The Failure of Social Education in the United States*:* A Critique of Teaching the National Story from "White" Colourblind Eyes

Prentice Chandler
Athens State University, United States

Douglas McKnight
The University of Alabama, United States

Abstract:

The curriculum discipline of Social Studies in the United States has historically been the field charged with preparing democratic citizens to participate in a complex political landscape that will serve to perpetuate the US national story of democracy, freedom and equality. However, it is our contention that the field of social education has failed to engage in a direct confrontation with one of the most significant and complicated themes in the US historical narrative – race. Race, simply, has been a defining problematic in the story of what it means to be an US citizen. The social studies must become the subject position to critically analyze and address this historical condition, especially when teaching and exploring with students the national narrative of what it means to be a democratic citizen. In an effort to address these issues, this article will explore the failure of social education research and practice to confront the issue of race, instead relying on a colourblind approach to the teaching of social studies. The discussion will include the different types of multiculturalism ideologies that social studies could pull from, specifically a critical multicultural approach that would enhance the charge of social studies teachers to develop critical, socially conscious citizens able to function in a democracy that is no longer white.

Racism, like every form of irrationalism, is a fatal idea, so it is never merely an idea. But it is not an idea that occurs to people at birth. Racism is learned, and within a society divided into rich and poor but ruled by the rich, learning is often a method of deception. Such is the nature of capitalist schools where, as often as not, teachers willingly or unwillingly teach lies to the children, using methods of constructing knowledge that make decoding lies nearly impossible (Gibson, 2006, p. 51)

A society founded on genocide, built on the labor of African slaves, developed by Latino serfs and Asian indentured servants, made fabulously wealthy through exploitation and masterful manipulation and mystification—a society like this is a society built on race.
(Ayers, 1997, p. 131)

Introduction

Of all public school curriculum subjects, when it comes to addressing the fundamental issues of what it means to be a democratic citizen within the United States, the social studies stirs

heated exchanges between politicians, cultural observers, academicians and leaders within state departments of education.

Such tension emerges out of the one point of consensus about the purpose of social education in the US: the social studies interprets and transmits to each new generation of US students the national historical story and what it means to play the part of democratic citizen. The social studies is the most "inclusive of all subjects" (Ross, 2001, p. 6), giving it great influence on how US democracy will be perceived and acted out by future generations. This national narrative, which constitutes the identity that each citizen is to embody, is embedded within and transmitted to students both directly (i.e. US history, civics, government) and indirectly (geography, sociology, current events, psychology, free enterprise/economics). This is significant in that students are saturated every day with the story's ideology, the basic assumptions, beliefs and value system of a society, which not only shapes the national identity, but makes promises to those who conform to its social principles and constraints (Bercovitch, 1975, 1978; McKnight, 2003).

At its best, telling the national story through academic traditions within the social studies is an institutional means to instill US students with democratic dispositions and virtues such as citizenship responsibility, social justice, equality, dialogue, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. However, all narratives are dependent upon several factors: who is telling the story; who is and who is not included in the telling of the story; who is shaping the plot of the story; and finally, who is interpreting the story, either directly or indirectly.

Hence, the social studies, as the main curricular discipline in social education in the US, is positioned within the institution of schooling to not only teach the historical story of where we have been, who we are and who we will be, but to also analyze incongruities between the claims made within the national narrative and the historical, concrete realities that contradict and betray promises made (Nelson & Pang, 2001). West (1993) calls this "keeping track of human hypocrisy," which denotes that there exist "gaps between principles and practice, between promise and performance, between rhetoric and reality" (p. 5). One of the largest gaps between principle and practice in the US story has been the issues of race and racism.

In other words, many US citizens have not been permitted to share in the material rights and rewards generated out of the historical story due to their racial category, precluding them from taking a prominent place within the narrative, despite legal and political corrections made

in the most important US historical document, the Constitution. Simply, race permeates the US historical and present landscape.

> The United States has been extremely 'colour-conscious' society. From the very inception of the Republic to the present moment, race has been a profound determinant of one's political rights, one's location in the labor market, and indeed one's sense of identity. The hallmark of this history has been racism, not the abstract ethos of equality…all can bear witness to the tragic consequences of racial oppression (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 1)

Race has always been and will remain "at the center of the American experience" (Omni & Winant, 1994, p. 5), even as the national story claims otherwise.

The social studies, given its disciplinary inclusive nature, has from its inception as an academic field in the late 1800s, the potential to become a critical tool to explain how attitudes and beliefs about race have often led to anti-democratic exercises, such as the marginalization and oppression of non-whites within the US (Bell, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Nelson & Pang, 2001; Parker, 2001; Santora, 2001). To view the field in such a way precludes teachers, especially white teachers, from hiding behind the belief that they are but telling a neutral, factual story of historical events. This "neutral" narrative actually privileges a monocultural perspective (Geher, 1993) that makes itself visible (i.e. Anglo-European culture) and all other perspectives invisible or visible only on the periphery as a warning to the dominant culture. These peripheral forms of existence that counter the dominant white culture are considered a threat against true "Americans" (white, conservative, patriarchal, heterosexual, etc) and are to be "warred against," as evident in US cable television shows such as *O'Reilly Factor* and *Hannity* (both on Fox News Channel) and both of which have large audiences.

Within the institution of schooling and in the academic research, social studies has historically tended to ignore the theme of race in relation to the national narrative, specifically glossing over how some members of society not part of the Anglo-European, middle class, protestant temperament (Greven, 1977) have been silenced or relegated to victim status in the telling of the story. An effect is that races other than white (i.e. African-Americans, Native Americans) are depicted as groups acted upon by the forces and personalities of history rather than as actors within history. Simply, the "white male" character is preserved as the main protagonist of the national story, which is presented within the curriculum and in textbooks as a

chronological, linear story of great moral, political, technological, economic and even spiritual progress.

However, an analysis of the social studies field has exhibited a dearth of research into how race permeates how the national story is told in the curriculum and classroom (Chandler, 2007). In effect, mainstream social studies research perceives race in terms of a series of cause and effect events rather than as a persistent subtext of the whole narrative that has to a large degree defined US society and perpetuated a condition of being white as a form of property that provides special privileges (Harris, 1993; McIntosh, 1990; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005). Social studies as a discipline tends to approach race in US history as a problem dealt with and solved during the past, such as the Civil War (white man as the "great liberator") and again in the Civil Rights era (with the curriculum privileging the peaceful, or sanitized, version of the African-American voice, such as civil rights leader Martin Luther King, instead of the more threatening voice of Malcolm X). After each event, race disappears within the textual landscape of the "American" story and so from the minds of students, making social studies a "poor resource for enabling students to develop a discourse of contemporary race and ethnic relations that addresses institutional racism, structural inequality, and power" (Wills, 2001, p. 43). In constructing the social studies and the story of the US in this way, the important interactions between groups of people are hidden in plain sight, removed from the narrative and from analysis (Wills, 2001).

In an effort to address these issues, this article will explore the lack of research on the issue of race in social studies research and textbooks in relation to the US. We do not attempt to draw conclusions beyond the US because of our focus on national narratives and how those narratives play out in a racialized context, hence, precluding any claims beyond that particular context. We will interrogate the possible reasons why race, which should be an emphasized area of US social studies research and curriculum in both schools and in teacher preparation, is subsumed within a colour-blind framework rather than from a critical race theory (Harris, 1993) or critical multiculturalism (McCarthy, 1994) perspective that interrogates the racial component in the telling of the national narrative.

Race in social education research

Since its inception as a formal field of study, the expressed goal of the social studies has been that of *citizenship* education (Shaver, 1981). "Social studies, in the broadest sense, is the preparation of young people so that they posses the knowledge, skills, and values necessary for active participation in society" (Ross, 2001, p. 21).

This preparation involves the creation of narratives within social studies that carry certain moral goals of directing students to a model of what their relationship to the greater society should look like (Morrissett, 1981). As Geher identifies: "The success of the monocultural ideal was closely tied to the emerging role of the United States as a hegemonic power. This is expressed ideologically in the common pronouncement that the United States unified the West, completed the course of Western development, and set global standards of civilization in fierce rivalry with the Soviet Union" (1993, p. 509). In essence, the national narrative has always embodied some form of progress toward some great end or perfection. The archetype of US exceptionality brings forth the following ideas social studies teachers' pedagogy: (1) God is on our side, (2) civilization has been created from the wilderness, (3) Europeans have created order where disorder existed before, and (4) hard work, merit, and virtuous character pay off (Loewen, 1995). "For these unexcelled blessings, the pupil is urged to follow in the footsteps of his forbears, to offer unquestioning obedience to the law of the land, and to carry on the work begun" (Pierce, 1926, p. 113).

Hence, the history written has been a form of mytho-history constructed for individuals to embody (Geher, 1993; McNeill, 1986). For the colonial Puritans, it was the "errand into the wilderness" and a "city upon the hill" (Bercovitch, 1975); for the next era it was Enlightenment Progress; then Manifest Destiny; to the more recent belief in the US as the moral arbiter and protector of the world. The theme of US exceptionalism, and its subsequent protection of all the material rewards that its people feel they deserve, undergirds all of the mainstream stories as told through the social studies. However, conflict arises over the responsibility of social studies educators beyond that point: whether such narratives need to be merely recited, as in a history teacher's lecture pulled directly from a textbook or from pre-packaged curricula resources; or to tell the story, analyze it historically and interpret to what degree it has and continues to match concrete reality. Shaver (1981) defines the basic dilemma in this way: "How can the school contribute to the continuity of the society by preserving and passing on its traditions and values

while also contributing to appropriate social change by helping youth to question current social forms and solutions" (p. 125)? Given Shaver's (1981) acknowledgement of such foundational concerns, it is difficult to explain why social studies research has largely ignored race as a major persistent theme within the national story (Marri, 2001; Marshall, 2001; Pang, Rivera, & Gillette, 1998; Tyson, 2001). In fact an excellent recent work that appears to be an exception to the problem of race in relation to education in general in the US, Ross & Pang's (2006) edition of *Race, Ethnicity and Education,* actually confirms the problem. Those involved in the social studies scholarship in these important volumes have removed themselves from the mainstream of NCSS -- given its complete resistance to any such discussion of race -- and are now situated on the periphery so as to find any space to inquire into such controversial issues. Mainstream social studies research has failed to confront directly the issue of race in any meaningful way.

Telling is a review of the social studies literature from 1973 to the present in the premier US social studies research journal, *Theory and Research in Social Education* (*TRSE*), subsidized by NCSS, reveals a lack of scholarly inquiry into the different issues of race. Noticeably absent are the issues of race as a subject matter in the social studies curriculum, as well as how race shapes the classroom as a cultural space in which "whiteness" is privileged. In Ehman's (1998) extensive review of *TRSE* from 1973-1997, only 6% dealt with "social problems and controversial issues," of which race would be a part. An analysis of the years after 1997 to the present found the same persistent lack of research in general confronting "controversial issues" in *TRSE,* and in specific lack of racial analysis (Chandler, 2007). Nelson & Fernekes (1996) found that NCSS has a long history of not taking stands on significant social conflicts between those privileged within the dominant culture and those oppressed by it:

> The National Council for the Social Studies' record on civil rights can only be characterized as negligent at best and indifferent at worst. NCSS largely ignored the civil rights movement and in the process demonstrated indifference toward a social crisis of immense significance, one that challenged the very basis of democratic institutions and posed difficult questions for educators who daily had to confront the gap between the stated ideals and social experience. (p. 98)

Two recent volumes of social education research are instructive in how race is either situated on the margins or is sanitized and hidden within the large framework of colour-blind

multiculturalism and diversity (further examined below). *Critical Issues in Social Studies Teacher Education* (Adler, 2004) and *Critical Issues in Social Studies Research for the 21st Century* (Stanley, 2001) present race as a topic on the periphery of social studies thought and research. Of the 33 chapters that constitute these two volumes, written by the foremost scholars in the field of social studies research, five address the issue of race mostly as a subset of either urban and/or global education or as just one piece of multicultural education. The one chapter that examines race as an unavoidable thematic within the national narrative is Santora's (2001) work on cross-cultural dialogue. From this perspective, she addresses how socially constructed notions of race and whiteness define what the dominant culture believes is "normality," which in turn perpetuates the privileging of "whiteness" within education. Santora's analysis complements Nelson and Pang's (2001) findings of how within the social studies curriculum the national narrative fails to match the material reality of social studies classrooms. They identified that while the "root ideas of liberty, justice, and equality" (Nelson & Pang, 2001, p. 144) were spoken the actions of teacher and student betrayed the sentiment by failing to interrogate the contradictions that existed between words and deeds. "This is a sobering and disquieting scenario, one that illustrates that justice and equality are not the standards of US society, no matter the credo" (Nelson & Pang, 2001, p. 144).

While the mainstream social studies is quick to transmit the story of colonial resistance, the virtues of republicanism, superiority of "American" culture and Manifest Destiny, race and its central role in the creation of the US is disregarded (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lybarger, 1991). The danger of this is that a failure to confront the legacy of race in the US will preclude students from understanding how racial injustice continues even as legislative attempts at redress, such as affirmative action, are struck down as unnecessary in the present age. This leads to an absence of examining race within the social studies as an important determinant of US past, present and future. In fact, Nelson & Pang (2001) found in examination of the social studies curriculum and practice a field characterized by "dullness, vapidity, absolutism, censorship, and inaccuracy in the promotion of patriotic nationalism and conservative social values" (p. 152) that fails to interrogate claims of US moral certitude and self-righteousness.

This is even more problematic given the broad and powerful critique by Critical Race Theory (CRT), revealing how US history is a story of racialization in which the freedom of some was preserved through the enslavement and oppression of others through legal means (Dixon &

Rousseau, 2005; Harris, 1993; Roithmayer, 1999). Domestic and foreign policy of the US have been predicated on racial notions; from Native genocide, to African enslavement, to Jim Crow legislation, to Manifest Destiny (i.e. empire building), the history of the US is tied to the manifestation of racism and racist regimes (Howard, 2001). Also missing is any analysis on the interaction between the races. The social studies is the one discipline that could provide students with a language to "develop a discourse of contemporary race and ethnic relations that addresses institutional racism, structural inequality, and power" (Wills, 2001, p. 43). Instead, the social studies mentions certain groups of people (i.e. women, Native Americans, African Americans) without any reference to the superstructure of oppression that causes their situation and/or respective actions. This gives the impression that either oppression does not exist or that nothing can be done about it because history is perceived as pre-determined and progressive. In fact, case studies with white high school social studies teachers found that these teachers tended to *mention* certain facts involving those of non-Anglo European backgrounds (e.g. Civil Rights, Slavery, battles with Native American tribes). However, no context was ever provided concerning the tension of how race and racial attitudes generated a condition in which those groups claiming to celebrate and represent the best of US identity (e.g. equality, individual freedom, liberty, democracy) could in the same moment engage in acts of oppressing others who, while non-Anglo, wanted to embody the same national identity (Chandler, 2007).

The word *mentioned* is utilized here for two reasons. First, race was mentioned and framed in ways that structured the discussion as tangential to the "real" information (i.e. formal curriculum, textbook information, information to be tested). In their analysis of textbooks and the ideology behind textbooks, Apple and Christian-Smith (1991) speak of this process of "dominance by mentioning" (p. 10). In this construct, more progressive and inclusive ways of writing and structuring textbooks are adopted, but without changing the ideological and political structure of the textbooks. In this process "progressive items are perhaps mentioned, then, but not developed in depth" (p. 10). In short, textbooks and by extension teachers who use these textbooks, are in the process of homogenizing the curriculum of the social studies by including "outside" knowledge within the framework of dominant power groups. Bennett (1986) characterizes the process of domination via mentioning in the following way:

Dominant culture gains a purchase not in being imposed, as an alien external force, on to the cultures of subordinate groups, but by reaching into these cultures, reshaping them, hooking them and, with them, the people whose consciousness and experience is defined in their terms, into an association, with the values and ideologies of the ruling groups in society. Such processes neither erase the cultures of the subordinate groups, nor do they rob "the people" of their "true culture": what they do is shuffle those cultures on to an ideological and cultural terrain in which they can be disconnected from whatever radical impulses which may (but need not) have fuelled them and be connected to more conservative or, often, downright reactionary cultural and ideological tendencies. (p. 19)

Following the logic of the analysis of "mentioning," then, the teachers in Chandler's (2007) study taught from a prepared outline; students would take notes on this material and then be tested on their mastery of this material. Race, as a part of this mentioning process, was never a part of the formal outlines, the formal notes, or the formal testing of the class--in short, race was *mentioned*. However, it was only mentioned in that the individuals who were acting within the larger US mainstream narrative had black or red skin. The racist ideologies at work that connected those skin colours to other oppressive and inequitable institutional arrangements were never considered.

This is not to suggest that race-related topics in the textbook, such as the "Middle Passage," are not part of lesson plans or outlines. More importantly, the question becomes what sort of treatment do such events receive from a curriculum and pedagogy perspective? In Chandler's (2007) study The Middle Passage was taught in a way that students were to approach it technically -- "Middle Passage" as a term used to name (not describe) the "journey of African slaves to America on slave ships" without any descriptions or readings testifying to the experiences of "the cargo." This is a privileging of factual information (i.e. the name of the journey) over the experiential and/or human side of the transatlantic slave trade. It is a privileging of a textbook definition over a primary document, leaving students with technical knowledge only. Chandler (2007) reported that coupled with this technicist approach was a parallel discourse of equality and the inherent goodness of "America." This was part of the belief in Progress that runs through the national narrative. If an historical event surrounding race received "mentioning," this was quickly followed by statements concerning the inherent fairness of the US state (Chandler, 2007). These statements (such as "we're getting closer to the goal of freedom for everyone") acknowledged wrong doing in the past, but that the US had progressed

beyond such racism and has come closer to the "ideal" of colour-blindness in which all would be treated according to merit due to the leveling of the playing field. In this way, even mainstream social studies curricula can be seen as a way of speaking about non-mainstream ideas in US history, but in a way that is still tethered to the dominant stories of Progress and virtue of our "uniquely" "American" institutions. Through the co-option of Other histories into the core dominant story, many items are added to the margins, while the dominant narrative, and how it is used, remains unchanged (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991).

Making this situation more difficult in the schools is the over reliance on texts within the social studies, which reduce the national narrative to a litany of dates and factoids that preclude any real interrogation of how and for whom the story has been constructed.

Race, Social Studies Curriculum, and Texts

Social studies and US history K-12 textbooks are conservative cultural artifacts (Anyon, 1979; Wade, 1993) that serve as the major instructional resource in the classroom to transmit the national story and identity (Loewen, 1995; McKnight, 2003). In fact, Gay's (2003) research of social studies teacher education textbooks over a seven-year-period discovered that all of the textbooks under examination did not confront race and racism as an important topic in American history. Gay (2003) found that social studies textbooks excluded contemporary instances of racism. Race, as a topic in these methods textbooks, was presented at best as a minor point within other politically more palatable organizing themes.

Traditional historical accounts attempt to obscure the narrative qualities and elements of the national story by characterizing textbook history as 1) neutral, the facts without political ideologies attached, 2) using journalistic (re. clear and concise) rather than technical language, and 3) presenting the "real" historical actors (i.e. stories that professional historians supposedly "uncovered" through scholarly investigation as the historical actors lived it) (White, 1997). This so-called social scientific account of history obscures that texts are, as much as anything else, highly political creations that represent the authors' ideological beliefs concerning the meaning of the national story and the identity attached to that story (McKnight, 2003; Seixas, 2000). "The narrator of the past 'reality' orders 'facts' into the form of a story emplotted as desired, at times names the politically possible as 'reality' in order to establish mythic continuity with the past" (Braun, 1997, p. 423).

Social studies texts fail to acknowledge that historical interpretations of the past are always human constructions open to amendment and debate (Fehn & Koeppen, 1998). Texts not only distort the past, but re-create it as well. This is not to claim that the historical stories are inevitably wrong, inaccurate or harmful. The stories serve a purpose of passing on what a nation perceives should be its best qualities and symbolic representations as well as provides ethical characters through which a democratic identity can be built. Historical stories, first written in the US by colonial Puritans, who layered their early histories with each act fitting into a divine mission (McKnight, 2003), are powerful in that they present a kind of typology through which individuals construct identity within the social context. However, when the stories make invisible past and present wrongs to deny or hide the privileges possessed by the storyteller (Solomon, et al., 2005), then the texts become oppressive. This condition is even more significant and important in the preparation of social studies educators; for they will be the ones choosing to either just transmit or transmit and interrogate the stories of US ideology and identity.

The inherent message is that race and racism are not important enough for inclusion in the social studies curriculum and texts except as unfortunate acts perpetrated by misguided individuals of long ago and that have been rectified. This condition persists for various reasons. Anti-intellectualism within teacher education programs in general is one good indicator. Much of the focus in teacher preparation programs is on the technical acts of teaching, presented as neutral and apolitical rather than as perpetuating any form of continued institutional racism (Pinar, 2004). Laid over the technical machinations of pedagogy is the mainstream metanarrative of the US as the only true harbor of freedom (VanSledright & Afflerbach, 2000), an entrenched notion that resists interrogation. This is especially true for the social studies.

Instead, texts in both the university setting as well in the public schools emphasize the "uninterrogated populist ideals of progress and individual perfectibility" (Cary, 2001, p. 409), which play into the belief in US as a nation that has overcome any racial issues, has realized a true merit based reward system, and as such has achieved colour-blind status. As CRT research has made evident (Dixon & Rousseau, 2005; Harris, 1993), colour-blindness is an ideology based on notions of an ideal meritocracy deeply entrenched within the US historical narrative. The story emerges out of the notion that the Declaration of Independence deemed all people as being equal and that their pursuit of life, liberty and happiness must be protected. Therefore, if an individual wants to achieve something and is willing to work hard enough, becomes self-reliant,

sober, punctual, entrepreneurial, etc, then *he* will be an "American" success story irrespective of any racial barriers and conditions systematically embedded within US institutional life. Within this language, race becomes a "malady": "[R]ace, within the scheme of whiteness, is seen as a malady. That is, if we accept the notion of whiteness as normal, then any person who is *not white* is abnormal. Thus, within polite, middle class mores, it is impolite to see when someone is *different*, abnormal, and thus, *not white*. Hence, it is better to ignore, or become colour-blind, than to notice that people of colour have the physical malady of skin colour, or *not whiteness*" (Dixon & Rousseau, 2005, p. 16).

African-Americans are not the only race to suffer from such narratives. Native Americans are poorly represented in social studies curricula except as stereotypes: "The residual guilt over how this country has evolved, where Native peoples have been massacred and fought, cheated, and robbed of their historical lands, coupled with the privileges that accrued from that evolution, creates an unwillingness to look past the stereotypes and misinformation, to a more realistic, accurate portrayal of this country's past" (Rains, 2003, p. 203).

Historically, mainstream history textbooks and popular culture have treated Native Americans as enemies of the state or as savages that were inferior in culture and/or race (Ayers, 1997; Deloria, 1997; Rains, 2006). Native American history is relegated to the "pre" history time period, the time period before Europeans began their military conquest (Zinn, 2005; Zinn, 2004) of the Americas. This placement of Native American history also pushes the achievements of indigenous peoples to the margins in favor of the achievements of European society (i.e. "Western Civilization"). History texts in schools present an empty American continent awaiting the arrival of Europeans; "people want to believe that the Western hemisphere…was a vacant, unexploited, fertile, land waiting to be put under cultivation according to God's holy dictates" (Deloria, 1997, p. 67). This struggle represents the ability to define and control the canon of thought (Baraka, 2000; Greene, 1993) in the social studies; the selection and use of certain materials outside the textbook materials can be viewed as subversive and anti-American (Gordon, 2001). Anticipated backlash from community members for teaching these types of materials can thwart controversial topics from being taught in social studies classes (Agee, 2004; Chalmers, 1997; Chandler, 2006; Mitchell, Evans, Daly, & Roach, 1997).

Military conquest of the Americas is portrayed in sanitized versions in which the details of genocide and mass murder are *whitewashed* for public school consumption (Loewen, 1995).

This story of betrayal and conquest by European invaders (Spanish, English, French, Russians, Dutch, Swedish, etc.) into the Americas is usually explained in terms of land seekers and Manifest Destiny (i.e. formal nation-state logic), thus erasing the stories of deceit and murder that accompanied these politico-military ventures. The possibility that "most American colonies were founded by terrorists" (Murrin, 1990, p. 10), especially given the current usage of the term terrorist, is never even discussed in American history classrooms. Usually textbook accounts of Native Americans end with the Massacre (some textbooks euphemistically call this a battle) at Wounded Knee in 1890. After mentioning this particular massacre, most mainstream textbooks omit Native Americans from the 20th century (Rains, 2003). Kailin (2002) points out that this condition is due to a lack of racialized curriculum for teacher and student alike, leading to the problematic situation in which white teachers, who constitute the majority of the teaching workforce, live in a "symbolic universe that is white'" (p. 115). Social studies teachers, a large majority of who are white, fail to recognize they have been educated toward "racial chauvinism or superiority that is reflected in their worldview and their teaching" (Kailin, 2002, p. 17). This means the curriculum becomes skewed to privilege the teller of the story, who may not even be aware of that privilege and would deny it by pointing to the story's idealization of freedom and equality.

Students of history, like writers of history, come to the classroom with personal, racial, cultural and class lenses through which US history is filtered (Epstein & Shiller, 2005). The "background" is given definition by the dominant culture, which in the US means that one is expected to view the world from "white" eyes. This "whiteness" as normative framework makes it difficult for a critical approach to social studies to produce any meaningful impact on the standard curriculum. As such, students tend to leave formal schooling, and this includes the university, with the impression that race, as a determining factor in one's life, is of no consequence (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; McIntyre, 1996; Solomon, et al., 2005). In addition to receiving non-critical instruction vis-à-vis race, many teachers, by utilizing colour-blind, meritocratic paradigms and narratives when teaching history are "often complicit with the very thing they are criticizing" (West, 1993, p. 6).

This avoidance of race in social studies classrooms and schools in general leads to teachers and administrators deciding what the definition of race should be for students; "when teachers affirm that race is irrelevant either by audible words or by their silence about race, they

reveal perhaps unwitting, racist assumptions that all people are alike" (Branch, 2001, p. 110-111). Racism in this position has been individualized to the point that people are shielded from the notion that racism occurs on cultural, legal and systemic levels, and that it is supported by the status quo on those levels (Wildman & Davis, 1997). To ignore race and its appearance in society and school allows the perception that race does not matter, and that failures (of a group or person) are due to innate deficiencies within that particular person, rather than allowing for systemic evaluation of the status quo. The colour-blind philosophy has created a situation in which whites are unable to understand that people of colour have more institutional and individual barriers than they do (Blau, 2003; Dixon & Rousseau, 2005).

When teachers treat race in particular ways (i.e. remain silent, give it partial treatment, and represent 'Others' experiences through "white eyes") they are operating from the right to define the story. It is based on the premise that "someone has more of a right to state what they think the world looks like and to coerce others into agreeing with that view" (Armstrong & Ng, 2005, p. 32). In other words, it sustains the power of the storyteller, who historically in the classroom has been and continues to be white, especially in elementary grades, even as the overall racial and ethnic makeup of the US shifts. And this powerful position is made all the more problematic when the story itself serves to defend dominant white images (DiPardo & Fehn, 2000; Chalmers, 1997) even as it claims to have overcome racism and achieved "colour-blind" status, hence enabling the dominant culture of whiteness to remain intact and not confront race as a compelling problem in US history as well as in the present. This condition preserves the story of the US as a "white" story, even as multicultural education theorists attempt to gain access to the story for "people of colour."

Race Subsumed Under the Umbrella of a Colour-blind Multiculturalism

Multiculturalism began as a response to the overwhelming monoculturalism that constituted schools and school curriculum since the beginning of common schools. Multiculturalism has never possessed just one critique or one voice and hence has not been comprised of theoretical position. Instead, there are many multiculturalisms. In US mainstream social studies and in school texts, the kind of multiculturalism embraced has at its foundations conflicting aspirations — to acknowledge that differences exist, but to hope that these differences eventually disappear as all US citizens have the opportunity to assimilate into the US narrative of equality and meritocracy. Meaning, there is the belief that the playing field on the

road to the "American dream" will truly be leveled, allowing all to compete and get what he or she deserves based on innate talent and/or hard work. In other words, this multicultural position seeks colour-blindness to the point that the social studies only addresses race, as discussed above, in terms of events passed and solved.

This has been problematic for many different reasons: 1) race is perceived as add on to the "real" curricular narrative that is tested and measured as significant information; 2) racial oppression in past and present created by the dominant discourse is not unpacked and interrogated; 3) white privilege is maintained, despite the desire otherwise and despite differences being acknowledged. In fact, in a 1992 study, Titus reported that social studies teachers in the US acknowledged positively the usefulness of multicultural education and that multicultural activities and ideas should be "added" on to the curriculum. However, the teachers said there was not time or resources by which to include more to what is already demanded of them. Titus's (1992) study presented the most nonthreatening and mainstream notion of multiculturalism possible, and yet still exemplifies the difficulty of infusing race into the social studies curriculum. Any changes are perceived as adding on to the traditional curriculum rather than transforming it. Also, teachers understood multiculturalism in terms how to best transmit the national narrative to diverse students rather than make critical curricular changes that speak of past and present institutional, legal and economic racism. This paradigm makes it extremely difficult to systematically and critically examine race in American society and education. At best, race, as a subject proper, is being subsumed under the umbrella of a particular type of multicultural education (Cary, 2001), which recognizes certain aspects of cultural differences (e.g. dress, music, art, food, sometimes language), but which then favors notions of assimilation, integration and colour-blindness (Bonilla-Silva, 2003; Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas 1995; Gibson, 2006; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Tate, 1997) .

In fact, within the social studies, Marshall (2003) points out that the NCSS's *Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education* intentionally excluded race and racism as subjects in the hopes that race would disappear: "We rarely used the term race in the first edition, perhaps because of our vain hope that silence would facilitate racism's disappearance" (as cited in Marshall, 2003, p. 80). Radical critique of multicultural education points to a paucity of attention given to the development of theories dealing with race as a form of institutional power and privilege (Sleeter, 2001, 1999). This mentality continues despite research critiques revealing

the stubborn persistence of race as a contentious and significant aspect of the national story, one that has indelibly shaped the US experience (Dixon & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings, 2003; Solomon, et al., 2005; West, 2001).

US social studies main national organization, the NCSS, often attaches the term "diversity" to any discussion of multiculturalism. "Diversity" has become a term less politically divisive by defining all differences as equal, hence, obscuring race as a stand alone topic relative to social education (Marshall, 2001). Rather than using the word "race," in the multicultural standards, NCSS's official documents (1976/1991) employ the terms "people of colour" and "diversity," giving the impression that race as a curricular topic could be covered. However, the standards (developed in 1976 but revised and rewritten by James Banks, along with an NCSS taskforce, in 1991), instead address the sorts of questions that should be asked and types of resources given when teaching "diverse" students. There is no discussion of a critical content concerning the nature of race in the US and its significant part played in the national story as told through the various social studies disciplines. In other words, the national story remains in place, but with a clearer picture of how "people of colour" can participate. As Branch (2001) points out, the core curriculum does not change; "evidence suggests that students are not learning much about race and racism in their social studies classes" (p. 99).

According to critical race theory research (e.g. Dixon & Rousseau, 2005), this mainstream form of multiculturalism is palatable to most as it seeks colour-blindness as an ideal (Crenshaw et al., 1995) and is presented as an expression of an enlightened and progressive US consciousness that has overcome discrimination based on skin color. Colour-blindness follows the Jeffersonian notion of a meritocracy, which functions within the national narrative that all individuals have the opportunity to rise above his or her station in life if willing to work hard, sacrifice and achieve above his or her peers. This is the "American" promise of the dominant culture of the white, middle class symbolic rhetoric. It is also a highly politicized strategy of the dominant culture to obscure what amounts to a maintenance of racial hierarchies. As Crenshaw et al. (1995) report, this acknowledging diversity while embedding white norms as rationalized lens by which all should view the world, has found favor with the judicial courts.

The courts, according to Gotanda (1991) employ a "formal-race" definition of race, which constructs "black and white as … neutral, apolitical descriptions reflecting merely 'skin color' or country of origin" and so is "unrelated to ability, disadvantage, or moral culpability. Moreover

formal-race categories are unconnected to social attributes such as culture, education, wealth or language" (Gotanda, 1991, p.4). Crenshaw *et al*. (1995) echo Gotanda and note that such a disconnection from the material reality of US daily existence creates bulkheads against possible change and hence, sustains the privileges afforded to those of the white race. By not providing historical and social context, an effect of colour-blind ideology is the supporting of continued inequities. The upshot of this strategy is that the dominant white culture can then point to any Other and claim that this Other cannot use his or her skin colour as an "excuse" for not "acting white," or "normal." Hence, diversity (meaning different colours of skin) are fine as long as all are willing to maintain harmony, which translates into all willing to be "normal." The obvious definition here of "normal" is to be white, and to be white is to have overcome any sense of racial prejudice. According to this "white" perspective, then, racism is something perpetrated by ignorant and evil individuals rather than mainstream, middle-class, white society. In other words, the idea of fighting racial injustice was integrated into the national narrative, and as such into the mainstream psyche, to constitute thinking that upheld the notions of fairness and equality but that did not radically challenge the structural status quo or the underlying causes of this racist nation—it (i.e. traditional civil rights movement) treated "the exercise of racial power as rare and aberrational rather than as systemic and ingrained" (Crenshaw, et al., 1995, p. xiv). By stressing that racism was a personal decision that was committed by people who were either ignorant or disturbed, mainstream society could absolve itself of participation in a previously more radical movement. This suggests that this mindset allows a "broad cultural mainstream both explicitly to acknowledge the fact of racism and, simultaneously, to insist on its irregular occurrence and limited significance…it serves to legitimize the basic myths of American meritocracy" (Crenshaw, et al., 1995, p. xiv).

This condition speaks to mainstream multiculturalism's desire to maintain harmony in the face of diversity, a position that the NCSS multicultural standards take and finds expression through colour-blind approaches, thwarts the original multicultural mission:

> The most difficult question concerns the kind of difference that is acknowledged and engaged. Difference seen as benign variation (diversity), for instance, rather than as conflict, struggle or the threat of disruption, bypasses power as well as history to suggest a harmonious, empty pluralism. On the other hand, difference defined as asymmetrical and incommensurate cultural spheres situated within hierarchies of domination and

resistance cannot be accommodated within a discourse of "harmony in diversity" (Mohanty, 1993, p. 43).

Such a homogenization of difference serves to protect the power of the dominant culture. This misrecognition of white supremacy by white teachers is not a racist aspect of teachers specifically, but rather of the entire white society. White teachers construct race in the classroom in a variety of ways based on personal theories and backgrounds. Research suggests that white teachers, when trying to conceptualize race in the classroom, do so through what Sleeter (2005) calls the "ethnicity theory." Through this theory, which runs through all of the three paradigms, teachers subscribe to the notion that societal success is open and that hard work will lead to a higher standard of living – the story of Progress and meritocracy as told through the social studies. This is a much easier story to tell for white teachers as it does not force white administrators, students and parents to question their own position of privilege or confront the fear of giving up the privilege of white normativity.

As pointed out above, much of this conflict within social education can be traced back to multicultural educations three main paradigms: assimilationist, integrationist, and cultural pluralist (Kailin, 2002). To varying extents the field of US social studies has adopted these models and attempted to integrate each into the national narrative. The effect has been to perpetuate a monolithic perspective. The assimilationist notion of schooling has been embedded within the US dominant narrative as told by the social studies from early on. The main objective of this paradigm is to force disparate cultures into the "mythical American melting pot" (Kailin, 2002, p. 48). All migrating to participate in the "American dream" were expected to shed the Old World cultural heritage, language and customs and adopt "American" (re white, protestant, middle class, and patriarchal) culture, an almost overwhelming and forbidding transition for persons of non-Northern European descent.

The integrationist model stresses changing the political structure so that minorities are allowed to participate in civil and social institutions. This model deviates from assimilationism in that differences are acknowledged, but responsibility for adjustment is placed on those constructed as "other," meaning not of the dominant group. This model also takes a hands-off approach to dealing with the lived reality of minorities. Instead, emphasis is placed on equal access to institutional life in the US. However, assumptions within this model lead to type of achievement gap complaints heard from the dominant culture (Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003).

The logic follows that if minorities can attend the same schools, restaurants, movie theatres, and so forth, then why are they not achieving on test at the same levels as whites? This paradigm provides a façade that all is well once superficial equality has been provided, leaving the deep-rooted structure of racism untouched and even hardened.

The cultural pluralist model strives towards tolerance and appreciation of cultural/racial differences. "It calls for mutual accommodation in order to enhance productivity in the economy, the workplace, the schools, and other institutions" (Kailin, 2002, p. 48). The major problem with this model is that cultural difference is assumed to be something that would eventually fade away as people became more and more assimilated into US culture (Kailin, 2002).

In each of these models, race, originally a core tenet of multicultural education, has been pushed to the margins because "the meaning of multicultural education has a great deal to do with *who* is doing the defining and, in a more pragmatic sense, *who* is actually implementing the multicultural perspective" (McIntyre, 1997, p. 11). In terms of actual school implementation, the who is the social studies teacher, a predominantly white, male group. These individuals are guided by NCSS, which determines the definition of multiculturalism through its research agendas and political relationships with other national educational organizations.

The NCSS has appropriated parts of each model in an attempt to satisfy all of its constituents and not create political tension on a national scale. However, the effect has been to create a kind of multiculturalism that only addresses race from a colour blind (Bonilla-Silva, 2003), merit based perspective that diminishes the significance of race in the telling of the national story. While cultural or racial differences in the US may be acknowledged, "the tensions between and among these differences is rarely interrogated, presuming a unity of difference," (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 48). Such a pedagogical and curricular approach fails largely because it reduces "difference to pluralism and attempt to erase racial power while simultaneously holding onto inherited privilege" (Chalmers, 1997, p. 68).

In other words, multicultural education within social studies relative to race tends not to interrogate the context of race and culture, giving rise to the above mentioned white-as-normal universe. Multicultural education, whether it is infused into university settings or in K-12 public school often fails to give students a "critical analysis of the socioeconomic context" of how race manifests itself in education and society (Kailin, 2002, p. 23). A multicultural education initiative that neglects the context and lived outcomes of racism usually devolves into broad

mission statements about celebrating or appreciating diversity, without any real critical dialogue taking place (DiPardo & Fehn, 2000; Kailin, 2002). Marable (2002) advocates the need to look at this condition more closely: "[W]e should be theorizing about the social processes of racialization, of how certain groups in U.S. society have been relegated to an oppressed status, by the weight of law, social policy, and economic exploitation" (p. 10).

The notion of "critical dialogue" is significant, as it may provide some insight as to how a more "critical" and robust form of multiculturalism can generate ways out of the mainstream. In terms of social studies, the tenets of critical race theory may provide some of the best means by which to attain the goals of infusing race into the national story.

Critical Race Theory and Telling Stories of Resistance

Any attempt by social educators to interrupt the normalizing discourses of social studies proper (Stanley & Longwell, 2004), must begin with encouraging more research into the specific ways race can become a major thematic within the telling of the national story. It cannot be just about changing teaching strategies or just about curriculum, but a basic shift in both. Two themes around which critical multiculturalism and critical race theory both orbit are the notions of voice, (i.e. to disrupt the mainstream narrative by bringing into the critical dialogue the voice and experience of the oppressed) (Dixon & Rousseau, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995) and "stories of resistance" (McKnight & Chandler, 2009). So often, students are unaware that there were slave revolts and that there was great conflict over the race question at the very origins of the US. Instead, students perceive non-Anglo inhabitants of the continent as faceless and voiceless objects that were acted upon as the Anglo-Europeans "discovered" and "inhabited," and "civilized" the "wilderness."

This is not to suggest that teaching a new narrative is a curricular panacea to the racist forms of social education that are now in place, but rather to serve as a foundational piece to an antiracist pedagogy (Fishman & McCarthy, 2005; Gibson, 2006; Howard, 2001) within the social studies. Gilborn (2000) warns against essentialized and simplified notions of what this pedagogical move entails:

> There is no blueprint for successful anti-racism, no one "correct" way. What succeeds at one time, or in one context, may not be appropriate at a later date or in another context. Racism changes; it works differently through different processes…and changes with

particular institutional contexts. Anti-racism must recognize and adapt to this complexity. (p. 486)

In terms of classroom practice, this would involve such curricular decisions as reading, discussing (Parker, 2006), interacting with and interrogating with first person voices of the past in a way that would reveal the social and racial dynamics precluding these oppressed individuals from participating in promises made. One hears often how social studies teachers want their students to know what it was like within a given historical milieu. But their theoretical approaches to the curriculum and pedagogy of such an activity contradict this desire: they give a monological lecture (Chandler, 2007); they send students to the Internet to find sources, who end up on commercial websites that just replicate the factoids of traditional historical texts (Robinson & McKnight, 2007); they give students primary documents, but no social theory or historical lens by which to interpret. For example, in teaching the Middle Passage, do teachers and teacher educators tell the story of the trans-Atlantic slave trade in ways that involve the voices of the people who experienced it? Do they discuss how racial attitudes and economics become intertwined? Or do they have students simply "learn" the definition of what Middle Passage "means?" Obviously, a more complex and robust way of teaching the Middle Passage would be to *allow* students to read first hand accounts of the horror of this episode and for the teacher to possess a critical historical lens to help students interpret and learn from these events. From the perspective of teacher education, this "type" of education would be a focal part of the social education agenda in schools of education. This type of discussion (i.e., *how* to teach the voices of resistance) would be an integral part of the ubiquitous "methods" class that is taught as a formal part of teacher education programs. In fact, race from a critical perspective would advocate that racism should be viewed as a normal outgrowth of living in the United States—a country in which race has played the central role in social settings since the inception of the country. And if race is understood as this sort of social construction, then race can be transformed into a means toward truly achieving the notions of fair and equitable, just not from a colour-blind perspective.

Oftentimes, university methods classes created to prepare social studies teachers are grounded in paradigms (Ladson-Billings, 2003) reflecting conservative, race-less, and technocratic ways of seeing education that stresses uniformity and standardization, rather than the struggling with epistemological and curricular questions of "whose" knowledge is allowed to

"count." And within the narrative of US history (i.e. social education) whose "race" gets to "count" is of obvious historical and contemporary importance. This would require of teacher education programs to "rearticulate whiteness" (Aveling, 2006; Gibson, 2006; Solomon et al., 2005) for teacher candidates as a focal part of their preparation.

Social studies methods classes, as traditionally conceptualized, ignore race and its impact on society and schooling as it unfolds in America. For professors of social education, this requires teaching explicitly race based "lessons" that go against the established order of accepted topics as they historically have been taught within social studies methods classes. It is a form of resistance that professors (and their students, who will become teachers) must engage in if they are to give their students access to different ways of thinking about the racial world as it applies to social studies curricula. After all, how can we expect our students (i.e., future teachers) to resist the formal (i.e., racist, classist) curriculum if we are not willing to, in some sense of the word, go first (Gibson, 2006)?

This constitutes a willingness of social education professors in the US and colleges of education writ large, to resist the paradigms of sameness and order and adhere to a more complicated and, at times, more ambiguous version of what the national story and how it will be represented to the world. Teacher education programs across the US are implicit contributors to the racial status quo within school settings, particularly within the area of social education. If we are educating social studies teachers to teach in race-less ways that assume the "freedom-quest" (VanSledright & Afflerbach, 2000) narrative as the one true story of America, we are guilty of erasing the voices of the oppressed and helping to obscure a more inclusive education from students in public schools in this country.

Teacher preparatory programs should "ensure that there are strategies that the candidates can employ to facilitate their movement towards more critical discourses such as anti-racism…critical race pedagogy" (Solomon et al., 2000, p. 165). This reconceptualization will need to take place within colleges of education, in textbooks (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Aronowitz & Giroux, 1991; Loewen, 1995; Sleeter & Grant, 1991), and in the ways that we holistically conceptualize the social studies. Inherent in this type of education for future teachers, method as well as methodology would constitute a major philosophical underpinning of this project. What have been ignored in these types of classes for so long are the methodological questions that deal with "why." Why should we teach race in social studies classes? Why do we

do schooling in this way? Why are schools oppressive for some students? Why is the social studies curriculum framed in these ways? All of these questions must be addressed within social studies research if the sediment of technocratic, positivist, and universal discourses in social education is to be broken. Can we instead produce global thinking citizens who will fight systemic inequalities and injustice, supposedly a core value of US democratic thinking? As Rains (1998, p. 95) warns: "To keep silent is to contribute to cultural hegemony, to contribute to certain forms of domination to leave value systems that sustain certain power structures in place."

References

Adler, S. (Ed.). (2004). *Critical issues in social studies teacher education.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Agee, J. (2004). Negotiating a teaching identity: An African American teacher's struggle to teach in test-driven contexts. *Teachers College Record, 106*(4)*, 747-774.

Anyon, J. (1979). Ideology and United States History Textbooks. *Harvard Educational Review, 49* (3), 361-386.

Apple, M., & Christian-Smith, L. (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.

Armstrong, J., & Ng, R. (2005). Deconstructing race, deconstructing racism. In J. Lee & J. Lutz (Eds.), *Situating "race" and racisms in space, time, and theory: Critical essays for activists and scholars* (30-45). Montreal: McGill's-Queens University Press.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (1991). Textual authority, culture, and the politics of literacy. In M. Apple & L. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook* (78-102). New York: Routledge.

Aveling, N. (2006). 'Hacking at our very roots': rearticulating White racial identity within the context of teacher education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 9* (3), 261-274.

Ayers, W. C. (1997). Racing in America. In M. Fine, L. Powell, L. Weis, & M. Wong (Eds.). *Off white: Readings in race, power, and society* (129-136). New York: Routledge.

Baraka, A. (2000). Multinational, multicultural America versus white supremacy. In M. Marable (Ed.), *Dispatches from the ebony tower: Intellectuals confront the African American experience* (236-240). New York: Columbia University Press.

Bell, D. (2004). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, T. (1986). The politics of the 'popular' and popular culture. In T. Bennett, C. Mercer, & J. Woolacott (Eds.), *Popular culture and social relations* (p. 19). New York: Open University Press.

Bercovitch, S. (1975). *The puritan origins of the American self*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bercovitch, S. (1978). *The American jeremiad*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.

Blau, J.R. (2003). *Race in the schools: Perpetuating white dominance?* Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2003). *Racism without racists: Colourblind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Branch, A. (2001). A look at race in the national standards for the social studies: Another bad check. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 99-122). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Braun, R. (1997). The holocaust and problems of representation. In R. Jenkins (Ed.), *The postmodern history reader* (418-425). New York: Routledge.

Cary, L.J. (2001). The refusals of citizenship: Normalizing practices in social education discourses. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 29*(3), 405-430.

Chalmers, V. (1997). White out: Multicultural performances in a progressive school. In M. Fine, L. Powell, L. Weis, & M. Wong (Eds.). *Off white: Readings in race, power, and society* (66-78). New York: Routledge.

Chandler, P. (2006). Academic freedom: A teacher's struggle to include "Other" voices in history. *Social Education, 70*(6), (354-357).

Chandler, P. (2007). White teachers, social studies, and race: A case study of the intersection of teachers' habitus and pedagogy (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 2007). *Submitted to ProQuest Dissertations for Dissemination.*

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G. & Thomas, K. (Eds) (1995). *Critical race theory: the key writings that formed the movement* (New York: The New Press).

Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education (1991). Prepared by the NCSS Task Force on Ethnic Studies Curriculum Guidelines, Adopted by NCSS Board of Directors, 1976, revised 1991, http://www.socialstudies.org/positions/multicultural. Accessed October, 2007.

Deloria, V. (1997). *Red earth: White lies: Native Americans and the myth of scientific fact.* Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishers.

DiPardo, A. & Fehn, B. (2000). Depoliticizing multicultural education: The return to normalcy in a predominately white high school. *Theory and Research in Social Education. 28*(2), 170-192.

Dixon, A. & Rousseau, C. (2005). And we are still not saved: critical race theory in education ten years later. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8* (1), 7–27.

Ehlman, L.H. (1998). Trends in *Theory and Research in Social Education* from 1973 to 1997: Implications for goals and process. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *26*(2), 238-257.

Epstein, T. & Shiller, J. (2005). Perspective matters: Social identity and the teaching and learning of national history. *Social Education, 69*(4), 201-204.

Fehn, B. & Koeppen, K.E. (1998). Intensive document-based instruction in a social studies methods course and student teachers' attitudes and practices in subsequent field experiences. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 26*(4)*, 461-484.

Fishman, S. and McCarthy, L. (2005). Talk about race: when student stories and multicultural curricula are not enough. *Race Ethnicity and Education (8)*4, 347–364.

Gay, G. (2003). Deracialization in social studies teacher education textbooks. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (123-148). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Geyer, M. (1993). Multiculturalism and the politics of general education. Critical Inquiry (19) 3, 499-533.

Gibson, R. (2006). Against racism and irrationalism: Toward and integrated movement of class struggle in schools and out. In E. Wayne Ross, Valerie Ooka Pang (Eds.) *Race, Ethnicity and Education* (Vol. 4) (43-85), Greenwood Press. New York: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Gilborn, D. (2000). Anti-racism: From theory to praxis. In B. Moon, S. Brown, & M. Ben-Pertez (Eds.), *International companion to education* (476-488). London: Routledge Press.

Gordon, B. M. (2001). Knowledge construction, competing critical theories, and education. In J. Banks & C. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (184-199). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gotanda, N. (1991). A critique of 'Our constitution is color-blind." *Stanford Law Review*, *44*, 1-68.

Greene, M. (1993). Diversity and inclusion: Toward a curriculum for human beings. *Teachers College Record, 95*(2)*, 211-221.

Greven, P. (1977). *The protestant temperament*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Harris, C. (1993).Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review, 106* (8), 1707-1791.

Howard, T. (2001). The dis(g)race of the social studies: The need for racial dialogue in the social studies. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies:*

The profession, policies, and curriculum (27-44). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Kailin, J. (2002). *Antiracist education: From theory to practice.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Ladson-Billings, G. & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education, *Teachers College Record, 97 (1), 47-68.*

Ladson-Billings, G. (2003) *Critical race theory perspectives on the social studies and critical race theory: The Profession, Policies, and Curriculum.* Information Age Publishing.

Loewen, J.W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your American history textbook got wrong.* New York: The New Press.

Lybarger, M.B. (1991). The historiography of social studies: Retrospect, circumspect, and prospect. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.). *Handbook on research on social studies teaching and learning* (3-15). New York: Macmillan.

Marable, M. (2002). *The great wells of democracy: The meaning of race in American life*. New York: Basic Civitas Books.

Marri, A. (2001). Race, social studies, and the world wide web. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (247-270). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Marshall, P.L. (2001). The persistent deracialization of the agenda for democratic citizenship education: Twenty years of rhetoric and unreality in social studies position statements. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (71-98). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

McCarthy, C. (1994). Multicultural discourses and curriculum reform: A critical perspective. *Educational Theory, 44*(1).

McIntosh, P. (1990), White privilege: unpacking the invisible knapsack, *Independent School*, Winter, 31-36.

McIntyre, A. (1997). *Making meaning of whiteness: Exploring racial identity with white teachers.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

McIntyre, A. (1996). Constructing an image of a white teacher. *Teachers College Record, 98*(4), 653-681.

McNeill, W. (1986). *Mythistory and other essays.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

McKnight, D. (2003). *Schooling, the Puritan imperative, and the molding of an American national identity: Education's errand into the wilderness*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McKnight, D. and Chandler, P. (2009). Social studies and the social order: Telling stories of resistanc*e. Teacher Education Quarterly*, *36* (1), pp. 59-75.

Mitchell, G., Evans, S., Daly, J., & Roach, P. (1997). Academic freedom and the preparation of social studies teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 25*(1)*,* 54-66.

Mohanty, C. T. (1993). *Beyond a dream: Deferred multicultural education and the politics of excellence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Morrissett, I. (1981). The needs of the future and the constraints of the past. In H. Mehlinger & O.L. Davis (Eds.), *The social studies: The eightieth yearbook of the national society for the study of education* (36-59). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Murrin, J. M. (1990). Beneficiaries of catastrophe. In E. Foner (Ed.), *The new American history* (3-23). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Nelson, J.L. & Fernekes, W.R. (1996). NCSS and social crises. In O.L. Davis (Ed.), *NCSS in retrospect: Bulletin 92* (89-101). Washington, DC: NCSS.

Nelson, J. L. & Pang, V. O. (2001). Racism, prejudice, and the social studies curriculum. In E.W. Ross (Eds.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (143-162). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1994). *Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s.* New York: Routledge.

Pang, V., Rivera, J., & Gillette, M. (1998). Can CUFA be a leader in the national debate on racism? *Theory and Research in Social Education. 26*(3), 430-436.

Parker, W.C. (2001). Toward enlightened political engagement. In W. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (pp. 97-118). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Parker, W.C. (2006). Public discourses in schools: Purposes, Problems, Possibilities. *Educational Researcher, 35*(8), 11-18.

Pierce, B. L. (1926). *Public opinion and the teaching of history in the United States*. New York: Knopf Publishers.

Pinar, W.F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Rains, F. (1998). Is the benign really harmless: Deconstructing some "benign" manifestations of operationalized white privilege. In J. Kincheloe, S. Steinberg, N. Rodriguez, & R. Chennault (Eds.), *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America* (77-101). New York: St. Martin Press.

Rains, F. (2003). To greet the dawn with open eyes: American Indians, white privilege, and the power of residual guilt in the social studies. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 199-230). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Rains, F. (2006). The colour of the social studies: A post-social studies reality check. In E.W. Ross (Eds.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (137-156). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Robinson, C. & McKnight, D. (2007). Technologized democracy: A critique on technology's place in social studies education. *THEN*: *journal about technology, humanities, education and narrative, 1* (4). http://www.thenjournal.org/feature/116/printable.

Roithmayr, D. (1999). Introduction to critical race theory in educational research and praxis. In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Race is...race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education* (pp. 1-6). Boulder: Westview Press.

Ross, E.W. and Pang, V. O. (Eds.) (2006). *Race, Ethnicity and Education* (Four Volumes). Greenwood Press. New York: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Ross, E.W. (2001). *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Santora, E. (2001). Interrogating privilege, plurality, and possibilities in a multicultural society. In W. Stanley (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies research for the 21st century* (149-178). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Seixas, P. (2000). Schweigen! Die kinder! or does postmodern history have a place in schools? In P. Stearns, P. Seixas, S. Wineburg (Eds.), (19-37). New York: New York University Press.

Shaver, J.P. (1981). Citizenship, values, and morality in the social studies. In H. Mehlinger & O.L. Davis (Eds.), *The social studies: The eightieth yearbook of the national society for the study of education* (105-125). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sleeter, C.E. (1999). Curriculum controversies in multicultural education. In M.J. Early & K. Rehage (Eds.), *Issues in curriculum: A selection of chapters from past NSSE yearbooks* (255-280). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sleeter, C.E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94-106.

Sleeter, C.E. (2005). How white teachers construct race. In C. McCarthy, W. Crichlow, G. Dimitriadis, & N. Dolby (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (243-256). New York: Routledge Press.

Sleeter, C.E. & Grant, C.A. (1991). Race, class, gender, and disability in current textbooks. In M. Apple & L. Christian-Smith (Eds.), *The politics of the textbook* (78-110). New York: Routledge.

Solomon, P., Portelli, J., Daniel, B.J., Campbell, A. (2005). The discourse of denial: how white teacher candidates construct race, racism and 'white privilege'. *Race Ethnicity and Education 8* (2), 147–169.

Stanley, W. B. (Ed.). (2001). *Social studies research for the 21st century.* Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Stanley, W. B., & Longwell, H. (2004). Ideology, power, and control in social studies teacher education. In S. Adler (Ed.), *Critical issues in social studies teacher education* (189-229). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Tate, W. (1997). Critical race theory and education: history, theory and implications. In M. Apple (Ed) Review of research in education, Vol. 22 (Itasca, Il. FE Peacock Publishers), 195-247

Thernstrom, A. & Thernstrom, S. (2003). *No excuses: Closing the racial gap in learning*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Titus, C. (1992). Social studies teachers and multicultural education: A pilot study of attitudes, perceptions and constraints. Research Report. Eric document ED366516.

Tyson, C. (2001). A bridge over troubled water: Social studies, civic education, and critical race theory. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race theory perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (15-25). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

VanSledright, B. & Afflerbach, P. (2000). Reconstructing Andrew Jackson: Prospective elementary teachers' readings of revisionist history texts. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 28*(3), 411-444.

Wade, R. (1993). Content Analysis of Social Studies Textbooks: A Review of Ten Years of Research. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *21*(3), 232-256.

West, C. (1993). *Beyond multiculturalism and eurocentrism: Prophetic thought in postmodern times.* Monroe, LA: Common Courage Press.

West, C. (2001, Revised). *Race matters*. Beacon Press.

White, H. (1997). Historical emplotment and the problem of truth. In R. Jenkins (Ed.), *The postmodern history reader* (392-397). New York: Routledge.

Wildman, S., & Davis, A. (1997). Making systems of privilege visible. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical white studies: Looking behind the mirror* (314-319). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Wills, J.S. (2001). Missing in interaction: Diversity, narrative, and critical multicultural social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education 29*(1), 43-64.

Zinn, H. (2004). *Voice of a people's history of the United States.* New York: Seven Stories Press.

Zinn, H. (2005). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-present*. New York: HarperPerennial.

Writers' details
Prentice Chandler is Assistant Professor of Education at Athens State University, Athens, Alabama, USA
Douglas McKnight is Associate Professor, Curriculum Studies, Dept. of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies (ELPTS), the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama, USA

Correspondence

Prentice.Chandler@athens.edu

dmcknigh@bama.ua.edu