

The Amherst Project and Reform of History Education, 1959-1972

William Weber

California State University, Long Beach

MOST ACADEMIC FIELDS are not deeply involved in the history of their discipline, since that subject may not seem related to the issues or methods under discussion at any one time. Ironically, that is the termination in history education today, where the future is of special concern after the ending of the Teaching American History program and other efforts. Members of the older generation nonetheless look back to creative activity in the late 1980s and 1990s, when collaborative projects arose among history teachers in schools and colleges—most notably, the National Standards for History in the Schools, the Society for History Education, the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, and the California History/Social Science Project. But it can be productive to look back even further. When, and in what contexts, did programs arise focused on primary sources and classroom discussion, such as is central to history teaching today? How did the social and political situation of the 1960s stimulate such innovation in educational practice?

During the 1960s, there occurred an unprecedented kind of such collaboration within the work of the Amherst Project. The Amherst Project involved the publication of seventy pamphlets of primary

sources for eleventh grade U.S. history, along with training for how to lead discussion of such materials. Bruce A. VanSledright has called the project “the most notable attempt to reformulate how the subject was taught and learned” in his book, *The Challenge of Rethinking History Education: On Practices, Theories, and Policy* (2011). This article will analyze where the Amherst Project stood within the evolution of educational thinking since the early twentieth century and then show in detail how its activities developed from its inception in 1959 to publication of the last pamphlet in 1972. The papers of the Amherst Project, held in the archive of Teachers College, Columbia University, have provided a detailed picture of how the workshops were conducted and how teachers used primary sources in class.¹ I was acquainted with members of the leadership group during the 1970s and have conducted interviews with several of them.²

The Amherst Project began among a group of instructors from Amherst High School and Amherst College who socialized regularly at the Lord Jeffrey Amherst Inn. A topic kept coming back in their discussions: why do students dislike history more than any other subject? That can, of course, be heard in our time as well—don’t students often say that they’d prefer to read novels or tinker with chemical materials? Leaders of the discussion group took it upon themselves to call a public meeting to confront the problem, during which a teacher from the high school insisted that students connect with history best through vivid primary sources.³ A committee was then formed and funds from a private foundation obtained to hold a series of six-week summer workshops to gather sources systematically in the Amherst College Library. The first pamphlets came out in 1963; running from forty to eighty pages long, they were published by D. C. Heath under the title of the Amherst Project. The central leader was Richard Brown, who taught at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, but refocused his career upon the project and moved it to the Newberry Library in Chicago in 1963. From the start, it was obvious that most teachers were unsure how to use such lessons and needed extensive professional development if they were to use sources effectively. Remarkably enough, the program obtained three-quarters of a million dollars in grants from the U.S. Department of Education to hold week-long sessions to help teachers employ primary sources through open-ended discussion.

Previous Efforts for Reforming History Teaching

The intellectual goals of the Amherst Project can to some extent be traced back to the reports made to the American Historical Association by the Committee of Ten (1892), the Committee of Seven (1899), and the Commission for the Social Studies (1932). As was suggested by Robert Orrill and Linn Shapiro (herself a high-school teacher), the Committee of Seven came to grips with “the absence of an established template for history education” whose “intellectual power” would help the subject become a discipline in its own right.⁴ An effort to move the teaching of history beyond traditional recitation and the memorization of passages from textbooks led the Committee of Seven to condemn what was called “the old rote system.” Albert Bushnell Hart, Professor of History at Columbia University and a member of the committee, published a book of source readings in 1899.⁵ Such a tool became popular in the early 1910s, as Chara Haeussler Bohan and O. L. Davis, Jr., have shown, led by Fred Morrow Fling in *The History Teacher's Magazine*.⁶

Still, several among the Committee of Seven opposed abandoning recitation, and their report said little about teaching methods as a whole. Their key responsibility at the time was to defend the place of history within school curricula generally, against the rising movement for social studies.⁷ As Robert Townsend showed in his history of the American Historical Association, it is easy to idealize what the reports proposed and to exaggerate how much impact they had on what was done in the classroom.⁸ Even though the report of 1896 suggested that source materials might be used as “illustrative matter,” it cast doubt on the ability of students to “handle original material.”⁹ *The History Teacher's Magazine*, put out under the auspices of the American Historical Association (AHA) from 1909 to 1918, published comments critical of pronouncements by the national committee and its later successors. Indeed, in 1913, a professor from the University of California, Berkeley admitted that only a few “ambitious high schools” were using “collateral readings,” the term used to denote sources and other materials not found in textbooks.¹⁰ Teaching with primary sources declined in the 1920s. Indeed, the 1932 Commission on Social Studies, led by the AHA with figures from the social studies, ended up being regarded a failure, bringing deep disillusionment with what national commissions generally might accomplish.

The Context of the New Project

Activists for history education in the 1960s went into a quite different direction to reform history teaching. These leaders began at the grassroots level to build local partnerships between schools and colleges or universities, through which to build intellectually challenging ways of teaching history, methods they called “inquiry” or “discovery.” The focus on local activity came from a pragmatism born of the disillusionment with the national commissions for reforming education. This approach confirms the argument made by Larry Cuban and David Tyack that, historically, student-centered instruction has worked best when aspects of old and new methods were bound together, hybridized, in ways that fit the needs of particular kinds of schools and teaching methods. In so doing, Cuban and Tyack challenged the widely held assumption among historians of education that American reform movements consistently failed to change traditional goals or practices.¹¹ They demonstrated that success in experimental methods tended to come when projects limited and focused their goals and methods. Even though the movement for inquiry teaching was set back by the collapse of educational funding around 1972, support for such methods survived on the local level and in some national organizations, enabling the rebirth of reform activities in the mid-1980s. From that time, there emerged a literature on teaching that linked pedagogical and historical thinking and gave an intellectual unity to teaching methods by the turn of the twenty-first century.¹²

How did all this relate with Progressive education? Teaching history through primary sources today can be seen to have a long-term intellectual origin in what was projected in that movement in the 1920s even though few such programs survived. The main link between the Amherst Project and that movement was the principle of *child-centered* teaching. In the 1920s, the notion became popular that students should become “their own historians.” Harold Rugg, the leading progressive educator involved with history education, called for a school to favor *child initiative* more than *teacher initiative*, and his social studies textbooks presaged inquiry teaching by recommending *open-forum discussion* on major questions. For that matter, the leading historian Carl Becker gave his address as President of the AHA in 1931 as “Everyman His Own Historian.”¹³

Still, Rugg did not elaborate such strategies in detail, and the only primary sources he dealt with significantly were political cartoons.¹⁴ Many progressive educators instead emphasized student creativity and the arts much more than history or the social studies. The main tendency among social educators was to bring a kind of *social reconstruction*, teaching students how to deal with the massive changes going on in modern economics and politics.

Another goal found among progressive educators was to transform the entire institutional framework of the traditional school fundamentally, giving students much more extensive roles in shaping the nature of the individual school and its teaching. The largest such project, the Eight-Year Study, tried to guide thirty public and private schools to reshape themselves comprehensively toward student-centered teaching.¹⁵ But such efforts came into disrepute, and progressive educators became deeply divided in their methods. Herbert M. Kliebard has shown how the field of progressive education degenerated into competing interest groups struggling to control schools and curriculum.¹⁶ Jared Stallones came to the conclusion that by the mid-1930s, the Progressive Education Association “had proven itself unable to resolve the differences between its members who advocated child-centered education and the social reconstructionists.”¹⁷

The origins of “inquiry” teaching can also be traced along rather different lines in private schools, chiefly those located in the Northeast. Note that in that era, teachers from public and private schools often mingled in state or local societies for history, and social studies teachers and historians from the main prep schools engaged significantly in discussion of teaching methods. The most challenging new instruction arose at the Phillips Exeter Academy in Exeter, New Hampshire, where an endowment given by Edward S. Harkness in 1930 enabled what was called “seminar” instruction of fifteen students around an oval table.¹⁸ High-level public schools in such cities as Newton and Brookline, Massachusetts also offered a similar kind of teaching and were linked with private schools through the New England History Teachers Association. Around 1960, it was generally assumed—correctly or not—that intellectually challenging teaching was found only at such schools. Yet we shall see how the Amherst Project introduced “inquiry” teaching to African American students in Washington, D.C. and working-class whites in Richmond, California.

The social roots of the Amherst Project can arguably be seen in the changes brought to American society after the end of World War II. Interestingly enough, a social critique of American elites evolved which in some respects resembles the one active today, bringing a major new set of goals to American education. The demand was voiced that everyone in the society as a whole should be able to obtain a college education, due to the weakening of the Anglo-American elite over American life in the previous several decades. In 1961, John W. Gardner, the eventual Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, called for the elites to look beyond self-interest as a “natural aristocracy” in the book *Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?*¹⁹ That sentiment arose within so elite an institution as Amherst College. The German-born Peter Schrag, who took his B.A. at Amherst College and became the assistant head of admissions for a few years, wrote a pamphlet titled *The European Mind and the Discovery of a New World* (1965), and a book called *The Decline of the WASP* (1970). Indeed, he accused the distinguished Henry Steele Commager, then a professor at the college, for reinforcing the social myopia which prevailed among the New England elite.²⁰ Schrag was also involved in the Amherst Project.

Leadership toward expanding educational opportunities came in part from members of the old elite who brought pressure upon private schools and colleges to open up admissions to a wider population. The Advanced Placement program, begun in 1952, was seen as a means by which to help students from all social classes get into college. Its director, Charles Keller, a Professor of History at Williams College, toured the country encouraging schools and students to participate, and along the way, he helped advance the Amherst Project.²¹ Moreover, Keller directed the John Hay Whitney Fellowships, whose funds from the Ford Foundation sent high school teachers to take graduate courses at major universities for one or two semesters.²² After the funding for the Whitney fellowships ended in 1965, the federal Office of Education administered the Experienced Teacher Fellowship program for five years. Several teachers involved in the Amherst Project won such grants.

The educational thinker who influenced the school reform movement most profoundly was the Harvard psychologist Jerome Bruner. Richard Brown and his colleagues were deeply influenced by Bruner’s argument in *The Process of Education* (1960) that any

child could be taught on a high intellectual plane: “Good teaching that emphasizes the structure of a subject is probably even more valuable for the less able student than for the gifted one.”²³ In Bruner’s view, intuition serves as a vehicle for analysis when a student senses how a problem might be solved. In 1959, Bruner led a meeting in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, where major scholars from a variety of disciplines discussed how education could go beyond teaching practical skills or what was called *life adjustment* and introduce students to the fundamental structure of each discipline. The two historians present were John Donald Cole of Phillips Exeter Academy and Morton Blum of Yale University, where research had not taken on the preeminence it had at Harvard University.²⁴ The meeting led to the founding of the Educational Development Institute to reshape school curricula called *discovery* or *inquiry*. History and social studies were represented by curricula called *From Subject to Citizen* and *Man the Course of Study*. By 1965, commentators grouped the Amherst Project along with such curricula—involving anthropology and sociology as well as civics and economics—which were usually called the “New Social Studies.”²⁵ Begun in the 1950s, this movement developed instructional strategies that emphasized student inquiry in the learning process, going beyond the textbook to hands-on classroom activities.²⁶

To be sure, consequences of the Cold War played an important role in motivating teachers to rebuild American education. Yet the movement surrounding the Amherst Project benefited both from programs derived not only from Cold War sensibilities, but also from larger ideas of social and educational reform that were emerging at that time. The Amherst Project grew to so great an extent thanks to funding brought by the Great Society programs developed politically by President Lyndon Johnson and defined by him in a speech in May 1964. The President’s speechwriter Richard Goodwin later described the notion of “Great Society” as “a concept, an assertion of purpose, a vision if you like, that went beyond the liberal tradition of the New Deal.”²⁷ A similar sense of vision was propounded by leaders of the Amherst Project as they participated in the federally funded educational programs linking schools, colleges, and universities. In 1964-1965 the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) began programs for curricular research, in-service workshops, and summer institutes for college or high school teachers. The project,

called Training Teacher Trainers and led by the American Council of Learned Societies, aimed to upgrade the preparation of teachers intellectually by bringing together professors from education and the academic fields.²⁸ In 1969, the History Education Project, based in the American Historical Association and funded by the USOE, began a five-year consortium of partnerships between schools and colleges around the country.²⁹

The Leaders of the Amherst Project

Despite its name, the Amherst Project developed what a teacher in the program called a “marginal relationship” with Amherst College.³⁰ The project was the main site for summer training sessions, and an office was maintained at the college until 1972. Yet only three faculty members participated significantly in its activities, only one of whom held an appointment chiefly in the history department.³¹ None of the project’s four early leaders had a career conventional to college professors, and all of them moved away from Amherst not long after the project began. Van R. Halsey, a New Yorker with a doctorate in English from the University of Pennsylvania, served as assistant director of admissions, but also taught a course in American Studies. “Van was the real instigator, he spoke to people in both the school and college worlds,” declared Edmund Traverso.³² In 1968, Halsey became admissions director at the progressive Hampshire College a few miles away. Traverso, for his part, administered much of the business of the project, even after he moved to a school north of Boston and then to Boston State College, where he directed the teacher training program. A participant in the project recalled that Traverso was “way ahead of his time—he was one of the rare teachers, he did the Socratic method to perfection, he made students think.”³³ Peter Schrag, in charge of public relations for Amherst College, likewise moved to New York to write for the *Saturday Review*, becoming a major commentator on education active still today.

Richard Brown emerged as both the main mind and principal administrator of the Amherst Project, naming it the Committee on the Study of History. Originally an Assistant Professor of History at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Brown moved the project to Chicago in 1963 when Lawrence Towner, Director of the Newberry Library, invited him to participate in his broad program

of civic outreach. As Brown said in a letter to Halsey, he thought of himself as “essentially a free-lance historian” and “a gambler by instinct.”³⁴ The marginality of the project’s four leaders in relation to Amherst College gave their work an independence from the college they thought was crucial to the project. “We always worked as outsiders,” Brown said in an interview in 1971, since “it was an advantage to us in many ways.”³⁵ It is accordingly best to see the project’s leadership coming from what has been called broadly the “historical enterprise.”³⁶

Open-ended teaching could be found at Amherst College most of all in the freshman class course on Contemporary Civilization that used the primary source collection designed for the pathbreaking course at Columbia University.³⁷ Influence in that direction came from George Rogers Taylor, head of the Department of American Studies, who helped lead that field to become as a major component in general education curricula. He had started a series of pamphlets for the publisher D. C. Heath called *Problems in American Civilization*, which offered contrasting opinions by historians on major issues but included few primary sources. Taylor helped Van Halsey develop a parallel series with Heath for the Amherst Project called *New Dimensions in American History*. Nevertheless, Halsey and Brown thought that Taylor’s pamphlets led students to mimic the point of view taken by the professor. They therefore endeavored to keep the introductions to their pamphlets from taking sides on any debate.³⁸ In their eyes, inquiry methods had to challenge students to pose their own questions and arguments.

Progress along diverse lines intersected in this history. The instructor from the college who participated in the project the most actively was Rose Olver, a psychologist who had studied under Jerome Bruner and co-authored a book with him. As the first woman to obtain a tenure-track position at Amherst College, she linked with instructors at Smith College and Mount Holyoke College while shifting away from lecturing to discussion. As she said later, her friends “pointed out to me that I didn’t have to teach that way, that it was possible to teach in much more discussion-focused ways.”³⁹ Olver participated in the summer workshops at the college and went on the road for the week-long institutes around the country. Having co-authored a book with Bruner, Olver translated his thinking into language teachers could apply to their classes.

Richard Brown articulated the goals of the Amherst Project by adapting Bruner's thinking to the needs of history education. He and his colleagues talked about Bruner endlessly, he said, because "Bruner put into words what [we] said in inarticulate ways about history teaching."⁴⁰ In a 1965 talk delivered to the National School Boards Association, Brown argued that "nothing less than a revolution" had taken shape in science and math, and this had to be extended to history and social studies.⁴¹ Bruner's notion of intuition as the vehicle for analysis stands out in Brown's thinking. In a proposal for federal funds, he stated, "Discovery learning refers essentially to an attitude, a stance, a style, in which the student starts with a question and uses various methods of investigation—perhaps listening to the teacher or looking at a textbook—as he seeks an answer." The project's goal, he said in 1964, was to make students "active inquirers by asking questions and pursuing their answers rather than...[having students]...master the answers of others."⁴² The leaders of the Amherst Project indeed saw themselves promoting a cause: thus, Robin McKeown, head of the project's California branch, spoke of "spreading our gospel" on the edge of the desert in Riverside.⁴³ His sense of mission bears similarity with that expressed for the Great Society legislation.

The most important decision made in designing the Amherst Project was to publish individual pamphlets rather than a comprehensive textbook such as Edwin Fenton was doing with a series of volumes for Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. Despite entreaties from publishers, Brown thought that such a package would inhibit students from thinking independently. He criticized Fenton's series as "a new dogma about how to teach which will be substituted for the old." For him, successful teaching came about "not in a style of teaching, but in one's attitude toward knowledge and students and the relationship between the two."⁴⁴ Besides, Brown was realistic that few teachers could focus a U.S. history course almost entirely on primary sources. In 1969, he shifted from D. C. Heath to Addison-Wesley because it was ready to sell individual lessons from the pamphlets that could be put into loose-leaf binders, allowing teachers to select sources as they wished. The device nonetheless did not sell well.⁴⁵ Each pamphlet included an introductory history of the topic, along with suggestions for discussion of each source. A teacher's manual was usually published

Region	School	College	Shifted	Total	Private	Women
New England	12	4	3	19	1	0
Mid-Atlantic	9	0	1	10	3	2
Mid-West	6	0	1	7	2	2
South	1	0	2	3	1	0
West	8	0	1	9	0	1
Total	36	4	8	48	7	5

Figure 1: *Authors of the Amherst Project Pamphlets.* Note: This data does not include seven male authors who were unidentified as to location or profession.

separately to deepen knowledge of the subject and to suggest angles by which to lead discussion.

One of the novel policies of the Amherst Project was that forty-eight of the booklets were written by practicing teachers (as is shown in **Figure 1**). Admittedly, some of these authors were changing careers somewhat, since a dozen obtained positions in colleges, usually as adjunct instructors. But it is remarkable that the project brought high school teachers into the process of curriculum development, as this was quite uncommon in that period. **Figure 1** also shows considerable geographic diversity among the authors, coming from places far from New England. That region led the list with nineteen participants in all three categories, including all four college or university faculty. Yet the other regions were not far behind: ten came from the Mid-Atlantic region, seven from the Mid-West, and nine from the West. Interestingly, more authors at independent schools came from the Mid-Atlantic region and the South than from New England. A list of schools where D. C. Heath planned to promote the teaching units in 1965 was tilted even farther west: only two in New England, fifteen in Mid-Atlantic states, four in Texas, and twenty in the West.⁴⁶

That only five women were among the authors typifies the considerable predominance of men over women in the field of history teaching during the 1960s. By comparison, leaders of social studies included significantly more women.⁴⁷ Brown nonetheless brought several women into his staff: he hired Carol Cooper, a teacher at the

University of Chicago Lab School, and included on the directing board both Eunice Johns, a teacher in Wilmington, Delaware, who later served as president of the National Council of the Social Studies, and Geraldine Meister, a teacher from George Washington High School in the poor Richmond district in San Francisco.⁴⁸ Brown also involved his aunt Alice Rice Cook, a widely known progressive educator who directed the Human Relations Center at the New School for Social Research.

Teachers from independent schools became less numerous and influential as the program expanded. While about a third of the schools that used the pamphlets in 1963-1964 were private institutions, the list included none of the most prestigious schools, but featured those noted for their progressivism—for example, the University Lab School and Francis Parker School in Chicago, and the Emma Willard School in Troy, New York.⁴⁹ The arrival of federal funds pointed the project more directly toward public schools.

Even though the division between history and social studies as disciplines had begun by then, the two subjects did relate with one another more than is true today. A variety of the pamphlets were designed to teach social studies, basing their methodology upon a focus on a “universal idea” pertinent to teaching civics. Richard Brown went regularly to the annual meetings of the Consortium for Social Science Education, the central body for what was called the New Social Studies, which was based in Boulder, Colorado. Pamphlets such as *Sovereignty and Citizenship* and *Liberty & Law: The Nature of Individual Rights* were often used in civics classes. Yet the focus on primary sources differentiated the booklets significantly from social studies textbooks, since most of the pamphlets were focused on specific historical topics. Moreover, the *Teacher's Guidebook* linked to each pamphlet did not point teachers toward newer strategies such as simulation or group work coming into use in social studies classes.

The pamphlets sold fairly well, all told, given their challenging nature. A study of the sale of textbooks in Connecticut, Texas, Colorado, and California showed that, while these pamphlets did much less well than Fenton's, they scored as high as several other social studies series. Indeed, the Amherst series came out on top in a question posed about the quality of materials.⁵⁰ Interviews done with teachers in Illinois and Maine in 1994 suggested that some

teachers had retreated from inquiry teaching to traditional social studies, partly because they developed what might be called a siege mentality from pressure they saw among students to control the classroom. Some teachers remained loyal to historical topics. One in Illinois reported, "I still have the Amherst Project around...Its strength was that it was basically inquiry with primary documents. I saw the value of kids reading. It got them into the events."⁵¹

Traveling to Train Teachers

It was unusual in that time for the federal government to give grants to educational institutions or projects, making special programs rely on funds from a city or the state. Thus, a new era arose when in 1964, the Amherst Project was awarded a \$222,000 grant for Cooperative Research on Curriculum administered by the Project Social Studies program of the U.S. Office of Education. The legislation was justified as an extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, aiming to develop longer-term efforts than the one-year programs of summer institutes for teachers in colleges.⁵² The Amherst Project was given its grant for three years to enable teachers to attend week-long training session in different cities and then write evaluations of what happened in their classes. A staff person in the project would visit the school, sit in on several classes, and discuss what went on with the teacher. As Brown observed in a report, the project had "grown into a full-fledged research and development project."⁵³ Educational idealism ran rampant in these programs; indeed, the USOE officers who administered the grants were visionaries in their own right. Donald Bigelow, head of the USOE program, sought out intellectually ambitious projects linking schools with colleges or universities. Alan Brownsword, his assistant, had led a group of teachers and professors while teaching history at Long Beach State College and published articles on inquiry teaching while with the USOE.⁵⁴

In the subsequent year, the USOE awarded the Committee two more big grants, enabling the project to send Education Development Teams to fifteen school districts around the country. The program also worked with twenty-four other cities to obtain local or state funds for similar projects. A broad range of activities developed; as the 1968 proposal stated, "the emphasis now is on teacher

education, and on stimulating innovation in the schools.”⁵⁵ The proposal included an ambitious diagram of potential sources of leadership from hundreds of people: school administrators, members of school boards, and college faculty, the latter possibly including a historian, an educational psychologist, or a trainer of teachers.⁵⁶ It is doubtful that as large or varied a group of participants showed up everywhere, but it did happen when an aggressive leader marshaled supporters—Edmund Traverso did just that as a member of high school administrator in Hamilton, Massachusetts.

The program spread widely across the country. After “tryouts” were done in Massachusetts (in Amherst, South Hadley, Newton, and Hamilton-Wenham), the program was extended to Wilmington, Delaware; Oak Park, Illinois; and several cities in northern California. David Tyack, then in charge of teacher training at Reed College, volunteered to follow suit in Portland through a program begun by the Ford Foundation, but a delay in obtaining federal funding prevented him from participating.⁵⁷ After workshops were held in Amherst, Newton, and Brookline, the program spanned the country with programs from vast reaches of the United States.⁵⁸ Moreover, workshops were given for directors of National Defense Education Act (NDEA) history institutes at Amherst, Berkeley, and Racine. Workshops for Education Development Teams involving school and community representations occurred in a variety of other cities across the country. The History Education Project co-sponsored workshops at Bloomington, Indiana and Newark, Delaware. An Inner City Materials Development workshop was held in Boston in 1969.⁵⁹

The social diversity of students involved in the project widened significantly during the late 1960s. While most of the early pamphlets were aimed at college preparatory students, some were now developed for those termed “slow learners”—supposedly those who were expected to end school in the eleventh grade. The USOE grants involved an effort to work directly with African American students. While the USOE’s Project Social Studies did not focus on disadvantaged groups as much as other parts of Great Society legislation, the Civil Rights Movement was so much at the forefront of national attention that all education programs began reaching out to African Americans and less affluent students in general. Van Halsey led the effort to make such contacts while traveling to talk with students applying to Amherst College. Writing to a teacher

at a Brooklyn school, Halsey said, “we have been trying to define whom we mean this summer and are still not sure where we want to hit into this tough problem.”⁶⁰

The 1968 proposal of the project to the USOE specified that five units would be produced for students from groups who were traditionally less well educated. The topics of the units were diverse, including, for example, *Liberty or License: The First Amendment in Action* (1966) and *The United States and the Soviet Union, 1917-1965* (1966). Two evaluators found the units considerably above the level of most high school students; they suggested that topics such as foreign policy be chosen because they were often discussed in students’ homes.⁶¹ Robin McKeown likewise suggested that students could understand pamphlets on specific topics such as *Individual and His Group* (1966) and *Liberty or License* (1966) more than the rather scholarly *Neutrality Act of 1935* (1966).⁶²

Moreover, training programs were developed directly for schools with low-income minority students. In the fall of 1964, Halsey began to write to Brown about teachers he had contacted in Detroit, Harlem, Brooklyn, and Washington, D.C. The main school involved was Benjamin Cardozo High School on the border of the Capital’s Northeast and Northwest districts. “This is a negro high school,” Halsey reported on his work with teachers there. His main colleague was Larry Cuban, who had just become the master teacher in the social studies department, heading the Cardozo Project in Urban Teaching for the school as a whole. Funds from the Amherst Project allowed him to hire a pair of interns to help him with his pamphlet, *Social Relations, Pre-Civil War* (1965).⁶³ Cuban had become disillusioned with the implications of vocabulary such as “the disadvantaged” and “culturally deprived,” then used in many grant programs. As he asked in *To Make A Difference* (1970), do rich and poor students have to be taught in different terms? The pamphlet series went in a similar direction, offering booklets on black history—*The Negro in American Life* (1962), *Civil Disobedience* (1965), *Origins of Racial Discrimination* (1965), and *Black Freedom* (1969).

The Training Program and Outreach to Schools

Reports that teachers had serious problems applying the Amherst pamphlets began in the early years of the USOE grant. Indeed, at

their start, leaders of the project demonstrated considerable naiveté about the ability of most teachers to develop classroom discussion with challenging historical source materials. Van Halsey wrote the head of D. C. Heath's High School Division that, although "optimistic about our materials over the long run, we are finding that many teachers who are using our trial material do not know how to present it in the most adequate way." He spoke of "experimental efforts" to keep teachers from using the questions in the teacher's manuals in the same way as they did with questions in conventional textbooks. "We have a long way to go," he admitted, "before we discover how to encourage teachers to use the new materials."⁶⁴

The original summer camps were aimed simply to help the participating teachers find primary sources and write introductions to passages used in classes. Traditionally, university programs for teachers had been led by schools of education, and historians provided lectures divorced from discussion of how that subject might be taught. But in 1964, the program offered a *workshop of discovery learning* focused on helping teachers find their way in leading open-ended discussion in the classroom in order to discuss historical subjects. On the first day, teachers would observe a staff member lead a class of high school students and then would discuss what had transpired. In the afternoon, the participants themselves would serve as students, and the day would close with a general discussion of what they had experienced. Halsey suggested that "someone, for example, could ask, 'What would happen if you had gone at it this way?'" Brown recounted how he and Carol Cooper often found themselves "thinking we knew what styles of teaching would work and what wouldn't, only to find that it was more complicated than that."⁶⁵ In the evening, a historian would usually discuss a subject to be considered the next day. An "anxiety" session was held in the middle of the week where participants were encouraged to talk about what challenged them, because some teachers found the experience stressful.⁶⁶

The project drew highly motivated teachers eager to try an intellectually challenging curriculum. At that point, the Advanced Placement examinations were given in relatively few schools and did not include document-based essay questions until 1973; indeed, teachers involved with the Amherst Project often did not like the test.⁶⁷ The project's archive includes voluminous reports on the use of the pamphlets, in some cases including examples of student work.

The teachers' responses display both the difficulties they encountered and the idealism of their intentions. The head of social studies in Parma, Ohio, a suburb of Cleveland, wrote to Halsey, "I am firmly convinced that in regular classes with students of average intelligence this kind of unit can work." He urged the project to develop "a more structured selection of documents," but also longer selections in some cases.⁶⁸ Teachers from the less-advantaged communities showed comparable motivation, for example, one who taught at Dorchester High School in a poor area in South Boston. John U. Michaelis, Professor of Education at the University of California, Berkeley, led the project's workshops in Berkeley and visited the teachers in their schools. He reported that he saw teachers learning to help students understand difficult readings, most often by using new methods such as organizing them in groups.⁶⁹ Likewise, a teacher in Middletown, Connecticut said that he had students do role playing as opponents of conflicting arguments on foreign policy.⁷⁰ But other teachers found working with the sources frustrating. One near Rochester, Minnesota related that the unit *Ideals and Reality in American Foreign Policy* (1969) appealed to the "real student" but not to the "non-student."⁷¹

Daily reports made by a teacher at Maine Township High School near Des Plaines, Illinois in 1965 illustrate vividly how teachers struggled to apply the inquiry method. While using *The American West as Myth and Reality* (1964), Thomas A. Beggs reported that on the first day, he found that the students did not understand the Introduction—"response was poor." He then got better results by having them read key passages aloud and explain a passage in their own words. On the third day, the students were "completely flustered" by the primary sources ("why don't these men write in plain language?" said one) and the teacher ended up doing most of the talking because "the inductive approach did not seem to work at all." But the next day, the students got the point made by Walter Lippmann that people interpret a society as they wish and thereby create a new "pseudo-environment." The fifth day seemed the best: the students responded well to a question about heroic qualities in James Fenimore Cooper's novel *The Deerslayer* because they were "eager to describe their impressions from t.v. and movie Westerns."⁷²

Californian Robin McKeown was particularly skilled at shaping lessons around what students could understand. A former teacher

working on a doctorate with John Michaelis, McKeown recruited teachers in a dozen places throughout California, including working-class communities such as Richmond or Pittsburg as well as prosperous Berkeley and Marin County. Pittsburg, he said, “is a lower-class oil refinery and steel town that is still suburban in character.”⁷³ He was delighted to find that places like Union City or Novato, “considered off the beaten path by the S.F. urban folk, have the most exciting and enthusiastic programs.”⁷⁴ He admitted that on visiting a “primarily Negro class” in Oakland Technical School, he found a teacher who “has difficulty eliciting the kind of dialogue necessary to a true ‘discovery’ process.” Indeed, he said, “I have found it true that the teachers have great difficulty eliciting discussion from lower socio-economic students.” Yet McKeown saw a particularly dynamic young teacher in Oakland learning the “general philosophy of ‘throwing the ball to the kids’ and allowing them to grapple with it.” And on another occasion, he reported that it was nice to see “an average teacher...one who feels that ‘these materials are radically different’...doing a fairly good job.”⁷⁵

Teaching with primary sources required a pragmatic approach even more vitally than is the case today, as comes across in McKeown’s letters. Looking back to the historical thinking of Larry Cuban and David Tyack, we see how he developed a *hybrid* methodology, blending new with traditional techniques. In a thoughtful letter to Brown, McKeown outlined realistic—and in some ways, traditional—methods by which he helped teachers approach the challenge of teaching through inquiry:

- Units should consider problems or issues that are of particular interest to the student;
- The reading level should be about fifth grade;
- A day’s reading should be done in class and should not take longer than twenty-five minutes;
- There should be an opportunity to discuss the materials immediately after reading;
- Discovery approaches or inquiry methods are considered as equally important with slow learners as with average...but directed at developing generalizations that are not abstract problems;
- Single-day units should have some attractive visual aspect such as introducing the article with a cartoon or photograph;

- Some units should be developed around a strictly visual presentation of data;
- There should be a short (ten-minute) set of questions to answer after reading the materials that would force the student to understand what was read.⁷⁶

McKeown developed a cadre of Californian professors for the Amherst Project that rivaled the school-university collaboration found in New England. The primacy of public universities in California blurred the social hierarchy among institutions of higher learning and made teacher initiatives a good deal more attractive to historians. McKeown and Alan Brownsword worked with a dozen college or university professors in local or state-wide projects. Charles Sellers, Professor of History at Berkeley, had already initiated efforts to bring teachers and professors together, and at least one historian or social educator participated from the University of California, Davis and from several of the State Colleges (Long Beach, San Francisco, Sonoma, Hayward, San Jose, and Northridge).

The Amherst Project in Long-Term Perspective

Reconsideration of the Amherst Project can help see how the history of history education relates substantially with present-day efforts to deepen teaching methods intellectually. This essay has traced how the most important attempts made to reform history education came about in the national reports of the 1890s, the progressive thinking of the 1920s, the movement for discussing primary sources in the 1960s, and, finally, the professional organizations begun in the 1980s. Even though the efforts of these projects may seem naïve in the present day, the very fact that we can discern a relationship with the four periods of educational reform indicates how comparable problems and solutions have emerged over time. Identifying how idealistic educational goals have survived can benefit present-day activity, bringing back confidence in the future for intellectually challenging education.

Tracing the origins and later influence of the Amherst Project raises a historical question: was it a phenomenon of the proverbial Sixties, a time of diversified revolt? We have seen that, on the one hand, the focus on primary sources and open-ended discussion posed a drastic change in teaching strategies for history teachers, and the

word “revolutionary” indeed often appeared in literature for the project. On the other hand, the program was pragmatic in design, had roots in initiatives of the 1950s, and did not attempt to expand student governance of the schools. Indeed, leaders of the project had something in common with the fairly conservative Council for Basic Education (CBE), founded by Arthur Bestor in 1956, which supported the idea of opening up history teaching to new methods. The main difference between the organizations was that Richard Brown did not follow Bestor in condemning professors of education as “educationists,” a word often found in Bestor’s book, *Educational Wastelands*.⁷⁷ Brown accordingly became involved with a new cabal within the American Historical Association that argued that the organization needed to involve itself with the teaching of history, including both teachers and professors of education. For a while, Brown was slated to be the editor of a journal on history education proposed for the Association.⁷⁸

It is not surprising that serious disagreement broke out among the project’s leaders in 1969, when Edmund Traverso wrote in the *Bulletin of the Amherst Project* that their goals had failed to adapt to student needs in the informal Age of Aquarius. Traverso claimed that students no longer accepted Brunerian thinking since they held a strong “distrust for traditional modes of cognition, intellectualizing or ‘objectifying’ the situation.” Critiques of Traverso’s article appeared in the next issue. Anthony Penna—a teacher who had taken the Doctor of Arts with Edwin Fenton and joined the faculty at Carnegie Mellon University—argued that the project had included the new discussion of social values from the start. Richard Brown insisted that his colleagues had refused to follow “narrowly cognitive” thinking and had worked to “free students in order that they may inquire about things that genuinely concern them.” He therefore saw the project fitting the times closely.⁷⁹

Federal funding for the Committee on the Study of History ran out in 1972, and by then, the movement for educational reform had gone on the defensive. In June 1971, Richard Brown declared that “the kinds of things that were being done in the new social studies movement of the sixties are now passé, because they don’t have to do with the problems that are now being identified as larger problems.”⁸⁰ Tension had been increasing between leaders of educational programs aimed at either intellectual or social change,

the latter tending to get the upper-hand in public discussion.⁸¹ For that matter, some teachers became disillusioned with the New Social Studies and inquiry teaching generally, born of a sense that too few students could handle such challenging exercises. In any event, Congress did away with many Great Society programs, and economic decline undercut programs on the state and local levels generally. Remarkably little was subsequently published about programs of the 1960s in either history or the social studies, save a set of short memoirs in the 1990s.⁸²

The movement for reform of history education nonetheless survived the dark days of the 1970s, probably with greater continuity than happened in the New Social Studies. A cohort of activists continued to work within the AHA and the NCSS into the 1980s—for example, Eugene Asher in California, Matthew Downey in Colorado, and Howard Mehlinger in Indiana. These figures and younger people following them adhered to the same basic principle, that raising standards of history teaching had to come from local collaboration between teachers and professors with roots in school programs. The Advanced Placement program became a vehicle for inquiry teaching when in 1973 it added the document-based question to its multiple-choice examination. Primary sources became more widely utilized in history classes, for by 1990, almost all new high school textbooks included at least short excerpts. Teaching through *inquiry* became broadened into *critical thinking*, developed by focus on role playing and having students work together in groups. The programs begun from the late 1980s all brought teachers together with history professors and encouraged local collaboration, most of all the four projects named at the start of this essay.⁸³

The success of the movement to reform history education came ultimately from its pragmatism, its success in hybridizing new and old teaching methods. Just as Richard Brown imbedded inquiry teaching within the traditional classroom, so do progressive school districts bid for funds to improve reading skills through instruction in historical methods. Bruce VanSledright has likewise shown how the movement that began in the Amherst Project stayed alive, if more or less underground, since “a veritable cottage industry of research has arisen that focuses on how teachers teach history.”⁸⁴ Even though present-day textbooks may offer shorter primary source texts than booklets of the Amherst Project, programs for curricular

development have expanded the range of sources and devised new ways students can interpret them. The Center for History and New Media offers sources on material culture; the National Center for History in the Schools developed a curriculum on world history; and the Stanford History Education Group, led by the thinking of Sam Wineburg, has helped teachers in how to frame a “guiding question” and manipulate a graphic organizer for a source.⁸⁵ These programs follow the principle established by the Amherst Project that teachers need a particular kind of training to apply challenging methods successfully. All of which suggests that the project’s choice to train teachers in workshops was the crucial turning point in its history.

Notes

I am grateful for help from Richard Brown, Robert Bain, Margaret Crocco, Larry Cuban, Mark Lytle, William Marmion, Howard Mehlinger, Geoffrey Scheurman, Peter Schrag, Jared Stallones, Stephen Thornton, David Tyack, and Bruce A. VanSledright.

1. Two doctoral dissertations were written on the Amherst Project by teacher participants: William Alan Kline, “The ‘Amherst Project’: A Case Study of a Federally Sponsored Curriculum Development Project” (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1974); and Charles E. Samec, “A History of the Amherst Project: Revising the Teaching of American History, 1959 to 1972” (Ph.D. diss., Loyola University of Chicago, 1976). Kline wrote two pamphlets for the project. See also Samec, “The ‘New Social Studies’ and Curriculum Innovation: The Amherst Project Experience, 1959-1972,” *Papers and Proceedings of the 15th Annual Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society* (Chicago, Illinois, October 26-27, 1979), *Midwest History of Education Society* 8 (1980): 3-14.

2. I appreciate the assistance of the Teachers College Archive very much. For related discussion, see William Weber, “The Evolution of *The History Teacher* and the Reform of History Education,” *The History Teacher* 45, no. 3 (May 2012): 329-357.

3. “Transcript of Taped Reflections on the Amherst Project, Recorded June 22, 1971,” typescript, Amherst Project, miscellaneous file, Teachers College Archive (hereafter AP/TCA); Richard H. Brown, “Learning How to Learn: The Amherst Project and History Education in the Schools,” *Social Studies* 87, no. 6 (November-December 1996): 267-273; Author interviews with Van R. Halsey (16 April 2009), Edmund Traverso (14 September 2009), and Richard Brown (14 and 21 September 2009).

4. Robert Orrill and Linn Shapiro, "From Bold Beginnings to an Uncertain Future: The Discipline of History and History Education," *American Historical Review* 110, no. 3 (June 2005): 727-751; Andrew C. McLaughlin, Herbert B. Adams, George L. Fox, Albert Bushnell Hart, Charles H. Haskins, Lucy M. Salmon, and H. Morse Stephens, *The Study of History in Schools: Report to the American Historical Association by the Committee of Seven* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1899); Charles A. Beard, *A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1932). See also Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988); and Robert B. Townsend, *History's Babel: Scholarship and the Historical Enterprise in the United States, 1880-1940* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 62-73, 113, 115, 136, 170-177.
5. McLaughlin et al., 7, 23-26; Beard, 55-56, 79-80; Albert Bushnell Hart, *Source-book of American History: Edition for Schools and Readers* (New York: Macmillan, 1899). August C. Krey advised caution in any use of the "source-method" in "Suggestions for the Teaching of History and Civics in the High School," *Bulletin of the University of Texas*, no. 201, October 1, 1911, 6, 18-21.
6. Chara Haeussler Bohan and O. L. Davis, Jr., "Sources in History Instruction: Evidence in *The History Teacher's Magazine*," *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society* 25, no. 1 (1998): 55-60; Ken Osborne, "Fred Morrow Fling and the Source-Method of Teaching History," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 31, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 466-501.
7. Townsend, 62-65.
8. *Ibid.*, 55-73, 167-180.
9. McLaughlin et al., 51.
10. H. Morse Stephens, "Courses in History in the Junior Colleges," *The History Teacher's Magazine* 4, no. 6 (June 1913): 153. See also St. George L. Sioussat, "Collateral Reading," *The History Teacher's Magazine* 5, no. 7 (September 1914): 227-229. On AHA programs with the schools, see Ian Tyrrell, *Historians in Public: The Practice of American History, 1890-1970* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 130-149, 251-252.
11. Larry Cuban, *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1990*, second ed. (New York: Teachers College Press, 1993); David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995); David Tyack and William Tobin, "The 'Grammar' of Schooling: Why Has It Been So Hard to Change?" *American Educational Research Journal* 31, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 453-479.
12. See, for example, Mark M. Krug, "Primary Sources in Teaching History," *The History Teacher* 3, no. 3 (May 1970): 41-49; John Anthony Scott, *Teaching for a Change* (New York: Bantam, 1972); Paul Gagnon and Bradley Commission on History in the Schools, eds., *Historical Literacy: The Case for History in American Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1989); National Center for History in the Schools, *National Standards for History* (Los Angeles, CA: National Center for History in the Schools, 1994); Peter N. Stearns, Peter Seixas, and Sam Wineburg, eds., *Knowing, Teaching, and Learning History: National and International Perspectives* (New York: New York University Press, 2000);

Stéphane Lévesque, *Thinking Historically: Educating Students for the Twenty-First Century* (Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press, 2008).

13. Carl Becker, "Everyman His Own Historian," *American Historical Review* 37, no. 2 (January 1932): 221-236; and Carl L. Becker, *Everyman His Own History: Essays on History and Politics* (Chicago, IL: Crofts, 1935), 233-255.

14. Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, *The Child-Centered School: An Appraisal of New Education* (Yonkers-on-Hudson, NY: World Book Co., 1928); Harold Rugg and James E. Mendenhall, *Pupil's Workbook to Accompany Changing Civilizations in the Modern World* (Boston, MA: Ginn and Co., 1930); Ronald W. Evans, *This Happened in America: Harold Rugg and Censure of Social Studies* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age, 2007).

15. Wilford M. Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study, With Conclusions and Recommendations* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1942); Patricia Albjerg Graham, *Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe, A History of the Progressive Education Association, 1919-1955* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967); W. H. Schubert, G. Willis, H. Simons, B. Labbett, J. Elliott, B. MacDonald, R. W. Tyler, and E. R. House, "The Impact of Major Curriculum Reforms: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of the Eight-Year Study in the U.S. and the Humanities Curriculum Project in the U.K.," *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 10, no. 4 (1995): 7-66.

16. Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge, 1986), 240-270.

17. Jared Stallones, *Paul Robert Hanna: A Life of Expanding Communities* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 2002), 220. See also David Jenness, *Making Sense of Social Studies* (New York: Macmillan, 1990).

18. Lawrence A. Smith and Margaret Foley, "Partners in a Human Enterprise: Harkness Teaching in the History Classroom," *The History Teacher* 42, no. 4 (August 2009): 477-496; Julia Heskel and Davis Dyer, *After the Harkness Gift: A History of Phillips Exeter Academy* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2008). The school's course in Western Civilization was focused on primary sources: see letter from Chuck Trout to Van Halsey, February 7, 1965, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.

19. John W. Gardner, *Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?* (New York: Harper, 1961). See also E. Digby Baltzell, *The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America* (New York: Random House, 1964).

20. Peter Schrag, *The Decline of the WASP* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), 25.

21. Eric Rothschild, "Four Decades of the Advanced Placement Program," *The History Teacher* 32, no. 2 (February 1999): 175-206.

22. Bernard Marlin, "Charles Keller: A Study of the Development of his Educational Thought" (Ph.D. diss., University of Connecticut, 1980); letter from Charles Keller to Friends of the John Hay Fellows Program, June 17, 1966, in Keller Letters, AP/TCA.

23. Jerome Bruner, *The Process of Education* (New York: Harvard University Press, 1960), 9, 55-68. See also Peter B. Dow, *Schoolhouse Politics: Lessons from the Sputnik Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 33-41.

24. See John Morton Blum, *A Life with History* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2004), 152-153. The Yale History Department gave strong sponsorship to the New Haven branch of the History Education Project led by Eugene L. Asher, linked with similar efforts at the State University of New York, Stony Brook and the University of Delaware in Newark.

25. Barbara Slater Stern, ed., *The New Social Studies: People, Projects, and Perspectives* (Boulder, CO: Information Age, 2010); Ronald W. Evans, *The Social Studies Wars: What Should we Teach the Children?* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004).

26. Jeffrey Byford and William Russell, "The New Social Studies: A Historical Examination of Curriculum Reform," *Social Studies Research and Practice* 2, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 38-48.

27. G. Calvin MacKenzie and Robert Weisbrot, *The Liberal Hour: Washington and the Politics of Change in the 1960s* (New York: Penguin, 2008), 99. Aspects of the Cold War were also involved; see Ronald W. Evans, "National Security Trumps Social Progress: The Era of the New Social Studies in Retrospect," in *The New Social Studies: People, Projects, and Perspectives*, ed. Barbara Slater Stern (Boulder, CO: Information Age, 2010), 1-36.

28. Thomas Vogt, ed., *Five Levels of Incompetence: Higher Education, Teaching, and the Education of Teachers: Report of the Grove Park Institute Conference, June 10-15, 1969* (Denver, CO: Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs, 1969).

29. Glenn Linden, "The Historical Profession in Transition: Its Response to the Challenges of the 1960s and 1970s," *The History Teacher* 23, no. 3 (May 1990): 293-303.

30. Kline, 10-12.

31. Historian Allen Guttman wrote the pamphlets *Freedom and Authority in Puritan New England* and *Who's in This with Me? The Individual and His Group*.

32. "Transcript of Taped Reflections," 2.

33. Author interview with Allan Kownslar (22 November 2009).

34. Letter from Richard Brown to Van Halsey, November 13, 1963, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.

35. "Transcript of Taped Reflections," 22.

36. Townsend, 3-4, 29-31.

37. John R. Gillis, "Detours," in *Becoming Historians*, ed. James M. Banner, Jr. and John R. Gillis (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 156-157.

38. Letter from Van Halsey to Henry Bedford, Phillips Exeter Academy, September 14, 1964, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.

39. Author interview with Rose Olver (18 June 2009). See Jerome S. Bruner, Rose R. Olver, and Patricia M. Greenfield, *Studies in Cognitive Growth: A Collaboration at the Center for Cognitive Studies* (New York: John Wiley, 1966).

40. Author interview with Richard Brown (10 March 2011).

41. "History as Discovery: An Interim Report on the Amherst Project," National School Boards Association, Boston, April 6, 1965, 1, AP/TCA.

42. "Proposal to the U.S. Office of Education for an Educational Personnel Development Grant," 1964, 4, Papers of the American Historical Association, Library of Congress.
43. Letter from Robin McKeown to Richard Brown, August 19, 1969, McKeown Letters, AP/TCA.
44. Letter from Richard Brown to Van Halsey, March 4, 1965, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.
45. Thirty pamphlets were published commercially, and the rest were made available through the Educational Resource Information Center.
46. Letter from Harley Mutzfeld to Van Halsey, December 10, 1964, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.
47. Margaret Smith Crocco and O. L. Davis, Jr., eds., *Building a Legacy: Women in Social Education, 1784-1984* (Silver Spring, MD: National Council for the Social Studies, 2002).
48. Schrag described his teaching in *Voices in the Classroom: Public Schools and Public Attitudes* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1965), 227-228.
49. "Schools Using Trial Units, 1963-64," in Evaluation Reports, March 3, 1963, AP/TCA.
50. Mary Jane Turner and Frances Haley, *Utilization of New Social Studies Curriculum Programs* (Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1975), 1-43.
51. Lynn R. Nelson and Frederick D. Drake, "Secondary Teachers' Reactions to the New Social Studies," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 22, no. 1 (Winter 1994): 62.
52. Richard H. Brown, "A New Approach to American History," *New England Association Review* 13 (1964): 24-26; Hazel Whitman Hertzberg, "Social Studies Reform: The Lessons of History," in *Social Studies in the 1980s: A Report of Project Span*, ed. Irving Morrisett (Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981), 2-14.
53. "History as Discovery: An Interim report on the Amherst Project," 3, Evaluation Reports, AP/TCA.
54. Author interview with Alan Brownsword (11 February 2009); Alan W. Brownsword, "Doing History: A Skills Approach," *The History Teacher* 6, no. 2 (February 1973): 251-266.
55. "Proposal to the U.S. Office of Education for an Educational Personnel Development Grant," typescript, 1968, Proposal to USOE, AP/TCA.
56. "Diagram of the System" in "Proposal to the U.S. Office of Education."
57. Author interview with David Tyack (17 March 2010).
58. To be specific, in Rochester (NY), Wilmington (DE), Washington, D.C., Miami (FL), Chicago (IL), Tulsa (OK), and Denver (CO). See Committee on the Study of History (The Amherst Project), Hampshire College, "Amherst Project Workshops," in "The Amherst Project: Final Report," 1969, available on ERIC at <<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED066378.pdf>>.
59. The cities included at Dallas (TX), Port Washington (NY), Columbus (OH), Vancouver (WA), and Newark (DE). See "Amherst Project Workshops," Appendix E, Final Report, Amherst Project, 36, Evaluation Reports, AP/TCA.

60. Letter from Van Halsey to Abraham Lass, August 14, 1964, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.
61. James Siar and Sister Mary Consuela, "The Amherst Project in American History: An Evaluation Amherst Project," Papers of the American Historical Association, Library of Congress.
62. Letter from Robin McKeown to Richard Brown, June 15, 1967, McKeown Letters, AP/TCA.
63. Letters from Van Halsey to Richard Brown, October 12, 1964, October 15, 1964, and November 4, 1965; Letters from Richard Brown to Van Halsey, February 23, 1965 and March 19, 1965, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA; Letter from Larry Cuban to William Weber, September 22, 2009; Larry Cuban, *Frogs into Princes: Writings on School Reform* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2008), 1-9, 13-38; Larry Cuban, *To Make a Difference: Teaching in the Inner City* (New York: Free Press, 1970), 74-81.
64. Letter from Van Halsey to Harley Mutzfeld, December 17, 1964, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.
65. Letter from Richard Brown to Van Halsey, May 11, 1965, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.
66. Letter from Van Halsey to Richard Brown, April 21, 1965, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.
67. Eric Rothschild, "The Impact of the Document-Based Question on the Teaching of United States History," *The History Teacher* 33, no. 4 (August 2000): 495-500.
68. Letter from Leonard Lang to Van Halsey, September 3, 1964, Halsey Letters, AP/TCA.
69. Kline, 225. See John U. Michaelis, "An Inquiry-Conceptual Theory of Social Studies Curriculum Planning," *Social Education* 34, no. 1 (January 1970): 68-71. In 1962, Michaelis edited the NCSS booklet, *Social Studies in the Elementary Schools, Thirty-Second Yearbook* (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1962), available on ERIC at <<http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED018275.pdf>>.
70. Sister M. Caedmon Homan, daily log, Pacelli High School, Austin (MI), April 1968, Evaluation reports, AP/TCA.
71. D. Hantah, daily log, Middletown High School, Middletown (CT), April 1968, Evaluation reports, AP/TCA.
72. Thomas A. Beggs, February 15-26, 1965, Evaluation reports, AP/TCA.
73. Letter from Robin McKeown to Richard Brown, October 7, 1965, McKeown Letters, AP/TCA.
74. Letter from Robin McKeown to Richard Brown, January 25, 1967, McKeown Letters, AP/TCA.
75. Letter from Robin McKeown to Richard Brown, February 6, 1967, McKeown Letters, AP/TCA.
76. Letter from Robin McKeown to Richard Brown, June 15, 1967, McKeown Letters, sAP/TCA.
77. Arthur E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in our Public Schools*, second ed. (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1985),

101. William Marmion, a Long Beach teacher, led an Amherst Project workshop and worked at the CBE in 1967-1968; I am indebted to him for access to his collection of CBE publications.

78. Instead, *The History Teacher*, founded at Notre Dame University in 1967, was shifted to Long Beach State College in 1972 and linked with the AHA; see Weber, "The Evolution of *The History Teacher*."

79. Edmund Traverso, "Education in the Age of Aquarius," *Bulletin of the Amherst Project*, no. 3 (Fall 1969): 1; "Education in the Age of Aquarius: Three Replies to Edmund Traverso," Spring 1980, 1-3, Marmion Papers, AP/TCA.

80. "Transcript of Taped Reflections," 24. In 1972, Brown became Associate Director at the Newberry Library, involved with outreach.

81. Doxey A. Wilkerson, *The Education Professions Development Act. In Congress, in the Office of Education, and in the Field* (Westport, CT: Medias Associates, 1979).

82. Edwin Fenton, "Reflections on the 'New Social Studies,'" *Social Studies* 82, no. 3 (May-June 1991): 84-90; Richard Brown, "Learning How to Learn: The Amherst Project and History Education in the Schools," *Social Studies* 87, no. 6 (November-December 1996), 267-273; Anthony N. Penna, "The New Social Studies in Perspective: The Carnegie-Mellon Slow-Learner Project," *Social Studies* 86, no. 4 (July-August 1995): 155-161.

83. Linda Symcox, *Whose History? The Struggle for National Standards in American Classrooms* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2002) and "Forging New Partnerships: Collaboration between University Professors and Classroom Teachers to Improve History Teaching, 1983-2010," *The History Teacher* 45, no. 3 (May 2012): 359-382. Even though reports of these projects were focused on historical content, programs for teaching them usually used primary sources.

84. Bruce A. VanSledright, *The Challenge of Rethinking History Education: On Practices, Theories, and Policy* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 19.

85. See the Center for History and New Media of George Mason University at <<https://chnm.gmu.edu/teaching-and-learning/>>; the Stanford History Education Group at <<https://sheg.stanford.edu>>; and the National Center for History in the Schools at <<https://phi.history.ucla.edu/nchs/>>. Though the Common Core Standards are likewise focused on primary sources, their involvement of required examinations departs significantly from the principles of the movement begun in the 1960s.