National Parents League, the Oklahoma Parents for God and Country, Parents Who Care in Maryland, and the Georgia Basic Education Council, to name a few.94 Many textbooks may also be censored quietly by textbook selection committees without any public attention. In general, these pro-censorship groups are well-organized. However, this does not mean to


94 Ibid., p. 218.
infer that individuals, whether they are parents or not, are not involved in censorship movements.

Thus far, we have seen censorship from the conservative side. From the liberal perspective there are racial groups, ethnic groups, and women's groups who have also called for censorship of certain books from schools, libraries, and classrooms. Little Black Sambo, for example, was a target of this type of censorship. Censorship attempts come from different political camps, various socio-economic groups, varying religious denominations, and both sexes.95

The campaigns to censor textbooks have varied in subject and at times seemed absurd in their concerns. A member of one state textbook commission protested that Robin Hood and his merry men were following the straight Communist line and asked that all books containing the Robin Hood story and its "rob the rich and give to the poor" philosophy be banned. The American Legion at one time commissioned the writing of a history text that would inspire the young with patriotism, preaching on every page a vivid love of America. The Texas Daughters of the American Revolution joined with the John Birch Society in protesting the use of Albert Einstein's name in textbooks. The Ku Klux Klan objected to books crediting Columbus rather than Ericsson with the discovery of America.96

96Ibid., p. 9.
Each year seems to bring at least one confrontation as a zealous individual or group sounds the alarm to save the youth from the "contamination of radical instruction." One season the subject may be evolution; another communism or immorality. 97

Past Censorship in Georgia Education

During the early fifties, many citizens of the United States were engaged with fear and suspicion as a result of claims by Senator Joseph McCarthy that some members of the State Department were also members of the Communist Party. Although the claims were not proven, the fear of a rise of communism in this country extended well beyond the boundaries of the national and state government offices into the classrooms of the public schools. It was a decade of increased control over books, public addresses and generally over all forms of expression.98

The communist purge of the early fifties was fundamentally similar to the censorship practiced earlier in the name of morals or religion. While it did not resort to the extreme of book burning, it did produce much fear, suspicion, and intolerance. Influenced by such a public mood, members of the Georgia Board of Education responded in a predictable fashion. Mrs. Julius Y. Talmadge, a dominant board member during the fifties and leading defender of "Americanism," led the attack on Frank A. Magruder's American Government in Georgia. Earlier,

97 Ibid., p. 9.

the Committee on Education of the American Small Business Organization published a review of the book in its journal, The Educational Reviewer, on July 15, 1949. In review it was stated that the book had socialistic and communistic overtones. Passages were taken out of context and distorted to prove how dangerous the book was. Despite deletions by the publisher of some objectionable material in the new 1951 edition, Mrs. Talmadge remained unsatisfied. On June 27, 1951, the Georgia State Board of Education held a general discussion on Magruder's book. Mrs. Talmadge moved that the book be suspended from the adopted list of state textbooks and remain so until the "book has been corrected."\textsuperscript{99} The State Board suspended the book while branding it to be unAmerican. The board chairman, George P. Whitman, wanted the books to be shipped to the Georgia State Department for confiscation. Vice-chairman, James S. Peters moved instead that the books be taken up, replaced by acceptable textbooks, and sold to the highest bidder. "Out of this state," Whitman amended and the motion was adopted.\textsuperscript{100} The book was also banned in Houston, Texas. It was also attacked in Little Rock, Arkansas, New Haven, Connecticut, Council Bluffs, Iowa, Washington, D. C., Jackson, Michigan, and Trumbul County, Ohio, but it was not banned.\textsuperscript{101}

On January 9, 1963, the Lowndes County, Georgia School Board of Education banned John Steinbeck's \textit{East of Eden} from all its school

\textsuperscript{99}Minutes of the Georgia State Board of Education, (June 27, 1951), p. 175.

\textsuperscript{100}The Macon Telegraph, (June 28, 1951), p. 2.

libraries because objecting parents had described it as "vulgar trash." Members of the school board admitted they had not read the book.¹⁰²

Finally, in 1971, after much controversy, the state of Georgia banned all textbooks written by Edwin Fenton. Details of this controversial issue are found in the following chapters of this study. However, this issue also raised many questions about textbook selection.

Textbook Selection

In 1966 the federal government, through Amendments to the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965, began to sizeably increase its contribution of funds to public schools. This indirectly increased local budgets for school textbooks. According to the American Publishers Institute, elementary school textbook sales in 1966 were up twenty-three per cent over 1965.¹⁰³

Unfortunately due to governmental or other restrictions, poor selection of books was frequently the result. Because too little time was allowed to prepare the order, choices were made hurriedly, sometimes from annotated lists without actual examination of the books themselves. Serious mistakes were made in some cases because school officials inexperienced in textbook selection - sometimes principals, sometimes central staff members - made choices independently.¹⁰⁴


¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 44.
All school districts are confronted from time to time with the responsibility of selecting textbooks to complement specific curricula. The textbook is still the mainstay of most classroom teachers. Moreover, unless a teacher teaches in a very large metropolitan school system, the teacher will likely be called upon to serve on the textbook selection committee with other colleagues to examine and select textbooks for use in the school.\(^{105}\) After all, selection of textbooks is really a cooperative task.

Who should be responsible for the selection of textbooks? Edwin Fenton argued that four groups of people should be used, each with a "clearly specified role." They are elected or appointed representatives of the general public organized in institutions such as state or local boards of education; appointed professional educators such as curriculum supervisors, university professors, and school administrators; classroom teachers; and students.\(^{106}\)

At the Georgia Council for the Social Studies Winter Conference in 1974 at Savannah, Georgia, Fenton explained his views of why four groups of people should be involved. He stated,

Representatives of the public should oversee education in a democracy for the same reasons that a civilian should be secretary of defense. Democratic society, organized to serve the people demands civilian control rather than control by special interests which might place their own desires or the interests of their institution before the public good. These public representatives should only set policy and choose advisors;


they should not try to make decisions which require expert knowledge. A secretary of defense should not overrule professionals within the army, navy, and air force by deciding that an airplane he fancies can do a better job of meeting stated national defense goals than an airplane which professionals have chosen.107

Some states have reviewing boards to select textbooks for recommendations to local school boards. These reviewing boards are usually experienced teachers and administrators who work to choose the best materials available. When teachers and school officials exchange points of view regarding books, all are likely to study the books more carefully in order to carry on critical discussions. Through the exchange of ideas and comparison of diverse views, the examiners are stimulated to verify and possible modify their judgments, and thus to reach sound conclusions.108

According to Fenton:

Representatives of the public should be involved in choosing curricular materials for the schools. But their role should be restricted to setting general policies, choosing expert advisors, and disseminating the results of materials analyses and classroom trials. The power to second guess and overrule their own Professional Textbook Committee can become the power to censor....

Professional opinion is a necessary...ingredient in this process. Curriculum supervisors, department heads, college professors of education, and other professionals spend their academic lifetime learning both the theoretical and practical aspects of their work...they study research about learning theory, objectives, classroom management, and similar vital matters. They have been trained to examine rationales for curriculum materials; to assess the quality of texts; audio visual kits, examination programs, and teachers guides; to interpret the results

107Ibid., p. 5.

of field trials; and to appraise curricular materials proposed for use in the schools in a systematic way.\footnote{Edwin Fenton, "Choosing Curricular Materials: Who and How," \textit{Georgia Social Science Journal}, Vol. 5, No. 3, (Spring, 1974), pp. 4-5.}

\textbf{Textbook Selection in Georgia}

In order that the instructional material used as basic texts in Georgia's public schools be of the highest quality, the State Board of Education, through the State Department of Education, carries on a continuous review and study of all textbooks presented by publishers. Prior to 1976, the State Board of Education appointed a committee of twelve professional educators to serve in an advisory capacity to the State Board. One member was appointed from each congressional district and two committee members represented the State at large. The instructional materials committee reviews all titles submitted and recommends to the State Board those titles found to be of high quality and desirable for use in the public schools of Georgia. Four options are open to the Board: (1) it can accept the recommendations as presented; (2) reject the recommendations of the committee; (3) add to the recommendations or (4) delete from those recommendations. Titles accepted and approved by the State Board are considered "adopted" for purchase with State textbook funds.

The textbook committees review several hundred textbooks per year. The textbooks are adopted for a period of five years. Each year one or more subject(s) is(are) considered for adoption. Bids submitted out of cycle are adopted until the next regular adoption for that subject.
During the school year following the state adoption, each school system should make plans for adopting textbooks in that subject.

The last two adoption periods for the social studies were in 1971 and 1976. Its next adoption period will be 1981 and every five years thereafter.

In 1976 the State Board appointed five lay members to serve with the committee as described above. This number has increased since 1976. Parents and other community representatives are also invited to serve on the local committees to share their views of the new textbooks. However, like the lay members on the state committee, they do not have voting privileges.

**Summary**

A problem of censorship in education exists where pressure groups or some dissenting individuals usurp the professional privilege of professional educators to determine the appropriateness of academic curricula. The public must educate itself about the changing society and determine whether its public school textbooks will be shaped by pressure groups or scholars and responsible representatives of the community seeking to supply the most accurate information available from an objective point of view.

Well organized pro-censorship organizations such as the Heritage Foundation, America's Future, Citizens for Decent Literature, the Hard Core Parents of Louisiana, the National Parent's League and the

---

Georgia Basic Education Council have played instrumental roles in the censorship of many textbooks. Individuals have also contributed the censorship of many instructional materials. While most censors are conservative, liberals have also called for censorship of certain books from the classrooms and libraries. Censorship attempts come from different political camps, various socio-economic groups, varying religious denominations, and both sexes. At all levels of education and within most subject areas, theories exist which are repugnant to some elements of society.

In Georgia, among the more prominent attempts at censoring textbooks and library references were the efforts of the State Board of Education to suspend Frank A. Magruder's *American Government* in 1951; the banning of John Steinbeck's *East of Eden* by the Lowndes County School Board of Education in 1963; the removal of all textbooks edited, authored, or contributed to by Edwin Fenton from the state-approved textbook list by the State Board of Education in 1972; and as of August, 1979, the question of evolution being taught in the public schools of Georgia is still pending in the state legislature.

Textbooks selected to be on the state adopted textbooks list in Georgia are screened by a committee of twelve professional educators who are appointed representatives by the State Board from each of the ten congressional districts in the state with two members being chosen at large. In 1976, this committee was expanded to include some lay representation. Each professional educator on the committee headed a sub-committee which aided them in the screening process. By 1973 the State Board publicity defined its options in selecting textbooks as follows: (1) It can accept
the recommendations of the committee or (2) reject them, (3) It can add to the recommendations or (4) delete from those recommendations.
CHAPTER IV

GEORGIA DURING THE SIXTIES

INTRODUCTION

As Georgia entered the sixties, its citizens could look back on the economic progress which had propelled Georgia impressively closer to the national mainstream in terms of per capita income and industrial development. During the preceding twenty years Georgia had piled up a striking record of progress and modernization. Industry had surged into Georgia from the North and jobs were plentiful. The average family income had risen sharply and the people were living better. Education was improving and the illiteracy rate was declining.\textsuperscript{111} By 1960, Georgia had become predominantly urban for the first time. Atlanta had become a gem among cities and most of the large towns were booming mightily.\textsuperscript{112}

Yet, Georgia like the other states in the deep South, upheld a peculiar type of provincialism built around a belief called southern tradition. When broken into its component parts, southern tradition is found to center around various devices to perpetuate segregation of the white and black races economically and socially. According to W. J. Cash in his \textit{Mind of the South}, it is,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{111} \textit{Saturday Evening Post}, Vol. 236 (February 16, 1963), p. 69.
  \item \textsuperscript{112} Ibid., p. 69.
\end{itemize}
...a fairly definite social pattern -- a complex of established relationships and habits of thought, sentiments, prejudices, standards and values, and associations of ideas which, if it is not common strictly to every group of white people in the South, is still common in one appreciable measure or another, and in some part or another, to all but relatively negligible ones.\textsuperscript{113}

This chapter is designed to discuss the influence of the southern tradition on Georgia politics, education, and its conflict with the social reform of the sixties. The purpose is to establish the trend of thought which prevailed during the controversy over the Fenton social studies series.

The Southern Tradition in Georgia Politics (1960-1970)

Although Georgia was one of the most racially segregated states in the nation, rapid urbanization and industrialization had weakened many of the old mores. Fifty years ago two thirds of the population lived on the land, and most of the rural people of both races were poor. Schools were poor and the roads for the most part were mere gashes in the red earth. The courthouse gangs dominated the political offices and all too frequently remained in power through appeals to ignorance, bias, and hatred.\textsuperscript{114} Until 1962, Georgia used a county-unit voting system which gave the rural farmers the most powerful vote in the state. Under the county-unit system, the politicians count the votes in such a way as to increase the power of rural areas and undercut


\textsuperscript{114}Saturday Evening Post, Vol. 236 (February 16, 1963), p. 70.
the cities. The segregation issue provided a strong reason for keeping the system as it prevented the organizing of city blacks into a political force. As one candidate for lieutenant governor during the late fifties put it, "the county-unit system is the best friend of the white man in Georgia, wherever he lives." 115

In April, 1962 a federal district court ruled in the Gray v. Sanders case that the county-unit voting system was not only unfair but unconstitutional as well. 116 In May, 1962 the court handed down its decision in Toombs v. Fortson, which required the General Assembly to reapportion on the basis of population. This ruling led to revamped senatorial districts and increased urban representation in the General Assembly. In 1965, Georgia completed this power shift by complying with the Supreme Court decision of Westberry v. Sanders, which called for the reapportionment of the state's ten congressional districts. 117

The public officials elected under the county-unit system were segregationists. Whether they were conservatives or moderates, segregation of the races was very much a politically desirable position to maintain in Georgia. During the early 1960's, however, a new type attitude emerged from the rapidly industrializing urban areas which forced the race issue to move aside for progress. Though still segregationists, the majority of Georgians were moderates who were willing

115 Look, Vol. 23 (March 17, 1959), p. 44.
to obey the federal court orders so that Georgia could continue its rapid progress. Georgia's new attitude was typified perfectly by a comment made by Governor Carl E. Sanders (1963-1967) when asked to define a moderate. He replied, "moderate means I am a segregationist, but not a...fool...I am a Southerner from my heart and I believe in separation of the races. On the other hand, I am for progress...and I know we can't have progress in the midst of social upheavals."\textsuperscript{118}

The political spectrum in Georgia ranged from extremely conservative to very liberal. However, during the sixties and years prior, the governor's office was held mostly by extreme conservatives and moderates of former Governor Sanders' description. The office was held by Governor S. Earnest Vandiver at the opening of the decade. His term expired in 1962. Governor Carl E. Sanders was elected in that year. His term was succeeded by Governor Lester G. Maddox. All three were staunch segregationists.

Georgia, like most Southern states, had long maintained "the Solid South" pattern in voting for the Democratic Party. However, during the sixties, things were changing. As the Democratic party adopted more liberal ideas, some conservatives grew increasingly dissatisfied with it. More and more Georgians became Republican. In 1964, Barry Goldwater and the Republican party were able to carry Georgia in the general elections. In 1968, neither Republicans nor Democrats were able to win in Georgia as the state supported independent candidate and neighboring conservative governor from Alabama, George

\textsuperscript{118}Saturday Evening Post, Vol. 236 (February 16, 1963), p. 70.
Wallace. In 1970, the Republicans held their first statewide primary in Georgia.  

Southern Tradition In Georgia's Social and Economic Life

In Georgia during the fifties and sixties, it was possible to see with the naked eye the almost convulsive changes which were occurring in the nation's way of life. The revolution in agriculture, the exodus from the land, the urbanization of the economy, and the rising standard of living for the rank and file were all trends proceeding at an accelerated pace in Georgia also.

In 1960, people were still leaving the farms in droves for city jobs. There were still many small, submarginal farms in Georgia. Rural poverty, and the ignorance that attended it still existed in some of the little remote communities of the state. The poor whites were still there although in much smaller numbers and all but approximately ten percent of the blacks had moved to the cities along with the other whites. Meanwhile, coincident with the revolution in farming, manufacturing came to the towns and cities, attended by a vast upsurge in wholesaling and general business. Many of the larger and medium-sized towns were showing a lot of promise with new industry moving. The median family income in Georgia was $4,208 in 1960 while the national average was $5,660. Although progress continued to improve on social and economic matters, Georgia clung to its traditional ways on political and racial matters.

---

120 Saturday Evening Post, Vol. 236 (February 16, 1963), pp. 69-73.
In many industrial plants, but not all of them, white labor was still preferred to black labor.121

A great portion of the impetus for change in Georgia came from Atlanta with its metropolitan population of well over a million. Atlanta was the largest wholesaling and distributing center in the Southeast United States and the leading manufacturing city in the metropolitan area. Atlanta provides many cultural and social outlets for its people. The city has its own symphony of professional quality and a number of other musical activities for leisure entertainment. Also, there are numerous art groups and museums which help to enhance education as well as cultural refinement. Several professional athletic teams add to the diversity of leisure entertainment which the city also offers its patrons. Atlanta is also a center of higher education with several institutions including Georgia Institute of Technology, Emory University, Georgia State University, a wide variety of trade schools, and a complex of five outstanding Black colleges.122

Under the liberal leadership of mayors Ivan Allen (1962-1970), Sam Massel (1970-1974), and Maynard Jackson (1974- ), Atlanta has come to be considered by rural Georgia as the fountain head of liberalism in racial matters.123 Although there were still many great difficulties and angry confrontations, Atlanta was able to set the pace for social change in Georgia. Associations between the races over the past

decade in the social, economical, and political life of Georgians personify the changes which once would have been unthinkable in that state.

The influence of the southern tradition had definitely been weakened. The rise of liberalism in Georgia was also represented by the election of Jimmy Carter as Governor in 1970. In his inaugural address in 1971, he boldly announced that "the time for racial discrimination is over." 124

Southern Tradition in Georgia Education

In Georgia, as in most southern states, the quality of education was below the national average. The high cost of maintaining a dual school system to maintain segregation no doubt affected the quality of education provided. In 1954, the U. S. Supreme Court in the case of Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, outlawed segregation in public schools declaring that segregation was "inherently unequal." Georgia had invested millions of its new school building money in modern structures improving the formerly inadequate facilities for Black children. In meetings that assembled members of both races, Georgians worked out legal and more satisfactory designs for learning. 125 Segregation, however, was maintained. In 1956, the Georgia legislature passed a law to cut off state funds for any desegregated school.

During the sixties, Georgians witnessed the power of the federal courts as Georgia legislation prohibiting the desegregation of public schools in the state was declared unconstitutional. Throughout the decade most local school boards and top officials in education across

124 Ibid., p. 198. 125 McCullar, p. 605.
the state were busy trying to develop desegregation plans which would be accepted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Meanwhile, the federal government made millions of dollars available for various support programs for education.

On the other hand, there were those who still believed in segregation of the races and sought means to get around the federal orders to desegregate the public schools. Therefore many plans were made to develop private schools which would not fall under the jurisdiction of federal court orders.

Although economics, religious concepts, and other social problems provided more reasons for the growth of private schools, forced integration was a main factor for their increase since 1969. The number of private schools has doubled in Georgia from 1969 to 1978.126

The Effect of National Trends on Georgia's Conservatism

The national trends of the sixties were centered around change and reform, politically, socially, and educationally. In each of these areas Georgians witnessed changes which rocked the very foundation on which many of its conservative institutions were built. While many among the conservative populace in Georgia sought slowly to make adjustments to the new changes and reform, the die-hard ultra conservative wing continued to fight against it. Let us examine the effect of several national trends in Georgia.

---

In Politics

Georgia's political history since the Reconstruction era has reflected segregationism as a core requirement for holding public office. Blacks were systematically kept out of the chambers of the state legislature and were discouraged from participating in elections at the polls. However, as a result of the Westberry v. Sanders case, the Georgia state legislature had to readjust its malapportioned congressional districts. Between 1962 and 1968 the Georgia legislature reapportioned its state legislative districts several times. The apportionment made it possible for blacks to be elected to the state legislature as the changes provided for more equal representation based on population and gave urban residents a greater voice in government.

New federal legislation giving more voting rights to blacks raised the registration rolls in Georgia from 733,349 in 1960 to over a million by 1968. In 1964 the Georgia legislature lost its all white complexion as two black candidates won seats in the Georgia House of Representatives. In 1966, eight Blacks were elected to the House. The Republican Party also gained some power in Georgia during the 1960s. Many Georgians became dissatisfied with some of the policies of the National Democratic Party, especially its support of civil rights legislation. In 1964, Georgians elected a Republican to the United States House of Representatives for the first time since 1872. Georgia also supported the Republican Presidential candidate in the 1964 elections.

In 1968, Georgia supported George C. Wallace, a presidential candidate of the southern tradition and the American Independent Party.

**In Social Reform**

The social legislation passed by the Federal government during the sixties had a tremendous effect on Georgia's conservatism. The civil rights act of the 1960's made many of Georgia's state laws illegal. On the one hand, the vast majority of Georgia's white population supported segregation of the races, most of them were moderates who held the law in high esteem. Therefore, they tolerated the new social reforms to maintain law and order. On the other hand, there were the ultra-conservatives, the die-hard segregationists who refused to change without a fight. Although they were not a majority, their influence across the state was very strong, especially in social and political circles.

The general attitude among Georgians was traditionally southern. They believed sincerely in separation of the races. Many considered the social reform movement of the sixties un-American as it overturned racial patterns existent in Georgia for more than a century. Federal legislation prohibited discrimination in public accommodations and in federally financed programs and set up the Equal Opportunity Commission. As a result of new housing rights for Blacks, formerly all-white neighborhoods were being integrated. This move ignited a white exodus to the suburbs. Most of the voters still wished the old racial status quo could remain and they deeply resented the new reforms which they regarded as

128 McCullar, p. 604. 129 Ibid., p. 605.
northern interference in their affairs. Yet, the economic motive, with industrial growth, urbanization and a rising standard of living, was becoming more important than the racial problem in Georgia.\textsuperscript{130}

Meanwhile, the die-hard ultra-conservatives clung to their racial policies of the past and challenged the new reforms whenever possible. Their champion during the sixties was Lester Maddox, a former governor and leader of the white blacklash movement in Georgia.\textsuperscript{131} They were very vocal in their protests and they supported any politician who spoke out against the reforms. They charged the protests of blacks and the youth as being either communist-inspired or anti-American. Moreover, ultra-conservative groups had become the super-patriotic protectors of a dying past in a state where change and reform was turning the corner for progress.

During the mid-fifties, former Governor Marvin Griffin once lauded the county-unit system and segregation as "Georgia's two greatest traditions." If this was true, then by the mid-sixties Georgia had undergone some fundamental changes of due notice. A social system based on caste and a political system based on malapportionment had both collapsed under federal governmental pressure. The strongholds for conservative influence in Georgia's political and social institutions were weakening.

\textbf{In Education}

The 1960's were trying times for the conservative influence in Georgia's educational system. Being determined to maintain the southern

\begin{footnotes}
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tradition of separate schools for the black and white races, the advocates of this tradition found themselves constantly seeking new ways to avoid desegregating their schools. Meanwhile, the federal courts were demanding that the Georgia public schools desegregate. In 1956 the Georgia legislature passed a law which would cut off state funds for any desegregated school in the state. 132 This was one of Georgia's reactions to the 1954 Supreme Court decision. When Governor S. Ernest Vandiver was running for office he declared he would close the public schools before desegregation came. That pleased the South Georgia sheriffs and politicians and klansmen, but it disturbed the people in Atlanta and in other urban areas who felt Georgia was already too far behind in educating their children for the Atomic Age. 133 However, Governor Vandiver won the election.

Desegregation came to Georgia first at the state university. In 1961, Federal Judge William A. Bottle found two young blacks qualified for the university and ordered them admitted immediately. 134 The judge also issued a restraining order preventing the Governor from closing the university according to the state's 1956 appropriations act. The Governor then held a press conference and read the contents of a telegram to District Judge W. A. Bottle. 135

"While my respect for lawful processes and my oath as Governor of the State of Georgia preclude any act of defiance on my part...I must register with you personally and officially the strongest possible protest of your action an interference in the administration of state and law and what amounts to usurpation of the legislative prerogatives of the general assembly of Georgia."\(^{136}\)

A riot followed the next night at the University of Georgia in Athens. The two black students were escorted back to Atlanta by state troopers and were officially suspended "in the interest of their own safety and the safety of more than 7,000 students at the University,"\(^{137}\) according to the Dean of Students at the University. The Governor's executive secretary commended the mob. He said "the students at the university have demonstrated the character and courage not to submit to dictatorship and tyranny."\(^{138}\)

Judge Bottle ruled the State Appropriation Act of 1956 unconstitutional. Also, about half the faculty at the university passed resolutions insisting that the two black students be returned to their classes and demanding the preservation of orderly education. Swiftly the two students were readmitted and Judge Bottle left law and order squarely up to the State of Georgia.\(^{139}\)

The politicians had put on a good act for the South Georgia voters and felt a sigh of relief as the blame for desegregated schools could be put on a federal judge. With desegregation swiftly approaching, Governor Vandiver spoke to a joint session of the Georgia Legislature.

\(^{136}\)Ibid., p. 7.  
\(^{138}\)Ibid., p. 21.  
\(^{139}\)Ibid., p. 21.
"I am addressing you not as your chief executive, but as a devoted father with one son and two daughters in the classroom of our public schools. I am speaking... about their future, as much as I am speaking... about yours. We meet together to proclaim to the whole world that public education will be preserved."\textsuperscript{140}

The Governor also stated that the state must not defy by "any thought, suggestion, hint or encouragement" federal court orders to integrate. However, being fully aware of the southern tradition and the attitude of the South Georgia voters, Governor Vandiver also offered some specific recommendations loaded with loop holes for segregationists. He proposed: (1) Students should have the right to appeal their assignment to a school; (2) If white students withdraw from an integrated school, they should be eligible for state grants-in-aid to pay for their private education; (3) Local communities should have the option to either obey the courts or to close their schools.\textsuperscript{141}

In the following years, as Georgia's black children were being admitted to formerly all white public schools, state universities and colleges, a number of private schools and academies, predominantly white, sprang up all over Georgia.\textsuperscript{142} Georgia Law (Code 32-2114) requires all schools, public or private, to report the names, ages, and residence of all students within thirty days after the beginning of the school term. The Georgia Department of Education began compiling the data in 1969. In 1969, one hundred and fifty-one non-public schools reported in Georgia with an enrollment of 34,105 students. In 1971,

\textsuperscript{140} Newsweek (January 20, 1961), p. 51.  
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., p. 51.  
\textsuperscript{142} McCullar, p. 605.
there were 269 private schools with a student population of 68,160. By 1978 there were 366 private schools with 80,686 students. Today, Georgia still has a dual-system of education. In Macon, Georgia's third largest city, for example, there were five public high schools, one parochial high school and one private academy before desegregation became an issue. By 1978, there were only three public high schools and twelve private high schools, including the parochial school and one private academy which existed prior to 1965. While the above is not intended to suggest that there are more private schools than public, it does intend to illuminate the growth of private schools in Georgia since 1969. While private schools enjoy the full support of those who advocate the conservation of the southern tradition, public schools are kept amid the political arena as the conservatives and liberals vie for control. The public schools are also the target of many ultra-conservative pressure groups.

Summary

The southern tradition upheld in Georgia by many ultra-conservatives was centered around various devices to perpetuate segregation of the races, economically and socially. The county-unit voting system in Georgia had guaranteed that the rural segregationist would control the state legislature. In 1962 legal action was taken by a district federal court in its decisions of Gray v. Sanders and Toombs v. Fortson and in the Supreme Court decision of Westberry v. Sanders declaring the county-

unit voting system unconstitutional and calling for the reapportionment of the state's ten congressional districts. This court action resulted with a political power shift from the rural areas to the more urbanized centers.

Although urbanization, industrialization, and a rising economy led to positive changes in Georgia, many of its people still clung to its traditional ways on political and social matters. Georgia had a long history for supporting the Democratic Party as did most southern states. The Republican Party was able to carry Georgia in a major election only after the Democrats supported a civil rights program which would destroy the traditional segregational patterns of Georgia and the rest of the South.

Economically during the 1960s the median family income was $4,208 in Georgia while the national average was $5,660. Some industrial plants still preferred white labor as the blacks continued to be the last hired in the job market.

Socially, Atlanta became considered as the fountainhead of liberalism by rural Georgia in racial matters. As the city was able to provide many cultural and social outlets for its citizens, Atlanta set the pace in Georgia for social change. Associations between the races there over the past decade typifies the social changes which had diluted the influence of the southern tradition in Georgia.

In education, the 1960s were trying times for the conservative influence in Georgia's educational system. The federal courts were demanding that Georgia public schools be desegregated. Being fully aware of the tradition and attitude of the South Georgia voters, Governor
Vandiver proposed that students should have to appeal their assignment to a school, they should be able to withdraw from an integrated school and be eligible for state-aid to pay for a private education, and that local communities should have the option to either obey the courts or close their schools. While these measures were rejected by the people in favor of keeping their schools open, black children were being admitted to formerly all white public schools, universities and colleges across the state. Meanwhile, a number of private schools and academies, predominantly white, sprang up all over Georgia. Between 1969 and 1978, the private schools increased from 151 to 366 while their enrollment increased from 34,105 to 80,686. Today, Georgia's dual system of education is public v. private instead of black v. white. While some conservatives of the southern tradition built their own private schools, others vied to control the public schools.

The influence of the southern tradition was still alive in Georgia education when the Fenton books were submitted for approval. The content of these books drew the ire of a conservative State Board of Education as they attempted to discuss the issues of the 1960s without establishing the conservative point of view. The following chapters are a detailed account of that textbook controversy.
CHAPTER V

THE SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOK CONTROVERSY

INTRODUCTION

Despite all the changes for progress and social reform during the sixties, the proponents of the southern tradition still had a considerable amount of influence in Georgia politics and education at the end of the decade. Lester Maddox, an ultra-conservative, served as Lieutenant Governor during the administration of Jimmy Carter as Governor of Georgia. Ultra-conservatives were harassing the State Board of Education about educational policy and textbooks. This chapter specifically deals with a textbook controversy which an ultra-conservative group initiated.

The textbooks at the heart of the controversy were the social studies series developed by Edwin Fenton, John M. Good, Mitchell P. Lichtenburg, and others at Carnegie-Mellon University under Project Social Studies. The books appeared in Georgia during the same period when youth were protesting the war in Vietnam, challenging the rank and file discipline of former generations, and embarrassing the fundamentalists in Georgia with their new morality. Also, the public schools had just desegregated and many parents were raging over the busing issue. Meanwhile, the social reforms of the sixties set very poorly with the many ultra-conservatives across the state of Georgia. These
social studies textbooks dealt with some controversial issues which were fuel for an ultra-conservative group to strike at the new social studies, the youth movement, and social reforms.

This chapter is limited to the textbook controversy and the related events which may have had some influence on the outcome of the decision made by the Georgia State Board of Education.

Inquiry and Edwin Fenton

Inquiry is a complex concept which has been at the center of most of the new social studies strategies in recent years. It is a systematic approach to learning designed to achieve a definite objective. The essence of inquiry is the planned involvement of students in thinking. Edwin Fenton is probably the best known advocate of inquiry instruction in the social studies. As a social studies educator professionally trained in history, Fenton is best known for editing a series of social studies textbooks, each of which is a collection of readings.

Other notable works by Fenton include the following titles: Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach (1966); The New Social Studies (1967); 32 Problems in World History (1966). Also, he has had numerous articles published in professional educational journals, such as, Social Education, the Journal of the National Council for the Social Studies. His work emphasizes the development of three sets of inquiry oriented curriculum materials: a sequential program for able students, grade nine through twelve; a modification

of this curriculum for average students; and an eighth grade American history course for slow learners. A rationale accompanies each curricu-
lum. Hence, there are three rationales: one for the able, one for
the average, and one for the below average students.

In the annual meeting of the New York State Council for the Social Studies at Grossingers, New York, April 9, 1968, Edwin Fenton, in his speech "The New Social Studies Reconsidered," discussed three modes of inquiry. He stressed an analytical mode of inquiry for the social studies. It is the historian's way of thinking about how to interpret the past, and it is primarily useful to teach the cognitive skills on which all thinking depends. The second inquiry technique discussed by Fenton helped the students to clarify their values. The objective was to have the student think through the issues in order to arrive at a defensible position, either the same position as held at the beginning of the discussion - but with evidence to support it - or a new position adopted because the original stand failed to meet the test of evidence. The third mode of inquiry discussed by Fenton could be used

---


to investigate solutions to contemporary social, economic, and political problems. 148

Fenton identified three major structural components: generalizations, concepts, and analytical questions. Since the last of these is central to active inquiry and the process of developing and validating hypotheses, he felt that it would probably be the most valuable for the social studies. 149

While various modes of inquiry have been studied and used by many educators of the new social studies, the motif of Fenton's new social studies involves its use of the inductive mode of teaching. However, one must be precise in applying the term induction to the Holt Social Studies Curriculum prepared by Fenton and others. To be accurate one should realize that Fenton and his colleagues were interested in developing "inquiry skills" of which inductive thinking is only one. They developed a continuum which envisioned a gradual progression from discovery to expository learning. While it sometimes referred to a systematic examination of value-laden issues, it most often entailed leading the student to a predetermined set of conclusions by presenting him with appropriate cues in the form of key questions. At times this approach differed little from traditional methods in terms of what is learned. The oft-heard complaint that Fenton was belittling the importance of content


cannot be supported. Fenton admitted quite openly that "directed discussion teaches students impressive amounts of sheer data." The fruits of the labors of Fenton, Good and their colleagues at the Carnegie-Mellon Project Social Studies Center were the Holt Social Studies Curriculum and The Americans, an eighth grade history textbook designed for slow learners, all of which included Fenton's inquiry approaches. Although these textbooks were designed to promote critical thinking among students, there were some people who were not ready to accept these textbooks in the public school classrooms. The non-conventional approach to the social studies disciplines used in these textbooks was too radical for the opposers to accept. The first sign of notable opposition in Georgia came in 1969 with the Georgia Basic Education Council.

Georgia Basic Education Council

In 1964 the Georgia Basic Education Council (GBEC) was founded. It was a small but well organized group of laymen whose purposes were to inspire citizens across the state to learn about their own school systems and to cause constructive changes where needed. They stated that one of the primary needs of public education was for the citizens to know what their school tax money was buying. A former airline pilot, A. B. Leake, was the chairman of the group. He was also the most persistent activist in the group. He attended the Georgia State Board of
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Education's monthly meetings regularly and occasionally, participated by protesting the actions of the State Board, a committee of the State Board, or some local school system. His views on educational issues were published in the GBEC's quarterly publication, the *Citizen's Education Review*, which emphasized the laymen's viewpoint.

One concern of educators with the GBEC was its ultra conservative influence which led to the removal of all textbooks "edited, authored or contributed to" by Edwin Fenton from the state-approved textbook list.

As early as 1969 the Georgia Basic Education Council was attacking the inquiry approach especially as it is used in the new social studies series by Fenton and others. The subjects of biology and anthropology containing scientific theories of adaption and evolution have also been attacked by the GBEC.153

**Opposition to Inquiry and the Works of Edwin Fenton**

The GBEC launched in 1969 an attack on the inductive approach to teaching social studies and the series of social studies textbooks produced by Dr. Fenton and others at Carnegie-Mellon University's Project Social Studies Center. The attack began after the Atlanta Public School System distributed a four page memo to its social studies teachers entitled "Teaching the Historian's Method of Inquiry - Interpretation."154 In this booklet, according to the GBEC, the first three paragraphs

---


154 See Appendix.
"present the philosophy of the skeptic," at one time not respected as reasonable or logical thought. Their denial of man's ability to record events accurately and their lack of trust in the work of responsible and proven historians is used to build a wall between the student and the knowledge of history so necessary to his total education.¹⁵⁵ Continuing, the GBEC considered Fenton's view of history, an interpretation of the historian, to be an "attack on the purpose of education in general and history in particular - to learn from the experience of others."¹⁵⁶

The second page of the booklet presented the inductive approach of teaching in which the student is given data, then helped to draw conclusions from it. The GBEC observed that the inductive method of teaching was an implementation of the interpretation principle. They stated that the inductive method ignores the fact that good "traditional textbooks will trap a student in a proper frame of reference."¹⁵⁷ This statement was a reaction to a statement in the memo which said, "Inductive teaching is desirable because traditional textbooks trap a student in the author's frame of reference and provide little opportunity for the student to modify his own viewpoint conditioned by his culture."¹⁵⁸

But according to the GBEC, educators were only fooling themselves if they denied that education's primary purpose was to mold the student's mind. They believed inductive teaching ignores the purpose of secondary education, which by their definition is, merely expanding the student's ability to learn and teaching in more detail, the nature of our society

and world. To them, to attach importance to a student modifying his own viewpoint misses the point. The student's mind must be receptive to the subject material in order to create the best learning potential. 159

The Georgia State Board of Education

The Board of Education was recognized by the Constitution of 1945 (Article VIII, Section 2) but it had been created by the Act of February 10, 1937 (Acts 1937, p. 864) and the Act of January 25, 1943 (Acts 1943, p. 636). This Board exercised exclusive jurisdiction over all public schools, both graded and high, and those for blind and deaf children, and, in its discretion, defines and regulates the curriculum and courses of study therein. It classified and certified for employment all teachers in the public school system and administered all funds appropriated for the maintenance and operation of the public schools, including transportation (1933 Code, Chapters 32-4 and 32-6). All phases of vocational education and training were within its jurisdiction. For all such purposes, it had authority to make and enforce its rules and regulations and to employ supervisors and other necessary personnel. 160

The Georgia State Board of Education is composed of ten members, each representing one of the congressional districts in the state, all appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate (Section 32-401). The terms of office are for seven years each, staggered so that two vacancies occur in one year, four in the second following

159Ibid., pp. 2-3.
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year and four in the fourth following year (Section 32-402).

During the period of the Fenton textbook controversy the following were members of the state board: Mr. Roy A. Hendricks, Chairman of the Board, representing District One from Metter, Georgia; Mr. Sam Griffin, member, representing District Two from Bainbridge, Georgia; Mrs. A. Edward Smith, member, representing District Three from Columbus, Georgia; Mr. Earnest Whaley, member, representing District Four from Charleston, Georgia; Mr. David F. Rice, member, representing District Five from Atlanta, Georgia; Mr. Kenneth Kilpatrick, member, representing District Six from Jonesboro, Georgia; Mr. Henry A. Stewart, member, representing District Seven from Cedartown, Georgia; Mr. James L. Dewar, member, representing District Eight from Valdosta, Georgia; Mr. Richard Neville, member, representing District Nine from Cumming, Georgia; and Mrs. Richard Huseman, member, representing District Ten from Athens, Georgia. The State Superintendent of schools was Dr. Jack P. Nix. Mr. Oscar H. Joiner was the Associate State Superintendent. 161

There was no minority representation on the State Board. Eight of the members were attorneys-at-law. The two women were the wives of a college professor and a businessman. Six members of the Board were appointed by the ultra-conservative governor, Lester Maddox. The remaining four were appointed by the more liberal administration of Governor Jimmy Carter. A major concern of educators in Georgia with the State Board was its highly conservative stand on issues in education in Georgia. The

Fenton textbook controversy was an example of the State Board's ultra-conservative nature.

The Professional Textbook Selection Committee

Section 32-709 of the Georgia code provides for a committee of educators actually engaged in public work in the state of Georgia to examine textbooks and make recommendations to the State Board of Education.\textsuperscript{162} This committee was to consist of the number of educators the Board deemed advisable, not exceeding five in each instance.\textsuperscript{163} By 1967, however, the number of members had been increased to twelve with one representative from each congressional district in the state and two members were chosen at large. The 1971 Georgia Professional Textbook Selection Committee during the Fenton textbook controversy was as follows: Representing district one, Miss Maxann Foy, an elementary teacher; district two, Mrs. Frances Harris, a curriculum supervisor; district three, Mrs. Mullin Whisnant, a secondary teacher, district four, Mrs. B. Euneta Shadburn, a curriculum supervisor; district five, Mr. James C. Fain, committee chairman and curriculum supervisor; district six, Mr. Thomas E. Thompson, elementary principal; district seven, Mrs. Margurite J. King, a secondary teacher; district eight, Mrs. Mildred J. McCrane, a curriculum supervisor; district nine, Mrs. Shirley Hamby, elementary principal; district ten, Dr. Louise McCommons, secondary principal; at-large Miss Mary E. Sanders, elementary teacher; and at-large, Dr. Bettie

\textsuperscript{162}Ibid.

M. Smith, secondary principal. All members were appointed by the State Board of Education.

After the textbook selection committee had been formally appointed, an organizational meeting was held in May of 1971. A chairman, co-chairman, and secretary were elected. Mr. James C. Fain was elected chairman. Procedures for examining textbooks were discussed. Dates were set and instructions for bidding were sent to the publishers.

The individual members of the professional textbook committee returned to their respective districts and organized sub-committees of local teachers and curriculum supervisors who aided them in the examination and rating of the textbooks which were submitted.

Textbook Adoption Process

All textbooks to be adopted fall within one of five areas which include (1) Mathematics, Business Education, Industrial Arts, and other Vocational Subjects; (2) Fine Arts, Foreign Languages, Science, Health, Physical Education and Recreation and Driver Safety Education; (3) English Literature and Humanities; (4) Reading, and (5) Social Studies. Beginning in August, 1967 one of these areas came up for adoption each year on a five year rotation basis. In 1971, social studies textbooks
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were submitted by publishers to be considered by the professional textbook selection committee. Among the social studies textbooks submitted in 1971 were the Holt Social Studies Curriculum, The Americans: A History of the United States, and 32 Problems In World History authored, edited or contributed to by Edwin Fenton.

Revived Opposition to the Fenton Textbooks

During the Fall of 1971 while the Professional Textbook Selection Committee was busy examining social studies textbooks to recommend for adoption, Al Leake of the GBEC was reviving his attack against the works of Edwin Fenton which he started in 1969. In October, 1971, Leake appeared before the Fulton County Board of Education to condemn its four quarter system of teaching and particularly to attack their social studies program which was made up to a great extent of Fenton's materials. This attack, however, was futile. Persisting, Leake carried his attack to the Georgia State Board of Education at its October meeting. There Leake attacked Fulton County's use of the Holt Social Studies Curriculum arguing that these textbooks did not teach Americanism. In the hall after the meeting, Dr. Paul West, who had just retired as Superintendent of the Fulton County Schools and Dr. Douglass McRae, the incoming superintendent, and Mr. Leake had to be separated. According to one observer, their discussion was about to lead to a fist fight. Again, Leake's attack was futile.

---

167 The Georgia Textbook List, 1971, p. IV.

The November Georgia State Board of Education Meeting, 1971

Al Leake appeared on November 24, 1971 at the regular meeting of the State Board and objected to the possible adoption of any books edited or authored by Edwin Fenton on the grounds that these works contain teachings that are unAmerican. The State Board's action on this issue indicated that Leake had been able to reach some Board members.

Mr. Henry A. Stewart, a State Board member, presented the financial items of the Report from the Committee of the Whole and moved adoption of all items with the exception of the bids on textbook adoption in the social studies. Mr. Sam Griffin, Jr. seconded the motion and it carried. In further discussion of the Professional Textbook Selection Committee's recommendations, Mr. Kenneth Kilpatrick moved that the recommendations be approved with the exception of those textbooks containing the works of Edwin Fenton and Nat Hentoff. He further moved that textbooks containing the works of these two authors be referred back to the Professional Textbook Selection Committee for "further study and interpretation to the Department staff and State Board as to whether or not they would continue their recommendation of these works and, if so, the reasons they feel the works should be in the report." Following more discussion, Mr. Kilpatrick withdrew his motion. One Board member, Mr. Stewart, wanted to turn down the entire report of the Professional Textbook Selection Committee, but his motion was lost because of a lack of a second.

---
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After several other motions failed to get a second, Mr. James Dewar stated, "the Professional Textbook Selection Committee reviewed all books submitted and recommended that only 507 from a total of 1,205 books be approved for the textbook list." On the basis of their study, he stated he was willing to approve the list as submitted. Mr. Earnest Whaley stated that his representative from the Fourth District was well qualified to serve on the textbook committee and he felt the recommendations of the Professional Textbook Selection Committee should be approved. 173

Mr. Kilpatrick moved that action be postponed on recommendations from the Professional Textbook Committee until the regular meeting of the State Board in December, 1971. He further stated that the materials edited, contributed to, or authored by Edwin Fenton and Nat Hentoff be provided immediately to members of the State Board for review so valid decisions could be made at the December meeting of the State Board. The motion carried. 174

State Superintendent, Dr. Jack Nix, stated the publishers would be contracted with the request that State Board members be furnished copies of all books in question at the earliest possible date so that the materials may be voted on at the December meeting as to whether or not the materials should be approved or disapproved. 175
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A Memorandum to the Publishers, November, 1971

Following the November regular meeting of the State Board, State Superintendent Nix sent a memorandum to all textbook publishers who had submitted social studies textbooks for bids. The memo read as follows:

SUBJECT: Georgia Bids, 1971-72

The Georgia State Board of Education has directed, this date, that the following information be provided all textbook publishers submitting bids for the 1971-72 adoptions. Any publication submitted which contains a contribution by or was written or edited by Edwin Fenton or Nat Hentoff is to be given special scrutiny. If your company has submitted such materials, it is imperative that you provide a copy of each such publication to each state board member and to the State Superintendent of Schools on or before December 8, 1971. Books written or edited by the above authors should be clearly identified. Contributions by either author should be clearly marked and identified in publications authored or edited by anyone else.176

The Holt Social Studies Curriculum The Americans, and 32 Problems in World History, all edited, authored or contributed to by Edwin Fenton, had successfully survived the rigorous reviews of the Professional Textbook Selection Committee. Receiving a 900 point rating on a 1000 point scale the textbooks were reaffirmed and again submitted with other social studies textbooks for approval at the December regular meeting of the State Board of Education.177 Meanwhile, the State Board members were reviewing the textbooks in question for themselves.

State Board Meeting, December 16, 1971

The State Board of Education met in regular session on Thursday,

---
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December 16, 1971, at 9:30 a.m. in the State Board Conference Room. All members were present except Mr. Henry A. Stewart, Sr., who was absent because of personal illness. Included on the agenda for this meeting were two items relative to textbooks. The first was consideration of revised policy for submission of professional textbook committee reports to State Board of Education; and, the second was consideration of bids on textbook adoptions in the social studies. 178

On the first of the two issues, the following resolution relating to submission of professional textbook committee reports to the State Board of Education was approved:

WHEREAS, the State Board of Education is charged with the responsibility for providing for the instructional needs of the students in the public schools of Georgia; and

WHEREAS, the selection of adequate and appropriate textbooks to meet these needs is becoming increasingly complex; and

WHEREAS, additional time is needed for a careful examination of recommended textual materials;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the list of titles recommended by the Professional Textbook Selection Committee be submitted at the regular meeting of the State Board of Education preceding the meeting at which adoption is requested. An examination copy of each title will be available in the State Department of Education for Board members desiring to evaluate more carefully recommended texts.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all questions concerning the textbooks recommended for adoption by the Professional Textbook Selection Committee be referred to the Professional Textbook Selection Committee for study and recommendation before the Board acts on the question raised. 179


179 Ibid., p. 9.
On the second item, Mr. Kenneth Kilpatrick moved that all books edited, contributed to, or authored by Edwin Fenton be referred back to the Professional Textbook Selection Committee for further consideration and written evaluation, and that all other books on the textbook list be approved. Mrs. A. Edward Smith seconded the motion and it carried. 180

Board member Kenneth Kilpatrick of Jonesboro, Georgia, who made the motion to accept the proposed list with the exception of Fenton's books, said later he felt there were better social studies textbooks available than those written by Fenton. Specifically referring to a book titled The Americans: A History of the United States, Kilpatrick said, "Some things in this book tend to create disruption and dissen- sion in our society. In many respects it is a biased book. I have nothing against a book that represents both sides, but this particular book represents a slanted view and injects some things that I don't think have anything to do with the subject of history." 181

Continuing Kilpatrick stated that he believes "there is more in this book about the Vietnam war than the American Revolution." By his analysis, the dialogue on the military draft would cause people who did not have an opinion prior to reading it to tend to shape an antidraft opinion." Kilpatrick said he did not think the Fenton books should be used until the Professional Textbook Committee had attempted to find better texts in the social studies field. "If they cannot find any better books then I would like to see the other books to compare for myself,"
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he said.  

In addition to The Americans, the Fenton books sent back to the Textbook Committee for further study included the following titles: Comparative Political Systems, Comparative Economic Systems, The Shaping of Western Society, Tradition and Change in Four Societies, A New History of the United States, The Humanities in Three Cities, Introduction to the Behavioral Sciences, and 32 Problems In World History.

The news of the State Board's approval of all social studies textbooks which were recommended by the Professional Textbook Selection Committee, except the ones edited, authored, or contributed to by Edwin Fenton, spread across the state and nation rapidly. Although the State Board had only referred the textbooks contributed to by Fenton back to the Professional Textbook Selection Committee for further consideration, the press reported the textbooks to be banned in Georgia. The State Board's move, however, was cause for concern among educators in Georgia. This was the first time since the early fifties that the State Board had removed textbooks from the approved textbook list after the Professional Textbook Selection Committee had approved of them. James H. Williams, Southeastern regional director of the National Education Association was critical of the Board's move. He stated that "the removal of the books of Edwin Fenton from the state-approved list...raises some
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serious questions concerning the abridgement of academic freedom." Continuing, he said, "the Professional Textbook Selection Committee is composed of educational practitioners, and they know best what materials should be used in the classroom. I hope that the State Board of Education will not become censors." 185

The Georgia Council for the Social Studies was an active supporter of Fenton, inquiry, and the Holt curriculum. Before the January meeting of the State Board, the executive secretary of the GCSS, Charles Berryman, sent a memorandum to the Georgia social science educators advising them of the State Board's action during its December meeting in 1971. He urged the educators to contact their district representative on the State Board and help him or her to make an informed, reasonable decision. He warned that it appeared that the State Board may override the recommendation of the Textbook Selection Committee and ban the inquiry based "Fenton Materials" published by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 186

Further, Dr. Berryman cited five other issues rising from this controversy which he felt were more important than the specific textbooks.

These issues are as follows:

1. The academic competency of Georgia students is at stake. In a conversation in May, 1970 with Dr. Paul Deiderich of Educational Testing Service he said that college admission tests include about 20% recall of information and 80% skills in the academic disciplines such as are taught by inquiry methods. We can ill afford to revert to ineffective methods and materials.

185 Atlanta Constitution (December 17, 1971).
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(2) Local control of education is at stake. While the Board does have the authority it seems to me unwise to further erode the power of local governments. Many current educational problems are partly consequences of decisions by educational authorities who are unresponsive to local needs. Adoption of materials by the State Board permits, but does not require, local adoption.

(3) How students are to make decisions is an issue. Personally, I much prefer that controversial social issues are discussed in a classroom where the teacher can insist that the analytic intellectual tools of the academic disciplines can be brought to bear. A counter argument that such decisions are better made in informal bull sessions seems to me inadequate.

(4) Whether students make their own decisions is a consideration. It appears that the Board may have been persuaded by laymen with good intentions but little knowledge of teaching that telling students what they are to believe will get the desired results. It is not that simple to change students' beliefs; we know only too well that trying to impose beliefs doesn't work, and often gets negative results.

(5) Finally, the purposes for censoring these materials concern me. Thus far, the reasons given (in newspapers and TV to which I have access) have either been flatly inaccurate or expressions of personal taste about rather complex professional materials. Further, objection was raised to one book but the entire sequence was censored. Since there is no reason to question the good intentions of the Board or any of its members, I have to believe that they are victims of poor advice or have not considered the implications of such bans, or both. 187

The Professional Textbook Committee met in early January, 1972 and unanimously reaffirmed their original recommendation of the books in the Fenton series for inclusion on the list of social studies textbooks approved for state adoption. Members of the Committee decided to defend their recommendation of the Fenton books at the January meeting of the State Board of Education. 188
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Press Reaction In Georgia

During the period between the December regular meeting of the State Board and the January regular meeting, the Georgia newspaper reports annoyed many of the State Board members. On December 17, 1971, the day after the State Board's regular meeting, many newspapers across the state reported that the State Board of Education had banned all social studies textbooks which were edited, authored, or contributed to by Edwin Fenton. Actually, at that point, the textbooks had not been banned, but they were sent back to the state textbook committee for further study. Yet, the headings for these newspaper articles in Georgia and across the nation read "Georgia Bans C-MU Professor's Textbooks,"189 "Professors Text Axed in Georgia,"190 or "School Board Bans Textbooks by Fenton."191

During the following weeks, the newspapers carried articles in which Fenton defended his books. Recognized as an authority on social studies curricula, Dr. Fenton stated that the books under his guidance were "designed for inquiry teaching or the systematic examination of alternative solutions to a problem."192 He further stated,

"We teach children to make up their own minds. The United States is a participatory democracy and social studies should train children to participate."193
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He stated that "most social studies books are narrative and analytical accounts - students read 20 pages on the American Revolution, learn the facts and repeat them to the teacher." He thinks that is "terrible and authoritarian teaching.... It controls the ideas that kids get."\(^{194}\)

Continuing, Fenton said that his books "operate on different principles. They are genuine educational systems, containing various materials such as filmstrips, skits, newspaper articles, letters and excerpts from diaries. They give students a variety of points of view.\(^{195}\)

Fenton cited the issue to be "what social studies teaching is all about. Is it simple indoctrination or should we teach students to think critically about the issues? And if we don't trust the students to think for themselves, then why don't we, since we live in a democracy?"\(^{196}\)

**The Americans**

The eighth grade history of the United States for slow learners was the main target of the attack against Fenton's works. This textbook consists basically of numerous readings, maps, graphs, or pictures, utilized as the bases or springboards for class discussion.

\(^{194}\) *Atlanta Constitution*, (December 20, 1971).

\(^{195}\) Ibid.
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or work. Many of the springboards deal with historical events which allegedly paralleled the experiences of slow learners. For example, text discussion of the experience of American immigrants is couched in terms of student experience in moving to a new town or home.\textsuperscript{197} Some of these springboards also compare controversial current events with past occurrences, such as, the then current question of resistance to the draft laws compared to defiance of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850.\textsuperscript{198} Such parallels are discussed in what the authors term a cyclical fashion, beginning with discussion of the historical topic (contextual aspect of discussion), turning to contemporary applications (the emotional aspect), and then returning to the historical parallel (the contextual aspect).\textsuperscript{199}

Extensive use of audio-visuals is necessary to the program, with more audio visuals to be used with slow learners than average students. A media kit accompanies the material. Although recitation is advocated for particular learning objectives, stress is placed on guided and pure inquiry.\textsuperscript{200} Skits and simulations are also emphasized.\textsuperscript{201}

It was noted that the Fenton edited history book entitled \textit{The Americans: A History of the United States} had specifically drawn the objections of state board member, Mr. Kenneth Kilpatrick. Mr. Kilpatrick said the book was "biased" and that it "contained more information on the Vietnam War than the American Revolution and it included an

\textsuperscript{198}Ibid., pp. 46-47.
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unfavorably biased section concerning the military draft."\footnote{202}{Atlanta Constitution, (December 20, 1971).}

Fenton's reply to these criticisms was that "there are twenty-six pages in \textit{The Americans} on the American Revolution and seven on Vietnam. And that is not a blow by blow account of the Vietnam War. It includes a skit with five student parts which offer varying points of view." On the draft, Fenton stated, "there is also a skit with a 19 year-old boy, his mother, father, and an uncle. Again, several points of view are presented and no consensus is reached." Fenton said he did not consider the skit to be "biased."\footnote{203}{Ibid.}

Fenton said the book \textit{The Americans} was written by eight Carnegie-Mellon graduate students, all of whom had been teachers in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania public school system. He served as the editor. He cited that the book was on the approved textbook list in at least a dozen states and was also used overseas. Written at a fifth or sixth grade level, the book was intended for students with an IQ of 75 to 90 or more intelligent students who have reading difficulties.\footnote{204}{Ibid.}

When asked whether his books had been attacked in other states, Fenton replied, "I've been shot at a little on textbooks before, primarily by members of the John Birch Society." I am not opposed to citizens coming to school boards and asking about textbooks, because that's participatory democracy. But they should come only after a careful examination of the works." He further stated that he was sure his books would get a fair hearing in Georgia, and that was all he asked for.\footnote{205}{Ibid.}
Debate Among State Board Members

The State Board of Education met in regular session on Thursday, January 20, 1972, at 9:30 a.m. in the State Board Conference Room. Again, all were present except Mr. Henry A. Stewart who remained absent because of personal illness. Item No. 17 on the agenda dealt with the report of the Georgia Professional Textbook Selection Committee. Mr. Sam Griffin stated that the vote was 5 to 4 for approval of the Report from the Professional Textbook Selection Committee at the Committee of the Whole session. Mr. Earnest Whaley moved that Item 17 of the instructional items be approved. Mr. James Dewar seconded the motion.206

Mr. Griffin then stated he would like to be recorded as voting "No" on the motion. He stated it should be clearly understood by the public, publishers, authors, members of the textbook committee, and particularly by the press that no one had ever suggested banning of any books.207 He pointed out the State Board of Education by law is charged with the responsibility of coming up with a list of textbooks for each class and actually to prescribe textbooks. By policy, the Board does not use its authority in full. He stated the Board approves a textbook list from which books may be purchased with State funds. He stated the fact that a book does not appear on the textbook list does not prevent a local system from using the book with local funds if they find other books they wish to use.208
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Mr. Griffin also observed that the Board is authorized by law to appoint a Professional Textbook Selection Committee. This Committee makes recommendations to the Board, but they are no more sacred than any other recommendation made by other committees and presented to the Board for consideration. As he continued, he commended the Textbook Committee for a job well done. He pointed out that the committee had reviewed some 1100 books and recommended that some 507 books be approved. Then he stressed that "no one had suggested that the committee was in the business of banning books because it did not recommend all 1100 books it reviewed." Further, he stated that he had not been persuaded, nor convinced by the report from the Textbook Committee that these books are indispensable.\textsuperscript{209}

Board members Mrs. Smith, Mr. Rice, and Mr. Kilpatrick also requested that the minutes show they voted against the motion. Mrs. Smith indicated her concurrence in what Mr. Griffin had said. Mr. Kilpatrick read a prepared statement\textsuperscript{210} and requested that it be made a part of the official minutes.\textsuperscript{211}

The first part of Mr. Kilpatrick's statement lashed out at educators and the press who accused the Board of favoring book banning and being influenced by a group of ultra conservatives. He stated that he

\textsuperscript{209}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{210}See Appendix A, "Statement by Mr. Kenneth Kilpatrick" presented in the State Board of Education Meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, January 20, 1972.

\textsuperscript{211}Minutes, State Board of Education Meeting (January 20, 1972), p. 9.
"refused to be intimidated and any reasonable person who is interested in facts cannot possibly be impressed with such babbling."\textsuperscript{212} As for outside influence, referring to Al Leake and the GBEC, Mr. Kilpatrick said, speaking for himself and leaving the possibility open for the rest of the Board, "this is simply not true."\textsuperscript{213} When asked a few years later about exterior influence, he replied, "No exterior influence entered into my decision. I can't speak for the others."\textsuperscript{214}

Then his attention turned to the social studies textbooks by Edwin Fenton and others. "I want to emphasize that I do not object to all of the works included in the subject under discussion.... I can probably tolerate \textsuperscript{32} Problems in World History...and most of the others. My main objection is the use of the book, \textsuperscript{The Americans}... We need to give our young people a strong positive philosophy. This book teaches a "nothing philosophy.... The approval of \textsuperscript{The Americans} as a textbook for use in the public school system damages the cause of public education and strengthens private education at a time when public education can least afford erosion. If parents in Georgia could make a choice they would never choose \textsuperscript{The Americans} as an influence to shape the minds of their young, and good education does shape minds."\textsuperscript{215}

While all of the Board members opposing the textbooks had something to say, only Mr. Richard Neville spoke in favor of the textbooks.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{212}Ibid., p. 10.
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He stated he did not feel the statements made by Mr. Griffin and Mr. Kilpatrick were personally addressed to him or to any other one member of the Board. He stated his position in supporting the Textbook Committee resulted from the fact they are appointed by the Board and he felt the Committee was a very competent one. He stated he did not feel he knew everything about everything and he was no expert in the approval of textbooks that should go into the classrooms of the State. He stated that he thought the committee members were experts in the field and he was willing to accept the committee's judgement and recommendation. He pointed out that while he did not find The Americans to be very challenging or interesting, he was not going to say that the book was not a suitable textbook to be used in the public schools of the state since the book was recommended by the Textbook Committee.  

Chairman Hendricks called for the vote and the motion passed by 5-4 with Mr. Whaley, Mrs. Huseman, Mr. Neville, Mr. Dewar and Mr. Hendricks voting in favor of the motion.  

The approved report of the Georgia Professional Textbook Selection Committee was as follows:

On motion by Mr. Whaley, seconded by Mr. Dewar, the Committee of the Whole recommends adoption of the following recommendation of the Georgia Professional Textbook Selection Committee:

"The textbooks under consideration are the Holt Social Studies Series and 32 Problems In World History published by Scott, Foresman and Company.

These textbooks offer a wide range of materials for teaching Social Studies by the inquiry method, utilizing
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primary and secondary sources. These books deal not only with the issues of American society but offer a comparative analysis of common world problems. The main objective is to help each student develop to the limit of his ability into an independent thinker and a responsible citizen in a democratic society.

Many opportunities are provided by the materials for building constructive attitudes toward learning for the growth of a positive self-concept, clarification of values and the development of critical thinking and reading. Issues are presented, alternatives are set forth and generalizations are supported with evidence.

These materials permit the student to compare, inquire and to make value judgments without the penalties inherent in situations outside of the classroom.

The Georgia Professional Textbook Selection Committee recommends that the materials under study be adopted.\textsuperscript{218}

\textbf{Campaign to Remove Fenton's Books From the State Textbook List}

The State Board of Education's close decision in favor of the Fenton social studies textbooks was not enough to stop the opposition from continuing to fight to remove the textbooks from the state-approved textbook list.

After the textbooks were approved in January, 1972 by the State Board of Education in a close 5 to 4 decision, Al Leake of the GBEC continued to agitate the issue. As an editorial page columnist for the Douglasville, Georgia \textit{Sentinel}, he wrote, "We have in Georgia an aspect of the inquiry method in its realignment of lines of authority in the teaching process.... An advocate of the inquiry method is Edwin Fenton, professor of History at Carnegie Institute of Technology and editor of social studies series for Holt, Rinehart and Winston and Scott Foresman,\textsuperscript{218}

\textsuperscript{218}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 12-13.
two major textbook publishers. Fenton has edited two books on the New Social Studies which incorporates the inquiry approach. Books from the Fenton series are in use in Georgia schools.... The Director of the Georgia Curriculum Development Division describes Edwin Fenton's approach as the coming thing and that we'll have it in spite of any protest.... Parents must tell their school boards they want no part of it. Let's have education for scholarship, not revolution.219

Spearheading the opposition on the State Board, Kenneth Kilpatrick said, referring to The Americans: A History of the United States, "some things in this book tend to create disruption and dissension in our society."220 Kilpatrick stated that he believed there were better social studies textbooks which could be used in Georgia. Enraged at the press coverage he and his colleagues received, being referred to as censors and "book burners," Kilpatrick said, "I refuse to be intimidated."221 Later, when asked whether he agreed with Mr. Leake's assessment that the Fenton materials create revolution, he refused to answer saying the questions had "built in biases."222 Mr. Kilpatrick, during the monthly meetings of the State Board following the January meeting, vowed to bring the matter to a vote every time the board met until the books were dropped.223 However, it was not until the regular Board meeting in May of 1972 that the issue was reconsidered by the State Board of Education.

220Atlanta Constitution (December 17, 1971).
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During the regular meeting of the Georgia State Board of Education in May of 1972, Board member Mr. Kenneth Kilpatrick reopened the discussion on the Holt-Rinehart social studies series by Fenton, Good, Lichtenberg, and others. He stated,

Since the Board had taken action in approving the Holt-Rinehart series of books edited and authored by Edwin Fenton, I have studied them a great deal more and have become more convinced than ever that these books are not suitable books for use in the public schools of this state.224

He pointed out that in addition to reasons stated by him in the past, he wanted to give one more example of why he felt as he did. He stated,

In the workbook that goes along with the textbook (referring to The Americans) one drill that high school students are expected to complete is writing a letter to the draft board.... the suggestion is very clear that this is to be a letter protesting service in the Armed Forces and the only persons who usually write the draft board are those who protest.225

Skillfully, Kilpatrick used sentiment against the anti-draft movement among the youth during the early seventies and their protests to arouse the Board.

Mr. Kilpatrick was specifically referring to a section in the book entitled "Why Fight for America?" The section included a skit in which a 19 year old young man, who had been drafted into the Army, tells why he would rather go to jail than into the Army. After reading the
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skit, the students were asked to write a letter explaining the young man's views to a draft board.\textsuperscript{226}

Another argument against the books was raised by Board member David Rice of Atlanta. Rice stated that the book should be banned as he called for "more Americanism" to be taught in the public schools of Georgia. He argued further that some history books devoted too much space to such figures as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and not enough to "the people who made this country great." The book made frequent mention of Dr. King and had one chapter titled "Letter from a Birmingham Jail," telling of Dr. King's famous 1963 letter to fellow ministers after his arrest for protest activity.\textsuperscript{227} Equally as irritating to the State Board members were the works contained in the book by black comedian Dick Gregory, black author James Baldwin, and Nat Hentoff, black writer and former member of the Black Panthers.\textsuperscript{228}

Mr. Kilpatrick indicated the Board did not have the authority to dictate to local systems how they could spend their own funds. However, he moved that the Holt Social Studies series edited or authored by Edwin Fenton be deleted from the state-approved listing of textbooks for which state funds may be expended. The motion carried by a 5 to 4 vote. Board member, Henry A. Stewart, who was hospitalized when the textbooks were approved in January, voted in support of Mr. Kilpatrick,

\textsuperscript{226}Athens, Georgia \textit{Daily News} (May 19, 1972).
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Mr. Griffin, and the other opponents of the Fenton books. Mr. Roy Hendricks, Chairman of the Board who broke a 4-4 tie in January for adoption of the textbooks did not vote.

Mr. Griffin pointed out, for the benefit of the press, that the State Board of Education had not banned any books from use in the public schools of Georgia. However, no state funds would be spent on this particular series of books. Local funds could be used if the system wished to do so. Nevertheless, the action amounted to blacklisting the books in Georgia's public schools since about eighty per cent of the purchase price of approved textbooks was funded by the state.

Ted Key of Forrest Park, the teacher from Kilpatrick's district who served on the textbook committee, stated that he was very disappointed about the action the Board took towards the Fenton textbooks. He said he thought the books were definitely not worthy of taking off the state approved textbook list. Key said he felt the books had some portions that seemed un-American or anti-war, but they left the teacher the freedom to present both sides of the picture.

---
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The following article appeared on the editorial page of the Atlanta Constitution a few days after the State Board made its decision.

Freedom

Children should be seen and not heard—so the old saying goes. The way to educate them is to sit them down and drill them in the three R's and don't mess up their minds by inviting them to think about controversial issues—so the old school approach goes.

The State Board of Education has voted to remove from its approved list some books deemed by some members to be too controversial. The books have been approved by the board's own Textbook Selection Committee and previously approved, 5-4, by the board itself.

Apparently what makes the books controversial is that they involve students in discussions of questions like the military draft. A workbook exercise asks students to write a hypothetical letter to a draft board after listening to various views on that subject.

The board's earlier vote suggested that it believed students ought to be encouraged to think. That made sense.

But one board member, Kenneth Kilpatrick of Jonesboro, doesn't like that approach. Evidently he firmly believes that only the right ideas about subjects like the military draft should be permitted—and guess whose ideas he considers right. And Mr. Kilpatrick has swung the board his way, 5-4. The books aren't banned, but the state won't be buying any more.

It's going to be tough teaching students all about freedom of thought and freedom of speech and all those other American freedoms when they find out we don't really mean it.233

In removing the books from the state-approved list, the Georgia State Board of Education was acting counter to the recommendations of the Professional Textbook Selection Committee which reaffirmed its faith

in the Fenton social studies textbooks by a special resolution.\textsuperscript{234} The Georgia State Social Studies supervisors\textsuperscript{235} wrote letters to Governor Jimmy Carter, the state legislature, and the Board of Education members protesting the Board's action. The letters requested a personal reply from those to whom the letters were sent. Board member David F. Rice, replying to a social studies teacher in Macon, Georgia, wrote,

As a member of the State Board of Education, I received a copy of the letter that Social Studies Supervisors sent to Governor Carter. The letter requests a personal reply from those to whom copy was sent. My first impulse was to ignore it, but on second thought I have decided to reply. I have carefully studied the book in question, "The Americans, A History of the United States." Here is my reaction to both the book and the letter.

In my opinion, there is so much wrong with the book, as a history of the United States, and as a history book for our schools, that I will not go into detail. In general, it is an insidious criticism of all that has made this country great and free. It distorts ideals, values, and the wisdom of the ages. If it is the only history book that teachers feel they can use, then we are really in bad shape, for both books and teachers.

During the twelve years I have been a member of the State Board I have constantly striven for better pay for teachers. Such attitudes by teachers as expressed in your letter make it exceedingly difficult for those of us in authority to obtain better pay for them. When parents learn that their children are being taught from such textbooks as this one, they become more and more disillusioned with today's professional educators.

Two years ago, I spent a month visiting schools and colleges in the Soviet Union. What I saw frightened me, and I am afraid for the future of our nation. The Russians

\textsuperscript{234} \textit{Atlanta Constitution} (May 19, 1972), p. 6-A.

\textsuperscript{235} The social studies supervisors are an organized group within the Georgia Council for the Social Studies. They include curriculum supervisors from larger school districts and Cooperative Education Service agents who supervise smaller districts in the state.
have boasted that they will destroy us from within, and it is such books as this one that aid them toward this goal.236

While the letters to the state officials made no gains for the Fenton materials, they did alert the State Board to the concern of social studies educators across the state.

Publisher's Loss

Since the Georgia State Board of Education had already approved the textbooks in January of 1972, about twenty-two public school systems across the state had already purchased the textbooks in large volume.237 The Holt, Rinehart and Winston publishers reported the financial loss amounting to approximately $100,000 in forecasted sales. One representative conceded that there was "nothing the publishing company could do" to get the books approved and that they must "absorb the loss"....238

Later, when asked about the role the publishers adopted during this controversy, the representative replied, "we watched the proceedings of the State Board closely, but we never considered taking any legal action. We felt the Board never really understood what the Americans was design-ed to do."239

236 A letter from State Board member David F. Rice to Mrs. Jackie Richardson, a Bibb County social studies teacher, May 27, 1972.
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Summary

Although there are some similarities between the concepts of teaching in Edwin Fenton's new social studies and the regulations and guidelines for the social studies in Georgia, the Holt Social Studies series by Fenton and others caused a big controversy in Georgia. The Fenton works included concepts in which the student would investigate solutions to contemporary social, economic and political problems. They included a continuum which envisioned a gradual progression from discovery to expository learning. Fenton felt that analytical questions, the process of developing and validating hypotheses would be the most valuable for the social studies. The regulations and guidelines for social studies in Georgia included the following: developing needed competencies, skills and knowledge of basic concepts from social science disciplines, and teaching students information gathering, analytical and interpretive methods of specialists in these fields.

The controversy over the Fenton social studies textbooks in Georgia began in 1969 when the Georgia Basic Education Council's chairman, Al Leake, published opposition to Fenton's works in the Citizen's Education Review. The articles blasted Fenton's inquiry method, the inductive approach, and his textbooks which embodied this approach to teaching. While Fenton and his colleagues were interested in developing inquiry skills among students, the GBEC was interested in methodology which molds the minds of the students.

In 1971 the vociferous leader of the GBEC carried his campaign against Fenton's works to the Fulton County Board of Education and eventually to the State Board of Education. He was able to find some
support among the State Board members. One State Board member, Kenneth Kilpatrick, led opposition on the board to the textbooks by Fenton and caused approval of the textbooks to be delayed for two months. He later vowed to continue this opposition until the textbooks by Fenton were removed from the state-approved textbook list.

In the January meeting of 1972, the State Board of Education approved the Fenton social studies textbooks by a narrow 5-4 decision after a hot debate. Irritated by the press with charges of censorship in Georgia, the State Board members who opposed the textbooks explained that they were not banning any books, but they were opposed to spending state funds to buy them. During the months following the January meeting the opposing board members continued to irritate the issue as they refused to let it die. In May, 1972, the Georgia State Board of Education during its regular meeting reversed its earlier decision to adopt the social studies textbooks edited or authored by Edwin Fenton. After a hot debate over the issue, the opposition to the Fenton materials won a close 5 to 4 decision to remove the materials from the state-approved textbook list. The votes which changed the State Board's decision was attributed to the opposition's ability to gain the support of board member Henry A. Stewart, who was hospitalized during the January meeting when the board voted 5 to 4 in favor of Fenton's materials. Also board chairman Roy A. Hendricks, who broke the 4 to 4 deadlock in favor of the Fenton materials in January, 1972, did not vote.

The publishers watched the State Board's proceedings with interests but did nothing to change their minds about the textbooks.
No legal action was ever pursued.

The subsequent events following the State Board's decisions led to several changes affecting textbook selection policy. These events are discussed in the concluding chapter of this study.
CHAPTER VI

SUBSEQUENT EVENTS AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

During the summer of 1971 Mr. Al Leake of the GBEC raised the question concerning the legality of the Fulton County curriculum for the 11th and 12th grades. The Holt Social Studies Curriculum had been widely used in Fulton County. Leake believed the Georgia Code 32-724 was being violated and registered complaints with the Fulton County Board of Education and the State Board of Education. Leake also protested the use of the Holt Social Studies Curriculum. In 1972, the State Board of Education, whose actions were not influenced by any person or group according to board member Kilpatrick, was pursuing the remains of Leake's complaint. The ensuing events led to legislative intervention and a ruling by the State Attorney General. This chapter will describe those events and their impact on social studies in Georgia. Also discussed in this chapter is Edwin Fenton's visit to Georgia and some reviews of related publications which were written to publicize the issues surrounding the controversy and encourage further study of its impact on Georgia's public education. After disclosing the present status of the Fenton social studies textbooks in Georgia, the writer will conclude the study with recommendations for similar problems in the future.
The Special Committee on American Government

An ad hoc Committee of State Board of Education members (Griffin, Kilpatrick, and Rice) met on June 15, 1972 with the state coordinator of social studies to study the requirements for American history and government as discussed in the Georgia Code, Sections 32-706 and 32-724 as quoted below.

32-706. Instruction in essentials of United States and State Constitutions. Study of American Institutions and Ideals. All schools and colleges sustained or in any manner supported by public funds shall give instructions in the history of the United States, and in the history of Georgia, and in the essentials of the United States Constitution and the Constitution of Georgia, including the study of and devotion to American institutions and ideals, and no student in any school or college shall receive a certificate of graduation without previously passing a satisfactory examination of the history of the United States, and the history of Georgia, and upon the provisions and principles of the United States Constitution and the Constitution of Georgia. (Acts 1923, p. 130; 1953, p. 532)

32-724. Instruction in Federal, State, county and municipal government required for graduation. The State Board of Education shall prescribe a course of study in the background, history and development of the Federal and State governments. The Board shall also approve and recommend textbooks to be used in this course. The course so prescribed shall be taught in the 11th or 12th grade of all high schools which receive in any manner funds from this State. The course shall be taught for the entire school year. Provided, however, the total time devoted to said course of study shall be sufficient to earn one full unit of credit. The course in the study of Federal and State government shall be supplemented in each high school by a study of the local county and municipal governments. No student shall be eligible to receive a diploma from a high school, which receives funds from this State, unless said student has successfully completed the course in governments provided for by this section. (Acts 1953, p. 587)

Under close supervision of the ad hoc committee the state coordinator for the social studies prepared a syllabus for a course of
study in American history and government which they believed would fulfill the requirements for Georgia Code 32-706 and 32-724 and the responsibilities of the State Board to prescribe the course which each high school must develop and teach in either the eleventh or twelfth grade to all students enrolled. The syllabus consisted of a list of topics some seven pages long. A portion of the syllabus follows:240

III. The Republic Is Launched

A. National Institutions Are Established

1. A Domestic Policy Emerges
2. A Pattern for National Debt and National Credit Is Established
3. The Hamiltonian Program Established A Precedent
4. Jeffersonian Neutrality Gives New Nation Time to Grow
5. John Marshall Helps Establish Supreme Court as Powerful Force in the Federal System
6. The Development of National Parties and the Two Party System Emerges
7. Jacksonian Democracy Symbolizes A "New Democracy"
8. The Minor Party Plays A Part in National Politics

Also, the committee would recommend only four textbooks to be used to teach the course of study as outlined. There was no rationale to accompany the syllabus.

On June 22, 1972 at the regular meeting of the State Board the Special Committee on American Government made its report to the State Board. Board member Kilpatrick pointed out it was his belief the committee had prepared a good outline of the course of study to be used, and suggested textbooks that should accomplish what the State Board feels

240Report of Special Committee on American Government in the minutes of the Georgia State Board of Education Meeting (June 22, 1972).
should be accomplished in this area. Board member Dewar moved that the report be approved with the addition of one item to indicate that "the courses should be taught so that every Georgian who completes this course should be proud that he is an American and a Georgian, and a participating American who knows what his responsibilities are under the American form of government." The motion carried. This meant that the State Board was demanding that only four textbooks be used for teaching the prescribed course of study.

The Georgia State Board of Education in their action on June 22, 1972 again reversed earlier endorsements by limiting school systems to the choice of only four textbooks for the course. Thirty-three other history and government textbooks which had previously been approved by the State Board and appeared on the official Georgia Textbook List for 1972 were eliminated from the approved list. Only four textbooks remained on the list and were eligible for purchase with state funds. Those textbooks were: Ver Steeg and Hofstader, A People and A Nation (Harper and Row, 1971); Todd and Curt, Rise of the American Nation, 3rd ed. (Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich, 1972); Link, Growth of American Democracy (Ginn, 1968); and Schwartz, Exploring Our Nation's History (Globe, 1968).

The annual joint summer conference of the Georgia Association of School Superintendents, Georgia Association of Elementary School Principals, and the Georgia Association of Secondary School Principals met in

---
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July, 1972. The local school superintendents raised such a furor over the State Board's new ruling requiring one of four textbooks for their high school American history course that it caused the State Board to reconsider its decision at their regular meeting during the month of July. The superintendents said that changing the United States history textbooks then in use would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars in needless expense.243

State School Superintendent, Jack P. Nix told the board members he had received numerous letters and phone calls from local school officials about the textbooks. Among the protests was a letter from Dekalb County Superintendent, Jim Cherry, who estimated it would cost his system $100,000 to shelve the textbooks it was using and buy the new ones the state board had approved. Bibb County notified the board that it would cost that school system over $11,000, and a number of other systems reported the cost would be exceedingly expensive.244

The State Board of Education met in its regular meeting on July 20, 1972. Mr. Kilpatrick stated "correspondence was received from several school systems relating to action of the Board regarding Code Section 32-724." He further stated "the school officials did not object to the law but indicated systems were having difficulties in procuring the recommended texts and that the previous action of the Board placed a financial burden on local systems in some instances."245

---
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Kilpatrick moved that "the action previously taken by the Board to implement Section 32-724 regarding the teaching of the origin, background and development of the government of the United States, the State of Georgia and local government, and specifically the action relative to the approval and recommendation of textbooks, be amended so that local systems may use texts on the state approved list, together with the course outline approved by the Board, in the school year 1972-73, but that in the school year 1973-74, all systems shall use one or more of the four books approved by the State Board of Education in conjunction with the course outline." 246

Board Impact

In about eight months the Georgia State Board of Education had made a significant impact on the textbook selection procedure and the determination of social studies course content with little public notice, if any. Although the State Board had acted on constitutional grounds, the changes were to have both immediate and long range implications for Georgia school children and the social studies. 247

The immediate effects meant the action taken by the State Board of Education severely restricted the liberty of teachers to choose materials they found suitable for their own students. Instead of a list of thirty-nine textbooks, there were only four. Oddly, none of the four approved textbooks contained materials about government required to teach
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the sections of the prescribed syllabus on American Political Behavior and State and Local Government.\footnote{248}

By prescribing a syllabus and limiting schools to the purchase of only four books with state money, the State Board of Education removed effective decision making power from the hands of local school administrators and teachers who know the children they teach and have professional competence and training in educational affairs.\footnote{249}

The Georgia Council for the Social Sciences

Social studies educators in Georgia, by individual effort and by the collective action of the Georgia Council for the Social Sciences (GCSS),\footnote{250} attempted to reverse those policies of the State Board. Because of the significance of the decisions by the Georgia State Board of Education affecting textbook selection in the social studies in the state, the officers and trustees of the GCSS drew up the following resolution which was approved by the organization at its Winter conference in January, 1973 at the Stone Mountain Inn.

The Georgia Council for the Social Sciences believes that decisions regarding the choice of school learning experiences and materials to develop a student's talents and meet the school's educational objectives are best made by a teacher who knows the learner. Teaching quality depends on freedom to make such decisions. Teachers must select instructional materials without censorship.


\footnote{249}Ibid.

\footnote{250}A state-wide association of over 100 social studies educators affiliated with the National Council of Social Studies.
Challenges to the choice of instructional materials must be orderly and objective, under procedures mutually adopted by professional associations and school boards. The Council urges the removal of all laws which restrict the diversity of instructional materials of their professional selection.  

The resolution was similar to one adopted by the National Education Association.

The GCSS members wrote to and met with members of the State Board and key members of the Georgia Legislature. A two-fold objective was pursued. First, immediate reversal of the actions taken by the State Board; and second, a structural change in the process of approving instructional material for purchase with state funds that would prevent censorious measures by the State Board of Education.

The result of the efforts by GCSS was finally realized during a General Assembly session in the Winter of 1973. The 1953 legislation which granted the State Board authority to prescribe and approve textbooks for the required American history and government course was amended "so as to remove the provision relating to the approval and recommendation of certain textbooks by the Board" and to repeal "conflicting laws" with regard to textbook approval.

The General Assembly enacted Senate Bill 254 which deleted two sections of the statutes pertaining to instruction in American history

---
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and government. The first change was to delete the requirement that the State Board of Education approve and recommend textbooks to be used in the required course in American history and government. The second change was to eliminate the grade level at which the course was to be taught other than during the high school years.254

Stated differently, the effect of this legislation was to leave to the local boards of education the choice of the text to be used in this required course so long as it was from the state textbook list. Further, the course may be taught in any of the top four grades where you offer a Carnegie unit's credit for a year's work.255 For a while it seemed that educators had made some progress toward professional selection of instructional materials as Senate Bill 254 had clearly removed the Board's authority to approve and recommend textbooks for any school subject.256 However, the Fenton series was not returned to the state textbook list. Some educators were disappointed when Holt, Rinehart, and Winston did not ask for a ruling on it.257

The State Board of Education, confused over the new legislative obstructions of its attempts to choose the textbooks for American history courses, requested a decision from the state attorney general on what it

254A letter from H. Titus Singletary, Jr., The Associate State Superintendent of Schools in Georgia, to the local superintendents explaining Senate Bill 254. (May 25, 1973)
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257A letter from Jeanette Moon, Coordinator of Social Science for the Atlanta Public Schools, to Edwin Fenton. (June 15, 1973)
could or could not do. Board member Kenneth Kilpatrick, who was instrumental in the Board's decision to censor the Fenton books and restrict the number of American history and government textbooks, was concerned that the clause of Senate Bill 254 repealing any "conflicting laws" may have repealed the Board's authority to approve textbooks for any school subject.\(^{258}\) He stated that he thought "the legislature was ill-advised." Further, he said what the Board had found was a very loose situation. People were coming out of the public schools in this state with "no knowledge whatsoever of American history...no feeling of patriotism." Now, "we are right back where we started."\(^{259}\)

Kilpatrick, who was the main force behind the American history change, said, "the news media was responsible. Those of us who felt strongly about this were accused of everything from censorship to book-burning."\(^{260}\) Board member David Rice said, "regardless of who buys the books, the State Board ought to have the authority to say which books will be taught in Georgia's public schools. If there ever was a time when we ought to have supervision of what is taught in American history, it is now."\(^{261}\)

The language of Senate Bill 254, however, created confusion, even among Board members, as to whether the Board had lost its total authority to approve textbooks for any school subject. During its April, 1973 meeting the Board requested the Georgia Attorney General to review


\(^{259}\)Ibid.

\(^{260}\)Ibid.

\(^{261}\)Ibid.
the legislation and render an opinion on what authority the Board had retained in the area of textbook approval. Also, the imposed limitation of four textbooks for the American history and government course was repealed.\textsuperscript{262} This meant the Georgia public schools could select and purchase with state funds textbooks for American history and government from the state-approved textbook list which was approved in December of 1971.

On May 10, 1973 the State Board met before hearing an opinion from the Attorney General. The Board acted under the assumption that it would retain its authority in the area of textbook selection. However, because of the broadened interpretation of "instructional materials" provided by House Bill 361, the Board adopted a new policy statement at its May meeting covering the evaluation and recommendation of all types of instructional materials. Under this new policy, the Board appointed an Instructional Materials and Media Advisory Committee consisting of "representative professional educators engaged in public school work in the state." This committee was to replace the existing Professional Textbook Committee. The Advisory Committee would evaluate and recommend instructional materials for the public schools to purchase with state funds and report those recommendations to the Board. The Board, then, could "approve, add to, or delete materials from these listings." The listing of approved instructional materials would be transmitted to local school systems to select and purchase with state funds.

\textsuperscript{262}Minutes, Georgia State Board of Education Meeting (April 12, 1973).
The new policy superceded all existing Board policies relative to instructional materials and media.\(^{263}\)

Momentarily, the legislative action by the General Assembly raised the hopes of the supporters of Edwin Fenton as they felt, with the Board's powers seemingly diminished, Fenton's banned textbooks might have a chance of being reinstated on the Georgia approved textbook list. Their hopes, however, were erased with disappointment when the attorney general announced his ruling in the Fall, 1973. He ruled that the Georgia State Board of Education retained the power to approve the recommendations of the professional committee which evaluated instructional materials. The social studies series edited by Edwin Fenton remained excluded by Board action from the state-approved textbook list in Georgia.\(^{264}\)

However, the social studies textbooks edited by Edwin Fenton, which were purchased by twenty-two local school systems in Georgia with local funds, remained in use during the next few years. This was made possible by the repealing of the State Board's degree to limit the American history and government course to only four textbooks. But consequentially, the low sale of the Fenton series caused the publisher to stop print on most of these textbooks. According to Jim Summers, regional sales manager for Holt, Rinehart and Winston, "the textbooks did not sell well in other states either, especially after the Georgia incident." In 1976, the publisher submitted three textbooks from the Fenton materials to the
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State to be considered for adoption on the state textbook list. The titles submitted were *The Americans: A History of the United States*, *Comparative Economic Systems*, and *Comparative Political Systems*. However, none of these textbooks were adopted. Jim Summers further stated in Atlanta, Georgia recently that only *Comparative Political Systems* was still being ordered in Georgia for use as of July, 1980. 265

**Edwin Fenton In Georgia**

In March, 1974, Dr. Edwin Fenton came to Georgia to speak at the Georgia Council for the Social Sciences' Winter Conference at Savannah, Georgia. At this meeting, Fenton gave his interpretation of the social studies textbook adoption issue in Georgia and made some suggestions for revision of the process of textbook selection. He stated that his first knowledge of the situation was in 1969 when a colleague sent him a copy of the *Citizen's Education Review*, a newsletter of the Georgia Basic Education Council. 266 Of the newsletter, he said,

"I did not take Mr. Leake's article seriously. His charges seemed as absurd and so inaccurate that I could not imagine any responsible person giving credence to them. Hence, I was surprised in the winter of 1971 when I learned about what had happened at the December meeting of the State Board of Education." 267

While reviewing the sequence of events relative to the textbook issue, Fenton cited that Mr. Kilpatrick had "actually praised eight of the textbooks he voted against." This circumstance, perhaps," Fenton stated, "explains why some have raised the issue of censorship." 268
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Turning to Georgia, he said,

Now look at what happened in Georgia. Appointed representatives of the general public set policy for choosing textbooks and appointed professionals to select books in line with that policy. The professionals made their choices. The Board then rejected the choices, made its own selections, and prescribed a course of study. In my judgment, the Board assumed an inappropriate role.

The members of the State Board of Education have been empowered by law to accept or reject the recommendations of a professional committee which chooses learning materials for all subjects and all grade levels; elementary school reading, senior high school mathematics, home economics, social studies, and so forth. I do not know a single curriculum expert who is competent in all those fields; hence, the Professional Textbook Committee usually includes balanced representatives from several fields. Members of the general public have even less competence than curriculum experts because they cannot be expected to know as much as professionals do about general principles underlying all curriculum work. Hence, when members of a state or local board of education begin to choose specific books, they assume a role for which they are not adequately trained. They may easily fall victim to the fallacy of the single criterion: that materials conform to their version of Americanism (the charge against both Magruder's American Government in 1951 and CMU's The Americans in 1971) that materials treat a particular racial or ethnic group according to their standards, or that materials do not exceed an arbitrarily chosen reading level determined by one or another reading scale. Moreover, representatives of the public are likely to be influenced by particular interest groups motivated by a single criterion. Mr. Leake, for example, claims credit for initiating the movement to have books which I have written or edited removed from the approved list in Georgia.269

Continuing on textbook selection, Fenton stated,

...Now let me turn to the role of professional educators in choosing curricular materials. In my judgement, professional opinion is necessary, but not sufficient,
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ingredient in this process. Curriculum supervisors, department heads, college professors of education, and other professionals spend their academic lifetimes learning both the theoretical and practical aspects of their work. More than most of us, they study research about learning theory, objectives, classroom management, and similar vital matters. They have been trained to examine rationales for curricular materials to assess the quality of texts, audio-visual kits, examination programs, and teachers' guides; to interpret the results of field trials; and to appraise curricular materials proposed for use in the schools in a systematic way.

The present adoption system in Georgia, however, asks professional people to assume extremely difficult tasks. Let's role play one of these people. You are a specialist in elementary school math appointed to the textbook committee by a member of the board of education. You must examine and rate on a scale of from 1 to 100 not only math books, but also books for science, or English, or shop, or social studies or any other discipline up for adoption that year. "How can I make a fair assessment?" I hear you asking. I can ask colleagues in those fields. I can rely on the judgement of any members of the committee who knows a field better than I do. Perhaps I can read what experts have said. But after doing these things - and there are many books to consider - how should I decide to rate a book at 60 or 70 or 80 or 90.

Now let's get out of role. Would we be likely to get better assessments from people all of whom were expert in a field? In other words, should social studies experts assess social studies materials, science experts assess science materials, and so forth?

Experts in each field ought to make preliminary judgements about curricular materials, and they ought to make them with a number of written specific criteria to compare different materials. One good scheme for assessing social studies materials has been devised by Professor Irving Morrissett and his colleagues at the Social Science Education Consortium at Boulder, Colorado. Morrissett's Curriculum Materials Analysis System consists of a series of questions which the analyst puts to curricular materials. These questions lead to assessments of the physical nature of the product, the rationale behind it, the learning theory it embraces, the objectives specified or implied, the relative emphasis on cognitive and affective content, the suggested instructional strategies, the nature of the examination program, and
similar vital educational matters. Professional educators appointed to textbook committees should obtain copies of analyses from the Consortium or do their own analyses. To do so, they will need funds to employ analysts since a thorough analysis requires several weeks' work. They should also obtain analyses done by other groups such as committees in other states or groups appointed by the NCSS. This systematic analysis provides a sound basis for curricular decisions relatively free from the particular biases which an individual may bring to analytical work.

Now what about teachers and students? Many teachers, of course, are well prepared to do curriculum analyses, and they should be employed at this task under the supervision of curriculum experts. But teachers have a more vital role: conducting a classroom trial of materials before final adoption takes place.

Most textbooks published for use in American schools have never been tried in classrooms. Most texts are written by college professors who do not teach regularly in schools; in fact, many authors of texts have never taught for a full year in a school. Publishers dangle prospective royalty checks before famous professors who know little or nothing about schools or about educational theory. Some of these authors permit house editors to do much of the work on textbooks; most authors have materials for teachers, workbook exercises, and examination programs written by other people retained by the publisher. Then this work rolls off the presses without classroom trial, to be used by hundreds of thousands of children. Do you know if any of the four books approved for purchase for American history and government by the State Board of Education underwent systematic classroom trial before they were published? If they did, their publishers have not advertised the fact....

Classroom trials seem even more vital in a situation where a Board chooses books for the students of a whole state. The larger the student audience, the more costly, both in terms of poor education and wasted money, a bad choice becomes. This generalization suggests that a state curriculum committee should select a number of books only after analyzing them carefully. Then each of these books should be tried by a number of teachers and a variety of student audiences. The results of these trials should then be made public.
In my judgement, neither a Professional Textbook Committee nor a State Board of Education should have the power to prescribe certain books for purchase with state funds and to bar others. Recommend, yes; prescribe, no. Final adoption decisions should be made by local schools where school officials know the characteristics and the needs of their students. Prescription at the state level has often resulted in the use of books based on outmoded principles which fit the experiences of Board members who attended school and college 20 or 30 years ago. In other cases, students and teachers have been denied the funds they require to purchase excellent materials which suit their needs.

But there is another side to the coin. Many local school systems drift in educational backwaters far from the mainstream of educational change. They continue, year after year, to use the same textbooks and the same obsolete teaching techniques. A state educational system should try to find ways to shake them out of their lethargy without resorting to prescription. Hence the suggestion that state officials should make it possible for professional educators to provide careful assessments of materials, including the traditional materials used in backward schools. Careful assessments reveal both strengths and shortcomings. They provide vital information to decision makers about both the general quality of educational materials and the special characteristics of a set of materials which may make them pertinent to a particular educational setting. Such assessments can help innovative teachers in backward schools to persuade administrators to let them try new materials. State educational systems should also provide help from consultants who can assist local educators to make curricular decisions. The state social studies supervisors I know well are talented people who want to use their expert knowledge to help school systems make their own decisions for their own students.

Talking about who should make decisions about curricular materials has necessarily involved discussion of how those decisions should be made. Let me review, under four headings, what I have already said about the matter. First, decisions about adopting curricular materials should never be made on the basis of only one criterion. Second, decisions should be partly based on careful analysis of materials carried on by professionals in each field who employ a written Curriculum Materials Analysis System. Third, all materials should undergo classroom trial by local teachers and local students.
Finally, the members of the State Board of Education should disseminate the results of the analyses and classroom trials, but they should not prescribe materials and they should not forbid schools to purchase with state funds any materials they wish to use with their own students....

Closing, Fenton said,

I think that we have everything to gain by an open examination of the issues and principles involved in the present system of state adoption. Education can benefit from a state adoption system if it shakes backward schools out of outmoded practices. But the damage can often outweigh the potential gains. No small group of people should have the power to censure. In effect, the Georgia state board has this power, although it is not absolute. In both the 1951 case when the Board took Magruder's text from the approved list and the recent case when the books which I had written or edited were removed, the Board acted hastily and on insufficient evidence, as my remarks have indicated. Citizens, the governor, and the members of the general assembly should be told that appointed officials acted in this way.

You members of the Georgia Council for the Social Sciences took a forthright stand when you adopted a resolution at the Fall, 1972 meeting urging the repeal of all laws which restrict the diversity of instructional materials and arguing that teachers should be able to select instructional materials without censorship. Some of your members, I understand, helped to lobby through the state legislature an amendment to a 1953 law which takes away from the State Board the power to prescribe books for the required history and government courses. I admire your devotion to the cause in which all of us believe so strongly. You have provided the rest of the nation with a superb example of the way in which conscientious professional people can be a constructive force in an educational system. Our students often learn more from what their teachers do than from what they assign in textbooks. They will gain keen insights into the way citizens should function in a democratic society from your example. Now we must show students that a democratic society can free itself from the pernicious influence of special interests and correct an injustice through legislative action. I am confident that Georgia's social studies and science teachers will lead the way and will restore sound educational practices to Georgia's schools.270
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Fenton's speech was published by GCSS so that all its members would have an opportunity to reflect on Dr. Fenton's interpretation of the social studies textbook issue as well as to consider his cogent suggestions for revision of the process of textbook selection.

While Fenton's address to the GCSS was well received by many of the social studies educators across the state, some took exception to it. There were a few classroom teachers who felt insulted because Fenton did not classify the classroom teachers with other professional educators when he gave his four groups for textbook selection.

In reviewing the speech that you made at the winter conference of the Georgia Council for the Social Sciences, I am very disappointed by one remark that you made. You stated, "First, four groups of people, each with a clearly specified role, should be involved in choosing curricular materials." Two of these groups were, "appointed professional educators such as curriculum supervisors, university professors, and school administrators; classroom teachers...."

By this statement, I sincerely hope that you did not mean that classroom teachers are not professional educators....

Related Publications

Although the social studies textbook selection controversy caused quite a stir among state board members and concerned professional educators, it drew little attention outside of Atlanta, Georgia. Most of the press coverage of the issue was found in the Atlanta newspapers, the Constitution and the Journal.

---
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Other publications are limited to the work of Mary A. Hepburn and Derwyn F. McElroy. Their first publication appeared in GCSS's Fall, 1972 issue of News and Notes. Attempting to bring more attention to the controversy, Hepburn and McElroy wrote "It's Happening Here," a chronology of the related events which transpired between December 16, 1971 and July 20, 1972. Further reports were published in News and Notes (Spring, 1973 and Fall, 1973), and in The Social Studies Professional (May, 1973), by the same authors. "The Continuing Textbook Controversy In Georgia" in News and Notes (Spring, 1973) and "Are the Lights On or Off In Georgia?" in The Social Studies Professional (May, 1973), were updates on the textbook controversy.


Derwyn F. McElroy also published a review of Fenton's The Americans: A History of the United States in Social Education (December, 1971). He stated,

...The Americans is a significant improvement over what was heretofore available. It represents a valuable contribution to the field. It should stimulate a wider, more interesting, more intelligent dialogue among social studies people about the objectives, content, materials and methods of teaching slow learners. And that is no small accomplishment.272

Current Status

By 1976, when new social studies textbooks and materials were up for adoption again, only four of the State Board members were still active on the board that were serving when the Fenton textbooks were removed from the state-approved textbook list. They were Mr. Roy Hendricks, Mr. Earnest Whaley, Mr. Kenneth Kilpatrick, and Mrs. Richard Huseman. Mr. Hendricks remained the chairman of the board and Mr. Charles McDaniel became the new State Superintendent of Schools. The State Board retained its power to approve or disapprove of the recommendations made by the textbook selection committee. No recommendations for a change of policy towards the Fenton textbooks have emerged to date by the State Board of Education as of 1980.

No Fenton materials have been adopted in Georgia since the 1972 controversy. Fenton stated that he had made several trips to Georgia to "speak to social studies teachers and to try to keep the issue alive." However, he admitted that he had had no results. Fenton also wrote,

> No books that I have written, edited, or to which I have contributed can be purchased with state money in the state of Georgia. Book salesmen from other companies have used this information widely around the United States. According to some of my friends in the schools, they tell prospective customers of materials that I have written, that the materials have been banned in Georgia, that they are subversive, that they are dangerous, and that the people will use them at their peril. Holt salesmen believe that this sort of malicious gossip has had a marked impact on sales. So far as I can tell, there is nothing I can do about it. I've considered legal action

273 A letter from Dr. Edwin Fenton to Mr. A. Graham Down, Director of the Council for Basic Education, (March 30, 1976).
against Al Leake, but the costs would be prohibitive for me, and such a proceeding would absorb an enormous amount of my time which I cannot afford.\textsuperscript{274}

This letter, perhaps, best describes the fate of the controversial social studies textbooks edited by Edwin Fenton. The textbooks were banned from the state-approved textbook list and are still victims of what was considered by many social studies educators to be the work of an ultra-conservative pressure group. Fenton conceded that he could not afford the time and expense of legal action against Al Leake. His publishers have, regretfully, accepted the State Board's decision and are no longer printing the textbooks for sales in Georgia.

The members of the Georgia Council for the Social Sciences and other professional educators remember the controversy over Fenton's textbooks, however, there is little interest in reviving the issue. Since many of the social studies textbooks now being used include much of the inquiry approach as did Fenton's works, many of the social studies educators consider the issue closed. Meanwhile, the Georgia State Board of Education has taken steps to solidify its position in similar matters for the future. While revising its policy 30-1600, Instructional Media and Equipment,\textsuperscript{275} the State Board adopted measures under policy 30-1614 in March, 1976, which clearly defined textbooks, restructured the textbook selection committee and called it the Textbook Advisory Committee, defined its duties, and set up guidelines for appeals from interested citizens, such as Al Leake, parents, or publishers.

\textsuperscript{274}ibid.
\textsuperscript{275}See Appendix C. Instructional Media and Equipment.
The lights are off on the Fenton materials in Georgia but the fight for academic freedom continues to be an issue there. Recently, the state legislature was again called upon to intervene and rule on the teaching of evolution in the Georgia schools.

Parent's Role

A major concern in the social studies textbook controversy in Georgia was the matter of textbook selection. Who should be responsible for selecting the textbooks for classroom use in Georgia? While the Georgia social science educators were protesting the Board's actions to protect the competence of professional educators in being able to wisely choose appropriate textbooks and preserve academic freedom, the State Board was concerned with protecting its power to make the final decisions on matters of textbook selection and other educational concerns in the state. Oddly, the role of parents in selecting textbooks had been ignored.

Throughout the debates over the suitability of the Fenton materials for Georgia classrooms, there was no evidence reported of any parental concern over the issue. However, the news releases on the issue across the state was so low key that parents paid little attention to it. There was no effort to enlist parental support on either side of the issue. Customarily, it had been general practice in Georgia for the parents to leave such matters as these to the State Board of Education or their local school administrators and the teachers. Parents usually would see the textbooks only after they had been purchased for use.
Obviously, parents had nothing to do with the ban on the Fenton materials in Georgia. However, in 1976 the State Board, realizing the need for parental input, revised its policy on textbook selection so as to include lay members on its Textbook Selection Committee. The lay members would provide parental input into the selection of textbooks in the state of Georgia. Also, parents would have the opportunity to review the textbooks before they are purchased.

Today, parents are actively engaged in curriculum planning and textbook selection in many school systems across the state. The probability of disruptive protests are minimized when the school programs are endorsed by the parents. In Houston County, Georgia, for example, a committee of parents and educators are working together to produce a sex education program for their school system.

**Summary**

In June, 1972 the State Board of Education took further action on the selection of social studies textbooks which spurred more protests. At its regular meeting the State Board passed resolutions which would limit the public school systems to only four textbooks for United States history and American government. Protests over this action were led by the Georgia Association of School Superintendents and the State Associations of the Elementary and Secondary School Principals. Objecting on the grounds of excessive high cost, they were able to force the State Board, temporarily, to postpone its new ruling for one year. The postponing action took place during the State Board's regular meeting in July, 1972.
During the Fall of 1972, the Georgia Council for the Social Sciences adopted a resolution which urged the removal of all laws which restricted the diversity of instructional materials or their professional selection. The Georgia General Assembly enacted Senate Bill 254 which deleted the requirement that the State Board of Education approve and recommend textbooks to be used in the required course in American history and government and eliminated the grade level at which the course was to be taught other than during the high school years. However, because the wording of the bill was not clear, board member Kenneth Kilpatrick asked Georgia's Attorney General to clarify the legislation. The Attorney General ruled that the State Board of Education retained the power to approve recommendations of the Professional Textbook Committee which evaluates instructional material.

The Fenton materials remained off the state-approved textbook list as the publishers gave up and Fenton was unable to afford the time and money to keep up the fight. Most Georgia social studies educators remember the controversy, but there is little evidence of interest in recent years.

The State Board, meanwhile, has made some changes in policy to regulate textbook selection and include lay people in the selection process. The new policy also set guidelines for appeals from publishers, parents, or interested citizens.

Although Comparative Political Systems is still in use in one school system in Georgia, most of the Fenton materials are out of print due to low sales. Jim Summers, regional sales manager for Holt, Rinehart and
Winston, stated that the Georgia controversy had affected sales in other states also. Only three of the social studies textbooks had been revised by 1975. The three textbooks were submitted to the 1976 Textbook Selection Committee for possible recommendations and approval. None were adopted, however.

There was no evidence reported of parental involvement in the Fenton textbook controversy. However, low key news releases and the customary practice of leaving such matters to school officials may account for their non-participation on the issue. In 1976 the State Board made provisions for parents to participate in the textbook selection process as lay members of the Professional Textbook Selection Committee. Today, parents are actively engaged in curriculum planning as well as textbook selection.
Conclusion and Recommendations

Although the movements for social reform and the Vietnam War dominated the trend of thought during the 1960s and early 1970s, the liberal legislation which was passed did little to change the conservative position. In Georgia, social change was tolerated but it was not fully accepted. The liberal influence was not substantial enough to get the social studies textbooks by Edwin Fenton accepted on the Georgia state approved textbook list, even by 1976.

The Holt Social Studies Curriculum and The Americans were social studies textbooks edited by Edwin Fenton, John M. Good, and others at the Carnegie-Mellon Center for Project Social Studies. These textbooks were an effort by Fenton and his associates to meet the demands for change in social studies curriculum and related instructional materials. Being produced during an era of social change, revolts, and an unpopular war, the textbooks reflected on controversial issues of that era which eventually led to restrictions on their purchase in Georgia. These restrictions, however, raised issues which made this study possible.

While there was some concern over the fate of the Fenton social studies textbooks, the major issues dealt with textbook selection policy and the academic freedom of social studies educators in Georgia. The writer does not believe the social studies textbooks edited by Fenton, Good, and others would have created a controversy if the Professional Textbook Selection Committee had not approved them in the first place. But since these textbooks were approved by the Professional Textbook Selection Committee, some social studies educators took offense when
the State Board of Education rejected the textbooks. Arguing for academic freedom, some educators accused the State Board of book banning. The State Board, while rejecting the notion that they had banned any books, exercised its power to approve or reject the recommendations of the Professional Textbook Committee. The debates which followed left open the question "Who should select the textbooks for the classroom?"

Ironically, the parents, one of the most important groups to be associated with textbook selection, were not involved in the issue. The factors which accounted for the parents not participating in the controversy included the lack of policy at the state level involving parents in textbook selection, the limited coverage by the news media, and failure by the parties involved to recruit parental support.

In 1972, there were no provisions for lay members to serve on the Professional Textbook Selection Committee, although some parents could have served on local sub-committees headed by one of the members of the state committee. In 1976, lay members were added to the state's Professional Textbook Selection Committee. Since 1976 the lay members have increased from five to ten, with at least one from each district. The writer believes the increase in lay members was a healthy move for the textbook selection process.

The limited coverage by the news media kept the issue from causing growing concern among parents. All of the media coverage on this controversy was in the newspapers. However, outside of Atlanta the reports were usually under small headings and drew very little attention.
Neither the State Board nor the Fenton supporters sought to recruit the parents or other groups such as the Parent-Teacher Association for support. The pressures applied on the State Board were done primarily by educators through the State's Legislative Assembly. However, their efforts were to try to wrest the power of textbook selection away from the State Board of Education in favor of the classroom teachers. The State Board was primarily concerned with maintaining and executing its authority over such matters. Parents were not involved in the protests and both groups seemed to want to keep it that way. Since the Georgia Basic Education Council did not represent a parent protest, they drew little attention from the general public.

After the events described in chapter six of this study had taken place, several measures were enacted by the State Board to prevent similar problems in the future. Guidelines were drawn by which complaints could be filed. Each congressional district in the state has two representatives on the state's Textbook Selection Committee. Sub-committees are formed locally and public notices are put in the local newspapers informing parents about the new textbooks and the place where they can review them. This practice allows concerned parents the opportunity to actually see and approve or disapprove of the textbooks before they are purchased by their local school districts. For further improvement in the textbook selection procedures, the writer recommends that the lay members on the Textbook Selection Committee be extended the power to vote on the textbooks being chosen.

Although the social studies textbooks edited by Fenton, Good, and others were never approved by the State Board of Education in
Georgia, many other social studies textbooks which employ the same approaches as the Fenton series are now being used in Georgia. According to J. H. Summers, three of the social studies textbooks by Fenton and others are still available. The titles include *Comparative Political Systems* (revised in 1974), *Comparative Economic Systems* (revised in 1974), and *The Americans: A History of the United States* (revised in 1975). All of the above titles were submitted for adoption in Georgia in 1976, however, none of the titles were adopted. There has been no revisions of the Fenton materials printed since 1975. However, inquiry today is encouraged in Georgia. It seems that Fenton's textbooks were much like a new invention. At first there were no takers and later everyone has one.

The steps taken by the Georgia State Board of Education will minimize the possibility of conflicts over textbooks to be used in the Georgia classrooms although it will not eliminate censorship. Meanwhile, the option remains open for those school systems not satisfied with the state approved textbook list to purchase their choices with local funds. The writer realizes there is no clear cut answer to the problems of censorship but does support Georgia's revised form of the textbook selection process.

The writer believes the controversy reported in this study uncovered in inconsistency between the social science educators in Georgia and the State Board of Education on the goals of the state's social studies curriculum. While the State Board of Education emphasized "molding the minds of the students" to think in a pre-determined manner about this country, the social studies educators supported a
more open-ended approach which would allow the students more freedom to analyze the facts and develop their own appreciations. This is a serious problem which needs to be corrected. The writer believes a free society needs a well-educated and informed citizenry. This is possible using the social studies educators approach to teaching the social studies.

The writer believes the State Board's approach is best suited in a totalitarian state where the emphasis is on discipline rather than freedom. Therefore, the writer recommends that the social studies educators develop a clear set of objectives for the social studies curriculum and present them to the State Board of Education for approval. These objectives should be made available to the general public for scrutiny before they become the set goals for the state.

Further, the State Board of Education should keep the lines of communication open with the educators of the state. No pressure group or individual should be able to influence the State Board into making any curriculum changes or decisions without having consultation with the educators of the discipline involved. The writer believes that dogmatic decisions by the State Board will only lead to more confrontations like the Fenton controversy. The powers vested in the State Board of Education should be exercised, but prudently.

Finally, the writer recommends further study of the uniformity of Georgia's goals in education across the state, especially the social studies goals. Recently, the state has adopted a series of criterion-referenced tests which are administered all over the state. A uniform testing system should dictate a uniform set of objectives.
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STATEMENT BY MR. KENNETH KILPATRICK
(EXCERPTS FROM THE OFFICIAL MINUTES)

STATEMENT BY MR. KENNETH KILPATRICK
AT THE GEORGIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
JANUARY 20, 1972

Mr. Chairman:

I request that the following be inserted in the record concerning the adoption of the HOLT SOCIAL STUDIES SERIES and 32 PROBLEMS IN WORLD HISTORY and the inclusion of these publications on the lists from which local school systems may choose textbooks and expend state funds for the purchase of textbooks.

I regret the length of this statement but the problem is complex and does not lend itself to short, easy answers.

The idea that textbook selection is a function of the Textbook Selection Committee and not the State Board of Education has somehow crept into the overall problem. Sections 32-707, 32-708, and 32-709 make it perfectly clear that the State Board of Education is directed by law to select the textbooks to be purchased with state tax funds. The Textbook Selection Committee is a valuable aid but it has no more authority than that, to simply aid the State Board. Since the State Board appoints the Committee it would follow that the committee's authority does not exceed that of the Board. All of this to simply say: When a State Board member considers the question of approval of textbooks, he cannot, by state law, substitute the judgment of the Committee for his own judgment because the law does not allow the Board to delegate textbook selection to anyone.

The idea that any departure from the Textbook Committee's list on the part of the State Board constitutes some sort of censorship and places those who support departure in the category of "book burners" has been fostered by some. This argument, of course, has emotional appeal and is somewhat intimidating; however, I refuse to be intimidated and any reasonable person who is interested in facts cannot possibly be impressed with such babbling.

A third idea that some have advanced is that certain members of this Board are dominated by some person or some organization and that our actions are influenced in a sinister way. As for me, this statement is simply not true and there is not a scintilla of evidence to support such an irresponsible assertion.

It is quite tragic that all I have said to this point is not really relevant to my objections to the use of some books as textbooks in the public schools. The only reason it is necessary is that the reaction
of the supporters of these publications has been so violent and their attacks so personal that defense is a necessity to clear the record.

I want to emphasize that I do not object to all of the works included in the subject under discussion. For the record, I think that if one were going to choose 32 PROBLEMS IN WORLD HISTORY for high school students to study, one would not normally choose some of these selected by Dr. Fenton. It seems that, as an example, the events leading up to the adoption and implementation of the "Marshal Plan" might be included and one of the lesser events left out. However, I realize that an American cannot think and study the "Marshal Plan" without feeling pride in being an American and realizing that the plan was one of the most humanitarian acts ever committed by man and that American dollars and know-how made it possible. Such thinking, some say, is not relevant to society today. Hogwash!

As a State Board member I can proudly tolerate the text mentioned above and most of the others. In fact, I find some of the publications in the SOCIAL STUDIES SERIES to contain excellent material and I am sure they are good teaching tools. The inquiry method may be very good in some circumstances and when used by a teacher with the right training and qualifications in a class capable of a considerable degree of reasoning it could result in real intellectual stimulation.

My main objection is to the use of the book, THE AMERICANS. I do support and defend the right of the author to write the book and the right of the publisher to publish the book. But neither the author nor the publisher has the right to expect the State of Georgia to purchase the book. The right to purchase or not belongs to the State Board of Education. The State Board should be able to exercise this right without accusation or condemnation; however, since even the author himself has chosen the alternate route, I have no choice except to meet his challenge and make my objections public. The things I am about to say concern the book, THE AMERICANS, and no other.

We need to give our young people a strong, positive philosophy. The reasons for this are obvious. This book promulgates and teaches a "nothing philosophy" about life, home, family and country. This book totally defeats the stated aims of the inquiry approach. The book does not present several differing viewpoints for discussion; it merely exposes the social philosophy of the author. Those who support the use of this book should never again comment on or complain about the lack of commitment to proven values on the part of our young. You have helped destroy them. The title itself is the first lie. It is no more a history book than is the METROPOLITAN SOUTH SUPPLEMENTAL TELEPHONE DIRECTORY. No definition of history ever conceived by the mind of man can be stretched to include this hodge-podge of imagination. How much of this book is admitted to be fiction by the author? Whatever history is, it is certainly not fiction. When we start to tell the history of this country, for goodness sake, let's be honest and tell the good and the bad, but let's do tell facts. I hope we can help you to find books to help you reach the "less motivated students and...students with limited academic backgrounds." Of all the complicated texts that I have ever
seen, I believe THE AMERICANS takes the cake. Pictures a simple textbook do not make. What is not said can be more important than what is said. Frankly, I don't wonder anymore (I did up until a few months ago) why young people by the thousands are reaching chronological maturity with so little else on their minds but protest and change and no more idea than the man in the moon what sacrifice has been made time and time again to make protest and change even possible.

Is the suffering of Valley Forge correctly portrayed on pages 75, 76 and 77? What idea do you really think is advanced by this little skit? Where in this book can one learn of the wartime agony of Abraham Lincoln? Are we so sophisticated that this is no longer relevant? Can't we present the glory (and the infamy) of our past without a blush or an apology? Since when are the protests we are witnessing today comparable to the protest we call the American Revolution? Any person who thinks there is a valid comparison knows little, if anything, about the background and the events leading up to the American Revolution and is pretty naive about organizations such as the SDS. Is there anything good and right about the United States? There certainly is and it ought to be taught! Where can it be found in this book? Throughout the book there are suggestions and references to "protest and change" and then the author devotes thirty consecutive pages to the subject. Why do you think he does this? Is Dick Gregory as important an historical figure in this country as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, James Monroe, Andrew Johnson, Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Jackie Robinson, Harry Truman, Whitney Young, Thurgood Marshall, John Glenn, Neil Armstrong and Dwight Eisenhower? Do you realize that Mr. Gregory gets more emphasis than the above named, some of whom were not even named. Isn't there something about these people that can be presented in an interesting way to those you have who are less motivated and have deficient academic backgrounds? Shouldn't they know? Don't they have a right to their heritage? Or do we want them to be deliberately led away from the past and the truth? My God, wasn't Abraham Lincoln assassinated and wasn't that a dastardly deed committed by a half-crazed zealot of the lunatic fringe of the society of a hundred years ago? Isn't it relevant to today? Doesn't his death and the circumstances surrounding it deserve mention and condemnation? Is there any connection between the Valley Forge skit on page 372, the "Why Fight for America?" skit on page 444, the Viet-Nam protest on pages 460-461 and the letters from Viet-Nam on page 487? Is respect for authority taught on pages 61, 447 and 458? Do you see any connection between the upheavals our colleges and universities have experienced and the part of the book entitled "Who's Running the Universities?" on page 437? That little gem is conveniently followed by another entitled "Anything to Change Your School?" Is this the teaching of history, relevant or irrelevant, antiquated or modern?

The approval of THE AMERICANS as a textbook for use in the public school system damages the cause of public education and strengthens private education at a time when public education can least afford erosion.
If parents in Georgia could make a choice they would never choose THE AMERICANS as an influence to shape the minds of their young, and good education does shape minds. If it doesn't, then there is no telling what shape a mind will assume. We cannot ignore the wishes of the people who pay the bills for public education.

/s/ Kenneth Kilpatrick
Kenneth Kilpatrick
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THE HOLT SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM
THE HOLT SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

Comparative Political Systems
Comparative Economic Systems
The Shaping of Western Society
Tradition and Change In Four Societies
A New History of the United States
Introduction to the Behavioral Sciences
Humanities In Three Cities

Ninth Grade
Ninth Grade
Tenth Grade
Tenth Grade
Eleventh Grade
Twelfth Grade
Twelfth Grade
APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA AND EQUIPMENT POLICY
30-1611 Allotment of Funds

The State of Georgia, State Board of Education shall allot funds for instructional media to a local unit of administration based on the number of instructional units allotted to a local unit under provisions of Georgia Codes 32-605a, 32-610a and 32-612a and the amount of funds appropriated by the Georgia General Assembly.

The State Board shall distribute funds for instructional equipment to local units of administration on the basis of average daily attendance and the amount of funds appropriated by the Georgia General Assembly.

30-1612 Local School Board Policies

Each local system is required to develop policies related to the use of these funds for the purpose of insuring that expenditures for instructional media and equipment contribute to the attainment of student goals identified for the system. Included in these policies should be the basis for determining the amount to be spent on textbooks and the amount to be spent on nontextual media. For instructional equipment priority shall be given to that which would benefit students with special needs. Written procedures must be developed for implementing the policies. The procedures must include a decision making process that is based on projected teaching strategies and learning activities.

30-1613 Nontextual Media

Nontextual media shall include library books, films, recordings, paperback books, filmstrips, workbooks, video and audio tapes, newspapers, magazines, as well as other consumable and nonconsumable supplies and materials.

The local board of education shall be responsible for determining the nontextual media to be purchased, maintained and repaired under this policy.
The State Board shall maintain a free textbook program for the purpose of providing funds to local school systems for the purchase of textbooks, in order that local school systems may achieve the goals and objectives of their instructional programs. Textbooks are defined as that body of basic material essential to instruction in a given discipline. This definition includes, but is not limited to, hardbound books, softbound books and basic instructional multi-media programs.

The State Board shall select a Textbook Advisory Committee to examine textbooks and make recommendations thereon to the State Board. Such committee shall consist of one professional educator appointed by each member of the State Board to represent his or her congressional district; two professional educators appointed by the State Board, upon the State Superintendent's recommendation, to serve at large; and five lay people, appointed by members of the State Board, who shall participate in committee discussions, but shall not have voting privileges. Appointments shall be made at the March meeting of the State Board.

The newly appointed Textbook Advisory Committee shall meet in May for the purpose of organizing itself and providing publishers an opportunity to present materials and inform the Committee of the use and value of materials submitted for consideration.

The Textbook Advisory Committee shall assemble in Atlanta prior to the October meeting of the State Board to prepare the list of titles to be recommended to the State Board for adoption. Each publisher shall be given an opportunity to answer any questions which may have arisen relative to the materials previously submitted. Also at this meeting interested citizens of Georgia shall be given an opportunity to present their views on any books under consideration.

The Textbook Advisory Committee shall present to the State Board at the regular October meeting of the Board a list of titles recommended for adoption as basic textbooks to be purchased with state funds. The State Board may accept or reject, in whole or in part, recommendations of the Textbook Advisory Committee.

Appeals from publishers or interested citizens shall be made in writing to the State Superintendent of Schools. The State Superintendent of Schools shall submit an appeal to the textbook committee of the State Board. The textbook committee of the State Board shall either:

1. Determine that the evidence is not sufficient to support the appeal and resolve the issue by making a recommendation to the State Board to dispose of the appeal;
2. Determine that the appeal is valid, and submit the appeal to the Textbook Advisory Committee which shall evaluate the appeal and submit written recommendations to the textbook committee of the State Board in an effort to properly resolve the appeal.

No member of the Textbook Advisory Committee shall receive any gift, reward, present or emolument from any author, publisher, producer or distributor of instructional materials (with the exception of copies of the materials themselves) nor shall any member accept employment with any author, producer, publisher or distributor of instructional materials while serving on the Committee.

The State Superintendent of Schools shall prepare and submit to the State Board an annual report that documents the activities of free textbook program and makes recommendations for future action.

30-1615 Instructional Equipment

Funds allotted under Georgia Code 32-614a shall be used for the purchase, maintenance, repair and replacement of equipment for instructional laboratories and for special education classrooms.

In using these funds local systems shall adhere to the criteria in the document Property Accounting for Local and State School Systems (Handbook III).

Funds under this program are intended for use in the instructional program. They must not be used in support of interscholastic or athletic activities. Purchases must not be eligible for purchase under other state programs which provide funds to local systems for instructional purposes.
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TEACHING THE HISTORIAN’S METHOD OF INQUIRY - INTERPRETATION

In many secondary schools, history is taught as a chronicle of past events which students are expected to memorize. In some schools, history becomes those events which are described in the textbook chosen for the course. Class recitations check upon the thoroughness with which students have mastered the details in the book, and objective examinations with questions of the true-and-false or fill-in variety provide a further evaluation. These procedures do not describe history as historians themselves know the subject.

History is really a way of reading and writing about events in the past. Since only a tiny proportion of all the events which have happened were recorded and saved for posterity, history cannot be an accurate record of everything in the past. Moreover, no historian in a single lifetime could read all the exact material on a topic as complicated, for example, as the Protestant Reformation. Hence, history is not even an accurate record of all the information remaining about the past. In addition, the historian doing research about the past selects from the mass of material which he reads those pieces of information which seem to him significant. What seems significant is conditioned by a man's conception of the nature of causation and by his personal characteristics and experiences. The very act of selecting evidence implies interpretation. There is no "Truth" in history; there is only interpretation.

This argument leads to the conclusion that we must teach methods of interpretation if we claim to teach history. Students must learn the rules by which historians collect evidence and then use the evidence to interpret the past if they are to read or write history intelligently. They must be able to judge whether an author's conclusions are supported by the evidence he presents. They must also learn to come to conclusions of their own and to present the evidence on which these conclusions are based. Unless students are taught to interpret, they are not taught history at all.

For a more detailed study of the teaching of History, you will find chapter 27 of Ed Fenton's new book, Teaching the New Social Studies, most helpful. This book is available either in your school library or the Professional Library.
A DIALOGUE ABOUT INDUCTIVE TEACHING

1. What is the essence of inductive teaching?

In inductive teaching students are given data, then helped to draw conclusions from it.

2. Why teach inductively?

It is not enough to learn fact after fact and to pile generalization upon generalization. Facts learned outside a structure are soon forgotten. Moreover, traditional textbooks trap a student in the author's frame of reference and provide little opportunity for the student to modify his own mindset; that is, the viewpoint conditioned by his culture. In order to become an independent thinker, a student must learn the mode of inquiry of history and the social sciences.

3. How does inductive teaching benefit the student?

Unless a student learns to work with raw data under the guidance of an expert teacher, he has no model for disciplined thought outside the classroom that will enable him to develop a frame of reference that meets the challenges of a complex world. He can build such a model, however, if most of his classes are taught inductively.

4. Does inductive teaching stimulate independent thinking?

Yes. The teacher encourages his students to figure out for themselves the answers to important questions in history and the social sciences. The students are allowed to develop hypotheses and to search for supporting evidence just as professional scholars do. Moreover, inductive teaching encourages each student to formulate his own structure for understanding human experience rather than to memorize a body of information set forth in a textbook.

5. What is the role of the teacher?

Inductive teaching requires the teacher to be a questioner and guide rather than an expounder and taskmaster. It asks the teacher to refrain from giving answers to questions that concern historians and social scientists. In fact, it asks that the teacher say relatively little. Rather, it requires him to pose questions that will lead students to another step in the process of inquiry, and to spend most of his time listening to their answers and formulating additional questions. The teacher's major task is to get students to maintain a continual search for probing questions as well as for answers. Eventually this process should lead them to discover the structure of the discipline inherent in the mode of inquiry and the major generalizations which have been validated.
6. What are some of the classroom techniques which may be used to teach inductively?

Socratic discussions, open-ended discussions, filmstrips, movies, presentations on the overhead projector, tape recordings, and slide shows can all be employed. Even a lecture can be used inductively; a closely reasoned argument presented in lecture form can serve as a model of how a historian works. Appropriate questions on an examination about the method of validation used in a lecture can make pure exposition an inductive learning process.

7. How can inductive teaching affect citizenship education?

Inductive teaching encourages the student to discover answers from the data or leads him to pose other relevant questions. Thus, it thrusts him into the same situation he will encounter when he reads information in newspapers or listens to it on the radio. And if he learns to apply his training, he will be prepared for his future role as a critical thinker and an intelligent citizen.

ASKING QUESTIONS

No art is more difficult to master than the art of the appropriate question. The majority of questions asked in social studies classes are sterile. "Who discovered America?" cannot get a student anywhere. Fact questions such as this one only demand recall of information memorized from a textbook reading. They cannot build a method of inquiry which will equip a student to investigate another problem in history nor can they reveal an important generalization.

Asking questions is an art, but like all arts, cannot be learned through a series of rules. Knowing the rules does help; it is a necessary but not a sufficient condition. Only self-confidence and knowledge of subject and method can equip a teacher to ask appropriate questions consistently.

A teacher needs self-confidence enough to leave his lesson plan in order to follow a line of inquiry which a student has initiated. An answer to one question should provoke another question and another answer in turn. Unless a teacher feels sure that he has control of the work for the day, he may confine himself so closely to a prearranged lesson plan that he will fail to recognize the opportunity for a provocative question inherent in a student's answer.

A teacher must know subject in order to develop a line of questioning which leads to a useful generalization. Good classes are often organized around only one big issue: What did economic and political changes contribute to the development of the Renaissance, or What did the Muckrakers contribute to the Progressive movement? A teacher who is not familiar with interpretations of the Renaissance or of Progressivism will not be able to lead students through a series of questions to
the major variables involved in answering these questions.

A teacher must know the method of the historian for similar reasons. Will a hypothesis be ventured to explain this development? What evidence should be looked for to validate or to modify this hypothesis? Where might evidence like this be found? All these questions help to teach a method of inquiry and to focus the attention of student in the class on worthwhile questions.

Dr. Fenton, in his book on the inductive approach gives nine questions that historians ask. Students need to become familiar with these questions since they show part of the method of the historian and are the type of questions that students themselves need to ask during their formal study of history. These questions that place emphasis on the interpretation of facts are as follows:

1. What was the immediate cause for the event?
2. Had these been a background of agitation for the principles victorious during this episode?
3. Were personalities involved on either side whose strengths or weaknesses may have helped to determine the outcome of the struggle?
4. Were any new and potent ideas stimulating the loyalty of a considerable number of people?
5. How did the economic groups line up on the issue?
6. Were religious forces active?
7. Did any new technological developments influence the situation?
8. Can the events be partially explained by weakened or strengthened institutions?
9. Was the physical environment itself a factor in the situation?

This material was prepared by Dr. Edwin Fenton of Carnegie Tech in connection with a study in Historical Instruction in the public schools of Pittsburg. A more detail reporting of his program is given in chapters 16 and 17 of this book, Teaching the New Social Studies. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 393 Madison Ave., New York 10017.

The study of people is very important to a study of history, but in studying a person, teachers need to take students beyond the old method of "childhood-education-romance" and need to ask questions which cause reflective thinking and interpretation. The thirtieth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies entitled Citizenship and a Free Society lists the following questions as being good ones for the study of a person.

1. What were the major contributions of this person and why were they important?
2. Did the person promote or retard change and in what way?
3. Who were some of his associates and some of his opponents and what were his relationships to them?
4. What special qualities did he possess for leadership?
5. To what extent do you believe he stood for wise and enduring ideas?
6. What were the consequences of the decisions that he made?
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CORRESPONDENCE
Mr. John L. Rhodes

Dear Mr. Rhodes:

I am writing in response to your recent letter to me in which you asked that I share with you my reasons for not voting on the Fenton textbook controversy in May of 1972.

As Chairman of the State Board of Education, it has been my practice to never vote except to make or break a tie. Had I voted on this motion, a tie would have been created, thus defeating the motion. By my not voting, the motion carried, deleting the Fenton textbooks from the State-approved listing.

I hope I have answered the questions you raised.

Sincerely,

, Chairman
State Board of Education
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A STUDY OF THE GEORGIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION'S BAN ON SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

by

John Lewis Rhodes

(ABSTRACT)

The Holt Social Studies Curriculum and The Americans were social studies textbooks edited by Edwin Fenton, John M. Good, and others at the Carnegie-Mellon Center for Project Social Studies. These textbooks were an effort by Fenton and his associates to meet the demands for change in social studies curriculum and related instructional materials. Being produced during an era of social change, revolts, and an unpopular war, the textbooks reflected on controversial issues of that era which eventually led to restrictions on their purchase in Georgia. These restrictions, however, raised issues which made this study possible.

The Georgia State Board of Education in 1972 rejected the recommendations of its Professional Textbook Selection Committee to include the social studies textbooks edited, authored, or contributed to by Edwin Fenton on the state's approved textbook list. Only the textbooks on the state's approved list could be purchased with state funds. This study is an investigation of the Georgia State Board of Education's ban on the social studies textbooks from the state's approved textbook list and the subsequent effects of the State Board's action on future textbook selection policies in the state.

This was the first time in twenty years that members of the Georgia State Board of Education had acted to remove approved textbooks
from the Georgia public schools. This study is also significant because the State Board's wording of its action leaves the impression that they were opposed to the author, regardless of his works. This study describes a step by step account of the events which eventually led to the ban on the textbooks. It also describes the subsequent events which led to a change in the state's textbook selection policies. While parents did not participate in the controversy, policy changes made their participation more likely for textbook controversies in the future.

Although the Fenton social studies textbooks were not adopted by the State Board, the approaches used in them are widely used in other social studies textbooks in Georgia today. For future textbook controversies in Georgia, the writer recommends that the lay representatives on the State's Textbook Selection Committee be given voting power.

The writer believes the controversy reported in this study uncovered an inconsistency between the social science educators in Georgia and the State Board of Education on the goals of the state's social studies curriculum. Therefore, the writer recommends that the social studies educators develop a clear set of objectives for the social studies curriculum and present them to the State Board of Education for approval. These objectives should be made available to the general public for scrutiny before they become the set goals for the state. Further, the State Board of Education should keep the lines of communication open with the educators of the state.

Finally, the writer recommends further study of the uniformity of Georgia's goals in education across the state, especially the social
studies goals. Recently, the state has adopted a series of criterion-referenced tests which are administered all over the state. A uniform testing system should dictate a uniform set of objectives.